

15th March 1928

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

Volume II

(8th March to 27th March, 1928)

**SECOND SESSION
OF THE
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1928**



**DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1928**

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II—8th March to 27th March, 1928.

	PAGES.
Thursday, 8th March, 1928—	
Message from the Council of State	1159
The General Budget—General Discussion— <i>concl'd.</i>	1159-94, 1196-1219
Statement of Business	1195
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1195
Saturday, 10th March, 1928—	
Questions and Answers	1221-33
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1134-39
Motion for Adjournment—Lockout at Lillooah on the East Indian Railway—Ruled out of order	1239-41
Motion for Adjournment—Announcement made by His Excel- lency the Commander-in-Chief on the 8th March, 1928, in con- nection with the Report of the Sandhurst Committee—Leave granted	1241-44
The Indian Territorial Force (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1244
The Auxiliary Force (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1245
The Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1245
The General Budget—List of Demands—	
Demand No. 16—Customs—	1245-83
Abolition of the export duty on raw hides	1245-56
Continuous increase in expenditure	1256-59
Export duty on jute	1259-66
Using the income derived from the protective duties for the general expenditure of the Central Government	1266-74
Policy: Viramgam Customs Cordon	1274-82
Rebate of Customs Duty on Scientific Instruments and Chemicals imported for the <i>bona fide</i> use of Educational and Scientific Institutions	1282-83
Motion for Adjournment—Announcement made by His Excel- lency the Commander-in-Chief on the 8th March, 1928, in connection with the Report of the Sandhurst Committee— Adopted	1283-1306
Monday, 12th March, 1928—	
Questions and Answers	1307-13
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1313-21
The Indian Mines (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1321

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Monday, 12th March, 1928—*contd.*The General Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

Demand No. 16—Customs— <i>concl'd.</i>	1321-39
Export duty on rice	1321-26
Inadequate and insufficient representation of minorities and the Mussalmans in all branches of the Customs Services	1326-39
Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	1339-66
Conditions of recruitment, qualifications, pay and promotion of officers in the Income-tax Department, Bombay	1339-41
Grievances of the Assesseees	1341-52
Defective Working of Devolution Rule No. 15	1353-55
Equitable Share to Provinces	1355-58
Incomes of Shipping, Insurance and Banking Concerns	1358-64
Levy of Income-tax in Upper Burma	1364-66
Appendix	1367

Tuesday, 13th March, 1928—

Member Sworn	1369
Questions and Answers	1369-71
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1371-78
The General Budget— <i>contd.</i>			
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>			
Demand No. 72—Miscellaneous	1379-1407
The Indian Statutory Commission	1379-91
Delegation to the International Labour Conference and allowances paid to Delegates and Advisers	1391-98
Delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations	1399-1407
Message from the Council of State	1407
The General Budget— <i>contd.</i>			
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>			

Demand No. 82—Expenditure in England under the control of the Secretary of State for India	1408-22
Powers of the Secretary of State for India	1408-11
The India Office being a reactionary body not wanted by India	1411-22
Demand No. 40—Central Board of Revenue	1422-28
Lack of uniformity in the system and incidence of tax collection	1422-27
Non-appointment of Burmans to the superior grades of the departments under the control of the Board	1427-28

Wednesday, 14th March, 1928—

Questions and Answers	1429-39
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1439-42
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>			
Demand No. 74—North-West Frontier Province—	1443-68
Introduction of Reforms in the North-West Frontier Province	1443-63
Necessity of strengthening the judiciary	1463-68
Demand No. 38—Army Department—			
For obvious reasons (The policy and expenditure)	1468-90

CONTENTS—*contd.***Thursday, 15th March, 1928—**

PAGES.

Bill passed by the Council of State laid on the table	...	1491
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		
Demand No. 38—Army Department— <i>concl'd.</i>		
For obvious reasons (The policy and expenditure)	...	1491-1532
Demand No. 28—Executive Council.		
On the principle that there should be no square pegs in round holes	...	1532-48
Demands Nos. 18—27	...	1549-51
Demands Nos. 29—37	...	1551-52
Demand No. 39	...	1552
Demands Nos. 41-71	...	1552-57
Demand No. 73	...	1558
Demands Nos. 75—81	...	1558-59
Demand No. 83	...	1559
Demands Nos. 84—94	...	1559-61

Friday, 16th March, 1928—

Member Sworn	...	1563
Statement of Business	...	1563
Statement laid on the Table	...	1563-71
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses adjourned	...	1572-1632

Saturday, 17th March, 1928—

Questions and Answers	...	1633-39
Unstarred Question and Answer	...	1639
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to pass adjourned	...	1639-89

Monday, 19th March, 1928—

Questions and Answers	...	1691-1706
Unstarred Questions and Answers	...	1706-16
The Indian Finance Bill—Passed	...	1716-57
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	...	1758-66
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses adjourned	...	1766-72

Tuesday, 20th March, 1928—

Questions and Answers	...	1773-76
Unstarred Question and Answer	...	1776-77
Resolution <i>re</i> Financial Irregularities relating to the Sambhar Salt Improvement Scheme—Negatived	...	1777-1805
Resolution <i>re</i> Export of Sacred Objects and Indian Antiquities—Withdrawn	...	1805-13
Resolution <i>re</i> Sugar Industry in India—Discussion adjourned for want of a quorum	...	1813-26

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	Page:
Wednesday, 21st March, 1928—	
Questions and Answers	1827-29
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1829-32
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1833-39
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Passed as amended	1839-63
The Indian Territorial Force (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1863-91
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	1891
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	1891
Election of the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	1891
Election of the Public Accounts Committee	1892
The Auxiliary Force (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended...	1892
Thursday, 22nd March, 1928—	
The Hindu Child Marriage Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1893
The Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1893-94
The Reservation of the Coastal Traffic of India Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1894-1901
The Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1901-17
The Hindu Inheritance (Removal of Disabilities) Bill—Passed	1917-18
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1919-20
The Indian Divorce (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1920-22
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Immunity of Members of unregistered Trade Unions, etc., from the consequence of the Conspiracy Law—Motion to circulate adopted	1922-24
The Hindu Marriages Dissolution Bill—Introduced	1924
The Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1924
The Indian Life Assurance Companies (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1925
The Hindu Marriages Dissolution Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1925
The Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1925-26
Monday, 26th March, 1928—	
Member Sworn	1927
Questions and Answers	1927-54
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1954-63
Messages from the Council of State	1963-64
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	1964
Election of the Public Accounts Committee	1965
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill—Withdrawn	1965-66
The Child Marriage Restraint Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1966-79
The Caste Disabilities Removal Repealing Bill—Motion to circulate negatived	1979-84

CONTENTS—*concl'd.*

PAGES.

Monday, 26th March, 1928—*concl'd.*

The Interest Restriction Bill—Withdrawn	1984-89
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate adopted	1989-90

Tuesday, 27th March, 1928—

Member Sworn	1991
Questions and Answers	1991-2004
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2005-18
Election of the Public Accounts Committee	2018
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	2018
Election of the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2019
The Chittagong Port (Amendment) Bill—Passed	2019-27
The Indian Mines (Amendment) Bill—Passed, as amended	2027-48
Demands for Excess Grants	2048-52
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2052-62
Resolution <i>re</i> Draft Conventions and Recommendation of the Tenth International Labour Conference regarding Sickness Insurance—Adopted	2063-77

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 15th March, 1928.

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

BILL PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF STATE LAID ON THE TABLE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, in accordance with Rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I lay on the table the Bill further to amend the Indian Limitation Act, 1908, which was passed by the Council of State at its meeting of the 14th March, 1928.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Expenditure charged to Revenue—contd.

DEMAND No. 38—ARMY DEPARTMENT—*concl'd.*

Mr. President: The House will now resume further discussion of Mr. Chaman Lall's motion:

"That the Demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced by Rs. 5,70,999." (For obvious reasons.)

Mr. N. C. Kelkar (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, my friend Mr. Chaman Lall, has given a cut on the Army Department, giving as his reasons, reasons which he says are "obvious". But sometimes we find that the unobvious is also more conclusive, and I am going to say something about that.

In the course of the debate on this subject yesterday I heard a Member denouncing the British policy in this matter as Machiavellian. I am here to protest against it, not because it is unfair to the British Government, but because it is more unfair to Machiavelli himself! (Laughter). We all know that Machiavelli is a byword in political history. He stands for cunning statesmanship of the highest order, but what do we find in contemporary history? The characteristics of one age and generation are easily displayed by those of another age and generation. After the termination of the war I remember to have read a literary critic who said that if in this age after the war a great poetic genius came to the front he could write an epic on the war which would be greater than Milton's "Paradise Lost". "Paradise Lost", of course, contains the tragic grandiloquence about Satan. But the critic said that if an epic poem were to be

[M. N. C. Kelkar.]

written now he could well describe the fall of William, Kaiser of Germany, which would perhaps be a greater fall than that of Satan himself. Similarly, I would say that if any man with historical and political acumen were to come forward he could easily write a treatise on statesmanship by which he could prove that Machiavelli was nothing as compared with the British genius in point of cunning statesmanship.

Now, in order to prove this, I will just quote Machiavelli himself. (Laughter). In the discussion of this subject we are saying that it is bad policy for the British that they should disarm the Indian people and should not appoint Indians to the higher ranks of the military service. Now what does Machiavelli say? He was an apostle of autocracy in its highest sense and yet what did he say? I will quote his very words. He says in his book "The Prince":

"A wise prince was never known to disarm his subjects; rather finding them unfurnished he puts arms into their hands, for by arming them and innuring them to warlike exercise those arms are surely your own. They who were suspicious to you will become faithful; they who are faithful are confirmed, and all your subjects become of your party. And because the whole multitude which submits to your government is not capable of being armed, if you be beneficial and obliging to those you do arm, you may make the bolder with the rest, for the difference of your behaviour to the soldier binds him more firmly to your service. But when you disarm, you disgust them and imply a diffidence in them, either for cowardice or treachery, and the one or the other is sufficient to give them an impression of hatred against you."

Now I ask anybody, who is the greater evil genius, the British Government or Machiavelli? Here is Machiavelli actually saying, you should give arms to your people and obtain their confidence. But what is the policy actually followed by the British Government?

Now, may I ask Government whether they can point out any instances in which it could be proved that your Indian officers, military officers, have ever been guilty of cowardice and treachery? I saw the other day a book in the Library which is full of rewards and military prizes given to Indian officers, and the book is full from cover to cover with the mention of the names of these high Indian officers. Now you might perhaps hark back and say, there was the Indian Mutiny, and it was a sepoy mutiny, and in that mutiny Indian military officers took part against Government. But that is a thing of the past, and it is high time that all of us forgot the Indian Mutiny. I dare say the last mutiny veteran has by this time died out. It is too late to think of the mutiny now, and we must adjust our relations between the Government and the people of this country.

I would say this that in other times, though there were foreign Governments in this country, history shows that those foreign Governments put implicit confidence in their Indian military officers. I will give only two striking instances. Who was the Commander of that most important arm in the army, namely, the artillery under the Marathas? It was a Muhammadian. Ibrahim Khan Lodi was the commandant of the artillery of the Marathas at Panipat. At Panipat the Marathas may have failed, but Ibrahim Khan gave the best account of himself: he died on the battlefield. He could not be accused of treachery. I will give another instance. Look at Aurangzeb himself. He is said by historians to be the most bigoted Mughal King. Yet he had such confidence in Indian commandants and captains that when in desperation to catch Shivaji and to defeat him, he

could not find a better General, a more trustworthy General than his Rajput commander, namely, Jai Singh, and it was Jai Singh who came to the Deccan and defeated Shivaji and took him as a captive, an honoured captive, to the court of Aurangzeb. Now what do these contrary instances prove? Here are Marathas putting their absolute trust and confidence in a Muhammadan, keeping him in charge of artillery, and here you have Aurangzeb himself appointing Jai Singh a Hindu, to go and defeat Shivaji! I do not think history can produce any better illustration of confidence reposed by a Government in an alien people even in matters of military command. But it is not only that we Indians say this. Testimony can be produced from very high English authors themselves on the subject, and I will just quote Sir Henry Harrison, who has pointed out the defect of the military policy of the British Government in this respect. He says:

"The citizen soldier is after all the backbone of national defence, if not the entire military system; and there is no country in the world except India in which Government not only do not take into account, but also rely upon, the civil population as part of their defensive military organisation. But the British Government have carried the idea of their duty of protecting the people in India to an absurd excess and they would rather import the available army from England, accept the services of colonial contingents, or perhaps even invite Japan, under the terms of a friendly alliance with her, to spare a portion of her gallant army. But they would on no account trouble the Indian people themselves for defending their own hearths and homes."

Mr. F. W. Allison (Bombay: Nominated Official): Will the Honourable Member kindly tell us who is this authority he is referring to?

Mr. N. O. Kelkar: He is Sir Henry Harrison.

An Honourable Member: Who is he?

Mr. N. O. Kelkar: You ought to know better. I have taken this from a book of which the author is Sir Henry Harrison, and you ought to know your Harrison better than I can. Well, in the course of this discussion, it has been pointed out that the British military officer would not like to serve under an Indian officer. Now may I ask why in this case there should be an exception, when we see European officers serving quite willingly under the authority of Indian superiors. Take your District Magistrate. The European District Magistrate certainly does not quit his job because the District and Sessions Judge is an Indian. In the High Court we often find that an Indian acts as a Chief Justice sometimes. Do the other English Judges quit their job because they have got an Indian superior at the head? Certainly not. Here again in the Executive Council there are at least three Indian Members. Englishmen serve as Secretaries to them. They do not give up their job because at their head is an Indian. Why should it be then that in military service alone the English officer should dislike to serve under an Indian head? Now too much is made of the racial prejudice against colour in this matter. It was always pretended that in European wars, or in wars in which Europeans were concerned on both sides, Indian troops were not to be utilised, and that the Europeans would prefer to fight out the quarrel themselves. That was the pretence sometime ago, but that pretence has happily been knocked on the head in the Great War when it was found that it was the Indian troops who went first of all to the rescue of France and England in Europe, and after that I suppose there would no longer be any talk of coloured troops not being employed in European wars. Then what do we find with regard to other nations? Take Spain, for instance, and France itself. France and

[Mr. N. C. Kelkar.]

Spain have actually employed coloured troops in their scheme of defence. Even in Russia, non-Christian subjects are admitted to high military service, and I will here just quote one more English authority about whose identity there is no doubt, I mean Sir Henry Cotton :

“The Mogul emperors adopted heartily and completely the policy of trust; Akbar's greatest generals and most devoted adherents were children of the very men his grandfather had conquered. . . . The British Government, on the contrary, has adopted a policy of suspicion. . . . The Russians can get from the territories they have absorbed in Central Asia an Alikhanoff or a Loris Melikoff. We can only produce men who rise to the rank of a Naik, Havaldar or Resaldar.”

Now if Shivaji himself were living at this time, I suppose he could not rise above the post of a Risaldar or Havildar.

An Honourable Member: Shame, shame!

Mr. N. C. Kelkar: Take your Indian captain of these days. His chest may be full of ribbons and medals and other marks of military honour, but the latest subaltern with no moustache on his lips would command that old veteran with his white beard. What is all this due to? Nothing but racial pride: and therefore I say the sooner Government quits this policy the better. I will hark back again and say that in all this we have an example of cunning statesmanship which out-Machiavellis Machiavelli himself.

Mr. Rajivaranjan Prasad Sinha (Patna *cum* Shahabad: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to associate myself with what has fallen from the previous speakers in condemnation of the entire military policy of the Government. That policy, Sir, is an outrage against the people of this country. We have been told time and again that the British people and the Government are sincere in their desire to advance India to the goal of responsible self-government within the Empire. I consider this question of army reform, Sir, as the touchstone of that sincerity. Without labouring the point further I may say at once that most of us are convinced to-day that the announcement of August 1917 was purely and simply a war measure, as was pointed out by my esteemed friend, Lala Lajpat Rai, the other day. I know that the Honourable the Home Member produced arguments to controvert that statement, but may I assure him, Sir, that Government are judged and can only be properly judged, not by their words or their skilful arguments, but by their acts of commission and omission; and judging them by that standard, there is not the least doubt in our minds to-day that Government do not stand by their declaration of 1917 or the Act of 1919 in so far as the question of reform of the Indian Army is concerned. Recent events have shown that Government are not willing to advance India even in the matter of the progressive Indianization of the higher ranks of the Army. Sir, a distinguished Englishman told us the other day that history will not fail to return its verdict—I do not recollect the exact words—against those who chose to hinder when it was in their power to help India. Sir, I make a present of these eloquent words to the Benches opposite. Let them search their hearts and say whether or not these words apply to them with far greater force than to those for whom they were originally intended. Sir, never before in the history of the association of the two countries, Great Britain and India, was a better opportunity presented to the British people and the Government to help

India, but they have chosen deliberately to hinder her. I want the House, Sir, to take note of this fact, because we, on this side, are often treated to homilies—cheap homilies—by the other side on the value of co-operation and are accused of contributing obstacles rather than help to the progress of our country, India.

Sir, during the last war Indians proved to the world that, given the opportunity they were as efficient fighters as any other races of the world. No question of their inefficiency was raised at the time. As a matter of fact, in those days they were lauded to the skies as a brave and gallant people who had done their very best for the Empire. Now, Sir, ten years after the war was fought and won, the British Government have discovered that the efficiency of the Indian Army would be seriously undermined if the scheme, the exceedingly moderate scheme, for progressive Indianisation of the higher ranks of the Army, whereby in 25 years—or rather at the end of that time—the proportions of Indian and British officers in the Army would have stood at half and half, was given effect to. Sir, I wish to ask a straight question of the Benches opposite. We all desire that the Indian Army should be maintained in an efficient state, but may I ask how that efficiency is going to be impaired by allowing Indians to be trained for the higher military service of their country? Sir, it is not our position that untrained Indians should be put into the commissioned ranks of the Army. All that we ask is that Indians should be allowed in increasing numbers to receive military training in a military college established here in our own country on the model of Sandhurst, and when the Indians have been properly trained, when they have successfully passed through all the tests of training, then they should be commissioned and taken into the Army. Now, is it the contention of the Government, Sir, that an Indian, even when he has been properly trained, when he has passed all the examinations, when he has passed out of Sandhurst, for instance, is still inefficient and that if such officers are allowed to enter the Indian Army in increasing numbers, the efficiency of the Army will be seriously damaged and a great disaster will overtake the British Raj? Sir, an argument like this has simply to be stated to be thoroughly exposed and rejected. I doubt very much if the Government with their well-known capacity for producing outrageous arguments will dare to subscribe to this, in the face of what Indians have done during the Great War and are doing to-day, and yet, Sir, that is the only argument which could justify the turning down of an exceedingly moderate scheme for automatic and progressive Indianisation of the higher ranks of the Army. Sir, I do not wish to detain the House longer, but I wish to say this, that an exceedingly reprehensible game is being played against Indians. It is not fair; it is not worthy of "God's Englishmen". Sir, they have deliberately and systematically disarmed and emasculated a whole nation; and after the war in which that nation gave such a gallant account of itself, there was a chance of helping it forward, of helping it to regain its lost manhood, Government, Sir, are content to dole out meagre concessions and to say "Be content with these, you will get more when you have given further proof of your efficiency." Sir, it is a hard thing, a very hard thing indeed, to ask for small favours. We hate asking for scraps of concessions as intensely as I believe Englishmen would in similar circumstances, but when we have asked for them, when we have begged them and have not got them, then, Sir, the feelings become embittered beyond all expression. Let Government take note of this. It is

[Mr. Rajivaranjan Prasad Sinha.]

not the political agitator alone who condemns the Government in this matter; every Indian of whatever shade of political opinion who has the smallest spark of self-respect in him is filled to-day with intense indignation and resentment at the policy that the Government have been pursuing in regard to the reform of the Indian Army. Sir, if the Government wish to keep up the merest pretence of ruling this country in accordance with the wishes of the people, they must alter that policy in an honest and straightforward manner. But if, Sir, they are minded otherwise, I can only say that I wish them the joy of their present position. I wish them the joy of their glorious position under this wonderful constitution of ours, a constitution which, I believe, has no parallel throughout the civilised world, in which they can continue to fill the Benches opposite, however grossly they may mismanage our affairs or however bitterly they may disappoint us and our hopes and aspirations.

Sir, I support the motion. (Applause.)

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Sir, I have already twice during the discussion on the Budget had some opportunity of speaking on the question of military policy. The time on those occasions was brief and I would like to expand to some extent the points I then made. Before going on to deal with the debate we have had in the House on this particular motion, I would like to refer to one point raised by the Mover of the motion, and that is his criticism of the absence of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in this House. Now, Sir, that criticism, if justified at all, might have fallen better from his lips if he, the Mover of the motion, had remained present during yesterday afternoon's discussion.

Diwan Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir, I was most of the time present in the House.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: My feeling on this point is that an active soldier like His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief should not be brought into political controversy.

An Honourable Member: Quite so, but why did he come here and make the statement?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: And I feel that his presence in this House and incidents which have arisen in this House are definitely damaging to his position as Commander-in-Chief and very definitely subversive of military discipline; (*An Honourable Member*: "We do not care".) And to have an attack made on His Excellency, such as Mr. Goswami made yesterday and to say that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief made a cowardly libel on Indians, well knowing the sympathy which His Excellency has always shown for his Indian troops, is, I submit, definitely subversive of the best military discipline.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Why does he come here and talk to us?

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I do not care.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Do you expect military discipline in this House?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Now, Sir, the arguments which were put forward in this debate yesterday and have been put forward to-day have taken two lines. One is directed towards a criticism on account of military expenditure and the other towards a criticism against Government on account of their Indianisation policy. I propose to deal first with the question of military expenditure because that was the line which the Mover of the motion took.

Now, Sir, if the Mover of the motion wanted to criticise the military expenditure, I submit that he should not have based his arguments on false premises. We are aware that the Honourable gentleman has, on a previous occasion, placed statistics before this House which were ten years old. Surely he knows what the actual position regarding the military expenditure is to-day. If he does not know that, I will remind him from some quotations from India, 1924-25, where we have this question of military expenditure placed on its proper footing. The military expenditure of India, if you want to get at the percentage of it according to the total revenues of the country, must be taken not as against the central revenues alone but as against the total of central and provincial revenues.

Diwan Chaman Lal: May I ask the Honourable Member whether it is not a fact that . . .

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I am not prepared to give way.

An Honourable Member: Who spends the money?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: The total expenditure of our military budget is somewhere between 50 and 60 crores and our total revenue, central and provincial, is 220 crores. Therefore, the correct proportion of our military expenditure to our revenues is somewhat under 33 per cent. and that is the ground on which the Honourable Member should, if he desired to criticise the military expenditure, of which he has every right, have taken up his stand. Now, Sir, he comes before this House and endeavours to compare the military expenditure of India with the military expenditure of other Dominions of the British Empire whose vulnerability to attack is in no way comparable with that with which we are faced. He might just as well have taken the military budget for the South Sea Islands and said that as these people can get on without any military expenditure, therefore why should we incur any expenditure at all. On the other hand, I feel that the genuine way of criticising the military expenditure is that we should endeavour to compare our rifle strength with the number of rifles that can be brought against us; and if you want to go outside for comparison, you should endeavour to find some other country in which the conditions of the terrain in which we will have to fight are to some extent comparable.

Now, let me take the question of rifles. I believe our strength of rifles in round numbers is somewhere about 200,000. Now, we know that on our North-West Frontier the actual fighting strength of the tribes amounts roughly to somewhere round about 500,000, of which, I believe, roughly about a third are armed with modern weapons. Behind that, again, of course, you have your Afghan standing army and, possibly just as important, your Afghan tribal troops who have been bred and brought up in a fighting atmosphere.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): How much money does Afghanistan spend on its army?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: So actually, as regards our number of rifles, when we have deducted as much as may be necessary for the protection of our strategic railways, and for watching our North-East Frontier and also for our internal security purposes, the fighting strength of our army as opposed to what might be brought against us is not, I submit, unduly high.

Lala Lajpat Rai (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Why not add Soviet Russia also?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Now, let me compare for one minute the position in some other country which has as comparable a terrain as that with which our military authorities are faced. I will take you to French Morocco. Here in a country the population of which is only 5 millions, I find the French are compelled to maintain 2 regiments of Zouaves, 10 regiments of Tirailleurs, 3 regiments of the Foreign Legion, one regiment of Colonial Infantry, and 6 regiments of mixed troops, partly French and partly Moroccan. Each of the above regiments is composed of three battalions and the total force maintained in Morocco is 85,000 men.

An Honourable Member: At whose cost?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: If we go again to the actual operations which the French had to carry out in Morocco in terrain, which, I submit, is comparable with the terrain which we have on the North-West Frontier, we find that in undertaking operations in a country 200 miles long, not a thousand miles as is the North-West Frontier of India, and only 60 miles wide, they had to deploy in spite of the Spanish forces already engaged in that area 100,000 rifles. Now, Sir, I hold that this is an example which does enable this House to appreciate to some extent whether or not the strength of the army which we maintain for our defence is extravagant, and I can only hold that in view of those figures our army, as far as its strength is concerned, is not in the least bit extravagant.

I will now pass on to the problem of Indianisation. Here I think my views are already to some extent known.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Well known.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I believe that Indianisation is not only a political necessity but to some extent a military necessity in view of the fact that we are faced and may be increasingly faced with difficulty in obtaining a British element. Why I have criticised and have been a close critic of the proposals put forward by the Skeen Committee and the proposals which are placed before the House by Government is on the ground that for an army mainly recruited from the yeoman classes we are endeavouring to find officers practically entirely from the urban middle class. Having knowledge of the conditions as they are to-day in India I believe that a policy which concentrates entirely in that direction is fundamentally wrong in principle. I have listened, Sir, for constructive proposals from the Benches occupied by the Swarajist Party. Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, their leader, threw out a suggestion that your best way of driving out the enemy is by votes of censure, and Mr. Goswami alluded to the well-known ability and command which Indians have of words.

Mr. M. B. Jayakar (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What else can we do?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I have, Sir, drawn from my imagination a picture of the type of army which we might expect under Field-Marshal Srinivasa Iyengar, and I thought that it might be composed of a first line of process servers, who would be supported by bodies of learned gentlemen moving appeals in the High Court, with a further body of politicians as shock troops firing off votes of censure, the advance of the whole army covered by a barrage of words under the direction of Mr. Goswami. But I could not persuade myself to believe that the idea of having such an army at the present moment was at all attractive. It might be that in the future, when your League of Nations has developed and nations take their cases to be fought out in the courts of the League, such an army, which, mind you, will be an expensive army, may, anyhow, in the first instance be of some use. But, remembering Pandit Motilal Nehru's statement that we have to keep before us the facts of human nature, I feel that it will be many generations and beyond our time before we can neglect the fact that we are faced along our North-West Frontier with people who will, long before they resort to law, resort to the force of arms.

Honourable Members of the Independent and Nationalist Party have made much play of the fact that a British officer cannot be commanded by an Indian, and yet their own words, I think, have very largely disproved that there is any particular argument in that point. My friend Mr. Kelkar has already definitely quoted the fact that Britishers are already serving under Indians in the civil administration, and my own impression is that, where a soldier inspires confidence, the pigment of his skin will not deter other soldiers from serving under him. But, after all, is the particular desire of this House that all that they want is that their Indian officers may command British officers? I hold that that is an entire side issue. What we want our Indian officers to do is to command men and what is more and very essential is Indian officers who will be followed by their men.

Now, Sir, I will turn to my own criticisms of military policy in so far as I made them the other day and was unable to get any reply from the Army Secretary during the General Budget discussion. On that occasion I pointed out that the Government military policy was the maintenance of a small army, but on the understanding that it was maintained at the highest standard of efficiency. Now, I contend that that last proviso which Government themselves make has not been fulfilled. On that occasion I pointed out that we had taken risks definitely owing to our financial stringency. Now, that the days of financial stringency are past, I would like to know from the Army Secretary whether the equipment of our army is in a satisfactory position. Are our troops in India for expeditionary purposes in that state of mobility in which we have a right to expect them to be? Are our troops equipped to contend with an attack from the air accompanied by the use of gas? My own impression is that he will be unable to give me a really satisfactory answer to both of these criticisms. I also asked him what was the position regarding the officers in our military forces; and here again I know that you have not, in those military forces and amongst your officers, that sort of contentment which is so essential to the efficiency of the army. I think in the main the difficulties are

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

very often of a minor nature, but they are ones which demand Government consideration. I mentioned during my speech on the General Budget discussion that the question of accommodation was one touching the interests of the officer which in some cantonments was very far from satisfactory. There are other questions regarding travelling expenses. For instance, I believe on the move from Simla to Delhi, while some officers are all right, many married officers actually lose because that particular move is put on the temporary and not on the permanent scale. I do not feel that if Government order officers to move about the country to suit Government purposes, that they should lose thereby. Also, Government have accepted the policy that they give their officers home leave, and yet there are few of our junior officers and junior married majors who are able to get the benefit of that holiday in England to which they are entitled by regulations, due to the fact that their furlough pay is definitely below the standard of living which they should maintain—let alone to provide them with any opportunity of enjoying that holiday when they get it. These are points, Sir, which I believe with a little manipulation and with no very great measure of expense—because after all if an officer takes his leave in India for eight months he gets higher pay than he does if he goes to England—can be adjusted. I would urge Government once more to have these matters not only under consideration but definitely to take some action. We cannot look to our army to fulfil its obligations if, as I say, its efficiency is hampered by the fact that its officers feel that they have a certain number of grievances and if our officers feel that their equipment is not modern, that they are not given the latest weapons of war wherewith to do their job, and if our men are not adequately equipped with what is necessary for their own protection in the event of certain types of attack. As I say, I feel these are definite matters to which Government should give attention. I feel that our military expenditure, though high, is forced on us by our geographical position and our vulnerability to attack; and I submit that I have produced figures which show that those figures are not, in view of the position, very high. They compare very favourably with the figures in other countries. You have Japan, a country which is very often quoted by Honourable Members opposite, who spends some 75 crores on her defence out of a total revenue of 210 crores. We are therefore well within what we ought to be. If anything our position is more easy. Mr. Chaman Lall stated that Soviet Russia had increased her forces for fear of attack by the British. I do not believe that he really thinks that. I know he is a very sincere admirer of the Soviet form of self-determination, although I do not know that the Muhammadan tribes in the Caucasus or Central Asia would perhaps quite so readily agree with him. But we must face the possibilities. Everything is not yet peaceful in this world. There is constant trouble in Mesopotamia which might easily spread throughout the Middle East, and I hold that this is not the time when we should leave ourselves with an inadequate military defence or a military defence that is improperly equipped.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I had no intention whatever of intervening in this debate, but for the somewhat humorous observations which the unofficial apologist for His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the Government Benches generally has made from the European Block. I am very sorry to hear that

Colonel Crawford is thinking of becoming Commander-in-Chief. If His Excellency the present Commander-in-Chief is to be Minister for Army matters in this House, he must take the consequences and the Government must take the consequences. Of course it might have been wisdom on the part of the Government to have put an Indian as Army Minister in charge of this department; then things would have been better argued on the one side and on the other; but if you choose to put in one who ought to be a non-party man, the head of the Army, as a political Minister in charge of Army matters, it is impossible for you to gag the Members of this Assembly, it is impossible to restrict the freedom of debate, it is impossible to prevent that criticism and that comment upon absences which are so perfectly legitimate. Whatever one's office is—and I am glad to notice that the opinion of the *Pioneer* is in favour of the view which I am just stating,—one must take the consequences of one's position. I shall not be in the least degree sorry, and the Members on the other side should not be sorry, if, as a result of this debate during the last week and this week, a change in the administration of the Army Department takes place. It is for good reason, Sir, that the constitution has put His Excellency the Viceroy outside this Assembly; and it is for similar reasons that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief ought not to be making announcements, ought not to be in the Legislature, and ought not to take charge of these matters. But if he makes an announcement in this House which rouses on our side the deepest resentment, if he makes his announcement in language which is calculated to provoke counter-attacks, he and his supporters must gladly, cheerfully and in a sportsmanlike fashion welcome them. Sir, it has been said that the British people like criticism, but I have never found that quality in people who resent criticism, who walk away when the Army debate takes place here and who, when they are backed up by nominated Members and majorities in their lobbies are vociferous and thump their tables time and again, but who, when their lobbies are thinned and from poverty of argument are unable to find anything else to do, simply shut their eyes, and who occasionally smile imperturbably and at other times with an unsmiling imperturbability they try to carry on. This sort of game has been carried on too far, and I would request Members on the other side of the House to remember that the political centre of gravity in India is not in the Civil Service only, but is in the unofficial European community in India, and therefore they should not lightheartedly enter into the affray. If they want to remain in India as equal citizens of a free India they must throw in their lot with us and not taunt us, as Colonel Crawford has chosen to taunt my friend Mr. Goswami. I consider that my friend Mr. Goswami was perfectly justified in canvassing in the way he did the speech which was made by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Some of us who are old enough might have for reasons of needless courtesy, chosen to keep quiet, but sometimes even an elderly man, as my friend Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan pointed out in connection with another subject, cannot resist the temptation of making a counter-attack when he is provoked. But I really associate myself with the resentment expressed on this side of the House, and with the fullest sense of responsibility I associate myself with every word that my friend Mr. Goswami said yesterday of the Commander-in-Chief's speech and attitude. I consider, Sir that when you find a friend like the one who spoke before Colonel Crawford, when you find a man who has that stake in the country, that sobriety and that wisdom.

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar.]

when you hear a man like that speak so strongly, you may be perfectly certain that the conclusion which we have reached on the administration of the Army is shared by every Indian, whatever his status in life, whatever his occupation, whatever his political inclinations may be. It is a grotesque proposition on the part of my friend Colonel Crawford to tell us that there are 500,000 thousand rifles among the tribes and that we have got in round numbers 200,000 rifles. What kind of arithmetic is he giving? Is he forgetting the machine guns and the Tank Corps and the various up-to-date weapons of offence with which he ought to be more familiar. His reply is really a case of *suppressio veri*. It must be quite clear to my friend that the British Army in India is quite capable of taking care of the Frontier even if it is one-fourth as strong as it is to-day. There is no need at all in modern times for such a huge army as this, and I do not desire, when we are at peace with Afghanistan, to imitate the example of my friend Colonel Crawford in dragging in the King of Afghanistan. If India is not tied to the Empire she will be far more peaceful and will have nothing to fear from her neighbours who will have no cause for misgivings or provocation. And are we made to feel that because we are tied to a bellicose Empire anxious to carry on a warfare to conquer the world, that that Empire is unwanted and is a galling burden to us? I think it is not statesmanship. I think the Madras Congress was perfectly wise in formally declaring that the goal of the Indian people should be complete national independence. I want to warn Members on the opposite side not to persist in the line of talk they have indulged in to-day. I want to warn members like Colonel Crawford and others of his way of thinking that the formal declaration of independence may ere long be followed by mass movement if that kind of talk is persisted in on the other side. It is necessary for Members on the other side to see things in their true perspective and to open their eyes to the realities of the situation. And when you find all over Asia, all the world over, there is jealousy against the British Empire and nobody loves this British Empire except those who are themselves the ruling people in that Empire, it ought to be plain to them that there must be a thorough change in their policy. Let them make up their minds to have that change of policy. We are not anxious to be within the Empire at all. They have overstayed their welcome in this country. It is not by votes of censure that any of us is going to be a Field-Marshal or a Commander-in-Chief, but the time will come when most of my countrymen will see things clearly. You may delay it by three years, five years or 10 years—but I tell you that I have a vision,—and those who see things clearly will appreciate it—that this Government will be soon swept out of the country. I therefore ask the Members who take part in this debate not to provoke us more than they have been provoking us. I think Honourable civilian Members of this House are much wiser in keeping quiet and not answering things because they cannot answer; it is much better for them to keep quiet than provoke us, for I would welcome many more specimens of Colonel Crawford's speech because that is the kind of spur that is required to enable us to speed ourselves up. I do not think that Colonel Crawford has been very wise in blossoming into a statistician, because he unnecessarily anticipated my friend the Army Secretary in connection with the ratio which he chose to draw between the central finances and the expenditure

Lala Lajpat Rai: Statistics are not his department.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Sir, the Army Department is a charge upon the central revenues and my Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall was perfectly justified in stating the obvious. What have we got to do with the provincial revenues when we know that in several provinces there are deficits and the provincial revenues are really taken out of the blood of the people in the provinces? You know perfectly well that whether the revenue is used in the provinces or in the central exchequer the people are groaning under heavy taxation. Do you think that with an average annual income of Rs. 60 to 70 for an Indian in India we can support the British administration, the British Government and army and all the rest including my friend the Leader of the House, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and Colonel Crawford? I say no. Let us make it perfectly plain to ourselves that in no department of life, neither in the Army nor in civil matters, neither in taxation nor in expenditure, is this Government welcome to us to-day. Do not make the resentment grow in volume and do not deepen the wounds which you are causing every day. Try if you can to mend your ways—your last chance is this year—try if you can come to terms. But I know you are not likely to come to terms. I know that you are carrying on a vigorous propaganda against us and there is no disposition in England to come to any terms with us. Therefore, we are certain that Providence has determined that we shall win Swaraj not only through our own patriotism but through the blunders, through the criminal negligence and through the provocative attitude which the Government is adopting. I have every reason to think that we are perfectly justified, according to the best Parliamentary traditions, in criticising His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and his supporters in this House, and I associate myself also with that aspect of the debate which has been raised. Sir, I cordially support the motion which my gallant friend, as I should like to call him, moved so ably.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan (North Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, while a really good constructive criticism was going on from the Opposition Benches it is unfortunate that some of the remarks of Colonel Crawford should have confused the issue and made it necessary for the Leader of the Opposition Party to make some remarks which can be regarded only as a sort of general criticism. I will try to confine my remarks to a few things which concern chiefly the nation-building department, as it was called by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. But before I do that, I must say that I entirely agree with my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford that we must maintain in this country a sufficient number of rifles, keeping in view the number of rifles which the men in the Frontier have got and such other considerations. But I would propose to Colonel Crawford to consider whether it is not possible for us to maintain the same number of rifles, rather more rifles than we have got at present and pay less for them. If he is convinced that we can get a larger number of rifles with the efficiency which is essential and we can still bring down the Budget by a few crores, I am sure Colonel Crawford would agree with me and he would welcome that proposal.

So much has been said about Indianisation of officers in the Army that I would not like to add a word to it, but I would confine myself to

[Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan.]

the condition of the soldier ranks. At present, Sir, there is much unemployment among ex-soldiers. I think if a railway workshop containing about 200 labourers is closed down, the Honourable Sir George Rainy feels quite upset, even if he thinks that he has got to close down a certain shop, he must try to find out some means of giving employment to these people who will be thrown out of employment by doing so. I wonder if His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief ever thought, when he was going to demobilise a very very large number of soldiers, what would happen to them when they would not be able to do any other job after giving up their soldiering? In my own district, I know that there are at least 15,000 soldiers who served in the Great War and were then demobilised and who are without any employment now. The same is the case elsewhere, without pensions, Sir, most of them. The same is the case with a large number of soldiers, thousands in number, in Rawalpindi, Campbellpur and other districts. Now, I would request the Army Secretary to consider whether it was right that such a large number of men, who proved very efficient during the Great War, should have been demobilised without giving them any employment. Sir, it may be said that this demobilisation was bound to come and took place everywhere. Even in England they had to demobilise a large number of soldiers after the War. I agree. But in England they had to demobilise because there was no other alternative. Naturally no sensible man would suggest that just to give employment to a certain number of persons one should keep up the military budget and pay more than one ought to pay. But so far as India is concerned, they could afford to avoid this unemployment but they have not done it. As it has been definitely established that the cost of one British regiment is equal to that of 7 Indian regiments, it would follow that if we were to demobilise one British regiment we would have enough saved to maintain 7 Indian regiments. So the number of rifles would be increased. Instead of 1,000 rifles, they will have 7,000 rifles, and so far as efficiency is concerned, particularly in fighting on the side of the frontier, I hope there is no military officer of any experience, who would not agree with me that the Indian soldier has proved much more efficient than the British soldier. This is chiefly due to the climate there. Naturally, a British soldier, who cannot remain in the plains, even in a cantonment, without any fight, during the summer season, and who has got to be sent to some hill station, how can you expect him to go and fight during the months of June and July near the Khyber Pass? So the Indian soldier has proved and still is sure to prove more efficient than the British soldier on the frontier side. Therefore, if the only fear is from 'frontier', I would strongly hold that the demobilisation of a few British regiments and the enlisting of a fairly large number of Indian regiments would not do any harm, so far as efficiency is concerned.

Another point, Sir, in this connection is the proposal to give 6 vacancies at Sandhurst to Viceroy's commissioned officers. At present the military have stopped direct recruitment of Viceroy's commissioned officers. A few years ago they used to enlist young men as direct Jamadars. Under the present rules they do not enlist anybody as direct Jamadar, but he must join as a soldier. In the first place, it will be very difficult to persuade educated Indian young men to come forward and join as soldiers in the Army on a pay of Rs. 20 or Rs. 25 a month. Therefore, even

if we persuade them to join before they become Jamadars it will take them 5, 7 or 8 years, and unless they become Jamadars they will not be entitled to be given a King's commission and sent to Sandhurst. Again, the question of age would come in. Supposing they join the Army at the age of 18 and they become Jamadars at say 25 or 26, and then they go to Sandhurst and come out as Lieutenants, they would probably retire before they become Majors. Therefore, if the object is to give 6 King's commissions annually to Viceroy's commissioned officers, then I would request His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to make direct recruitment as Jamadars of Indians who are really suitable young men and who after a short time, if they prove fit, can become Lieutenants. I do not mean to suggest that all the posts of Jamadars should be filled up by direct recruitment, but what I would suggest is that a certain number of these posts, say if we are taking 6 annually, then 10 posts of Jamadars should be filled by direct nomination.

There is one more point, Sir. The recruitment of certain castes of Mussalmans is stopped in various regiments. I know even in the case of the Sayeds, who are a highly respectable Mussalman caste and who have proved very fit in the regiments in which they were enlisted at certain times, orders have been issued that they cannot join some regiments. I had a talk with some military officers who said that this was due to the fact that the Sayeds command great respect from the soldiers and therefore it will not be desirable to take them. I do not think this is such a crime that they should be debarred as a caste from joining the Army.

I would request the Army Secretary to tell us what objection he has got to keeping the British soldiers in the same numbers as at present. I have proved that so far as the Frontier is concerned, the Indian soldier is quite efficient. So far as loyalty is concerned, you can entirely depend upon him. I do not think any more trying circumstances would come than the Great War, when the Mussalman soldiers had to fight against the Turks, and in Arabia, and had to attack Baghdad, but still they proved loyal. During the non-co-operation movement and the 1919 disturbances you cannot give us a single case of an Indian soldier who proved disloyal. Even in the Khilafat agitation when there were *fatwas* by Ulemas that they must resign—*fauj main naukri haram hai*—you could not give me even half a dozen names of Indian soldiers who resigned. This shows that they proved absolutely loyal and therefore, if the object of keeping a large British Army is simply due to your not trusting the Indian soldiers, this is very unfair to them.

There is only one more point, and that is about the Army Remount Department which was called by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief as a nation-building department of the Army. I must acknowledge at the very outset that this Department has done a good deal of service and there is no denying the fact that the number of good mares and horses which are now produced in India would not have been produced but for the assistance of this Department. In 1901 and 1902, the Army Remount Department offered 2 squares of land to each man who brought a horse which was approved by the officer of the Army Remount Department. So what happened? Some of the Zemindars sold their property—their ancestral property—their houses and lands, and bought a mare for

[Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan.]

Rs. 800, 900, or Rs. 1,000, and took it to the Remount Officer. After that mare was approved, 1 or 2 squares of land was allotted to the man. That was in 1901. The Government wanted to make the acceptance of this land as attractive as they could to these Zemindars. At present the number of such Zemindars who have taken land on these horse-breeding conditions is very nearly 4,000 or 5,000, and they mainly exist in the Sargodha, Gujrat, Lyallpur and Montgomery districts in the Punjab. I have received general and wide complaints that these people are very unhappy. Many new conditions have now been gradually imposed upon them and at present they really do not know what to do. They have not got their homes. They have sold their houses; they have sold their lands and come and settled in these new lands. They have now settled there for about 20 or 22 years. They are now troubled to such an extent that they would very much like to give up the land and go back to their old places if they could possibly do so. The first thing is that some of the Army Remount Department officers are very unsympathetic. I have got certain cases with me where the land has been confiscated on very ordinary grounds. I give one instance. There was one Muhammad Hussain, Abadkar, 95 S. B., Tehsil Sargodha. His mare lost a colt in 1926 and again in 1927. His land was confiscated for 5 years. There are many other instances in which even if the mare is a little bit overfed the owner is fined heavily or his land is confiscated. Besides, these people are under a dual control, the control of the Punjab Government and the control of the Army Department. If they keep the terms of their contract and fulfil all the conditions imposed upon them by the Army Remount Department, still, if there is any criminal suit against them or there is a police complaint against them, the civil authorities may confiscate their land. If they behave properly and the civil officers are quite satisfied with them, yet if they do not comply with any of the conditions imposed by the Army Remount Department, that department may get the land confiscated. These people are living under such difficult circumstances. Then, Sir, another complaint which they have got is that they are forced to sell the mares by the Army Remount Department officers. A mare which may cost Rs. 1,500 is bought by the Army Remount officers for Rs. 400 or Rs. 300 and *vice versa*, I would strongly urge that this buying or selling of mares by the Army Remount Department officers should be stopped altogether. I know

Mr. President: Order, order. I do not know how the Honourable Member connects the reduction of this vote with the price of a mare.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan: Sir, the reasons are obvious. (Laughter.) Then, Sir, another grievance which these colonists have got is that when the Army Remount Officers go to inspect the mares, all the persons are made to stand together in a line and on very ordinary excuses they are abused and beaten. This is a serious charge but I make this charge because I have got instances, which I do not like to quote, where this thing has actually happened. It is most unfortunate. Almost all the big landlords of that district who can approach the officers have themselves got land on these conditions, and therefore, as they are very intimate with the officers, they do not mention these grievances before the higher

officers. The unfortunate thing is that the price which has been fixed by the department to be paid to the Zemindar when the Army Remount want to buy a colt is not paid on the same scale as prescribed, so much so

Mr. President: I hardly think this is relevant to the question before us now.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan: I will bring my remarks to a conclusion, Sir. I have got many more grievances to relate. I trust the Army Secretary would devise some means of satisfying himself.

Mr. President: But you do not want the Army Department to continue.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan: I have not said, Sir, whether I want the Army Department to continue or not. (*An Honourable Member:* "If the cut is carried there will be no Army Department.") I do not know whether the cut will be carried or not. (*Another Honourable Member:* "I hope you will support it.") I will bring my remarks to a close. I would request the Army Secretary to look into these grievances. If I had time I wanted to tell him that I have received complaints from the Viceroy's commissioned officers that they are not well accommodated, and that they have not got good quarters. Soldiers as well as Jamadars and Subadar-Majors—they all blame the Assembly for that. They say, whenever we make a request to our officers, they say "the Assembly will not pay us money". That is what the Indian officers and the other ranks tell me. They are under the impression that the Indian Members of the Assembly are opposed to their getting all the comforts which they are entitled to. But so far as I know, there is not a single elected Member in this House who would not like to afford all reasonable facilities to these Indian officers. Whenever we talk about extravagance in the military budget, what we generally mean is that this extravagance exists so far as the maintenance of this large number of British troops is concerned, so far as the spending of an enormous amount on the comforts of British soldiers is concerned. Dr. Moonje told us the other day that the money spent on the education of sons of Indian officers is very, very small, as compared with the amount spent on the education of the sons of British soldiers, and so on. But there is not a single Indian Member, I want to make it clear, who is opposed to providing all reasonable facilities and comforts to the Indian soldiers and Indian officers in the Military Department.

Sardar Muhammad Nawaz Khan (Punjab: Landholders): I feel, Sir, that while discussing matters of high policy the Members of this House have ignored one or two important factors, but before I say a few words about those points I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my Honourable friend, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, when he said, or at least I took him to say, that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief should not be a Member of any of the Legislatures. I do think that he, like Their Excellencies the Governor General and the Governors, should be kept out of the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State, and some other official, like the Army Secretary, should be deputed to make statements in these Houses. I also want to thank my Honourable friend, Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, for advocating the cause of Indian officers, i.e., Viceroy's commissioned officers, and of the ex-soldiers. I quite

[Sardar Muhammad Nawaz Khan.]

agree with him that they are suffering a lot and it would be in the interests of India, and especially of the Army Department, to improve their prospects. We do not often hear about them in this House for several reasons, chiefly, because most of the Members are not aware of their conditions and the difficulties under which these people are living. I do not want to go into details; perhaps some other occasion will be more suitable. For the present I only want to submit that as far as the principle of Indianization is concerned, every Member in this House is of opinion that it is in the interests of India to Indianise the Indian Army. If there is any difference of opinion, then that is only with regard to the system that ought to be followed. There are some of us who think that the methods which have been adopted in the past or which the powers-that-be propose to adopt in the future are not adequate; I am one of those who think that these are not the correct methods. We want a national army. For this purpose it is not sufficient that every year a few King's commissioned officers should be appointed. I tread perhaps on thorny ground when I submit that if we really want a national army then we must at least start to do away with the present system of recruitment of the rank and file in the Indian Army. Members in this House are aware that the Army at present is only recruited from certain classes or clans. An Indian may be medically fit, but he is not therefore necessarily eligible for enlistment. I am quite aware of the difficulties which we may have to face if we seriously take up this scheme, but I cannot understand how it can be possible to avoid them. The aim is to create a national army; it will only exist when we have a mixed army. At present an Infantry battalion has class companies, i.e., one company is recruited from a certain class of people and another from another class, and so on. I have already said that there may be difficulties if we raise these mixed battalions; battalions without any class companies or class platoons or class sections. These difficulties cannot be overcome just now, but there is no harm at all in making a start. If I may suggest, I think at least one mixed battalion in every Command may be raised immediately. These battalions will, of course, enlist people who are now enlisted in the Indian Army and people who are now kept out of it. The mere fact that a few Indians will be appointed as King's commissioned officers every year is not going to make the army now known as the Indian Army a national army. I was told only the other day by one of my friends that in about 300 years all the King's commissioned officers would be Indians. (An Honourable Member: "They cannot all be Indians.") Not even after 300 years? Let me say, after an indefinitely long period they may all be Indians but.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: If every one of them lives for 300 years.

Sardar Muhammad Nawaz Khan: The rank and file will, even then, be recruited from certain classes. I do not propose that the present system be done away with at once, but if we really want to have a national army then I cannot see how it can be allowed to continue. (Mr. M. A. Jinnah: "Quite right.") It may perhaps be desirable to start with 4 battalions, one in every Command, of these mixed soldiers: every person whether he belongs to a class which is at present admitted to the Indian Army or not, may be eligible for enlistment. The progress made by these battalions will give us an idea as to how long it will take to create a national army.

I am quite aware of the difficulties but we will have to face them, and the sooner we make a start the better it would be for all of us.

With regard to the few King's Commissions which are going to be allotted in future to Indians, it has been said at different times and in different places that it is not possible to find 10 or 20 suitable persons for this purpose. I do not share that view; I do not contribute to that idea. I think it is very easy to find 10, 20 or more suitable Indians to fill those vacancies if only the right sources are tapped. I think we have got very good material among people known as the Viceroy's commissioned officers. Among them there are suitable men, young men, men who would make excellent officers, men of whom any army may be justly proud. I am quite aware that they are not so well educated, but one is never too old to learn if he is not too wise to be taught, and if these people can be given educational courses for one or two years at Government expense, then I am quite sure that they would make suitable and very efficient officers, and that they would be the people who will stick to the army, who will make the army their profession. I do not want to go into details. Perhaps it may not be quite the right thing to do. People who go to Sandhurst now find that their prospects in the army are not very bright. Though they have not got many careers open to them even then, with the help of my friend Sir Denys Bray, they try to get into the Political Department. Take the figures. Many people who went to Sandhurst and came back to India as officers have gone into the Political Department. I know many who are even now thinking of going into the Political Department if only that kind gentleman, Sir Denys Bray, would allow them to do so; and there are other jobs which are anxiously sought after by people who are now King's commissioned officers; jobs as executive officers and officers of the Remount Department. I think no Indian has so far been admitted to the Remount Department, but I know that there are many who are anxious to be appointed to this department. These are not the sort of people, and I am one of them, who are required for this purpose. What is the use of giving commissions to people who will not stick to the army. The people who will stick to the army and will make the army their profession are the people who are now serving as Viceroy's commissioned officers, and it is not right to say that the material is not there. There are any number of Viceroy's commissioned officers who are quite suitable for King's Commissions. I know many of them; I live among them. I have not the honour of representing them here; Captain Kabul Singh has that honour and he knows more about them than I do. I live in the same part of the country as my friend Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, and he knows them as intimately as I do. I am quite sure that if opportunities are given to them then they will make good King's commissioned officers.

Mr. B. Das: Do you want them to go to Sandhurst or do you favour an Indian Sandhurst?

Sardar Muhammad Nawaz Khan: I am just coming to that point. I had the honour of appearing before the Indian Sandhurst Committee in the days when my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal had not resigned and my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah was also there. I had suggested that the present Dehra Dun College should be transformed into a sort of college where people from the Indian schools may be admitted and after staying there for a year or so they may be commissioned into the army: just

[Sardar Muhammad Nawaz Khan.]

as people got commissions in the army from different Universities in England. That was my view and I could see that it was not much liked at the time, but now seeing the result of the efforts of the Skeen Committee I believe that my friends, had they agreed to my proposition, would have gone more ahead with Indianization than they have otherwise.

There is not much else to be said except that even in these few vacancies that have been allotted to Indians I think it is not proper that only six should have been reserved for people who are now holding Viceroy's commissions. I think it would have been in the interests of the army and in the interests of India generally to reserve more vacancies for them. I do not advocate that they should be taken as they are, but permit them to qualify and if you find that they are suitable then take them. The other point which I wish to bring to the notice of my Honourable friend Mr. Mackworth Young is that no provision whatsoever has been made to enable officers holding commissions in the Indian Territorial Force to enter the commissioned ranks of the regular army as is done in England. I think it is in the interests of India that people in the Territorial Force should be encouraged, and that encouragement would have been forthcoming had officers of the Territorial Force been permitted to qualify for commissions in the regular army. We have got to bring a better class into the Territorial Force than that which is there at present. I am not in any way reflecting on the present officers of the Territorial Force, but I know as a matter of fact that better people could have come in to the Territorial battalions. For the reason that a sufficient number of vacancies has not been reserved for Viceroy's commissioned officers, and for the reason that no provision whatsoever has been made for enabling officers of the Territorial Force to qualify for commissions in the regular army, I will support the motion of my Honourable friend Mr. Chaman Lall.

Captain Kabul Singh Bahadur (Punjab: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, my Honourable friend opposite appeared to me to be rather speaking under passion than with reason, though it is a passion for the love of our country, when they say that British troops should be eliminated to make room for Indians. This may be desired by them but they must not forget that whatever the causes may be Indians of equal fitness and education are not forthcoming in numbers enough to replace British troops. Honourable Members perhaps do not know that in modern warfare there are many occasions when a single private soldier himself is the only person who represents his side and on whose correct and immediate appreciation of the situation rests the victory or disaster for his side. Are all the private or even the non-commissioned officers of the Indian Army able to rightly understand the position and perform in the nick of time such acts as signalling or writing a message or throwing up lights or signalling to aeroplanes the necessary signal to save the occasion? No, Sir. We have very few non-commissioned officers and men who can do this. Therefore I appeal to my enthusiastic countrymen to move slowly. Let us first spread education in the country, so that youths with some education could be found who will come and serve in the Indian army. Then and then alone we could think of replacing British soldiers *in toto*.

Now, Sir, the grievance that Government are killing the military spirit is not understood by me; the birds of military spirit are not captured and kept in a cage by the Government and daily taken for breakfast. Let my

countrymen who are anxious to become soldiers cultivate physical strength, play open-air games, take part in races and other competitions, and thus prepare a material which is in demand for the army, and Government will come with pleasure and make their choice, because Government only want able-bodied and intelligent youths for the army, and will always be willing to take such men.

Dr. B. S. Moonje (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, my friend, Mr. Kelkar, has characterised the British policy as Machiavellian. I have been diving deeper into the Indian seas and the English seas of the military budget, and the more I dive deeper I find the more Machiavellian mysteries and wonders of the world, of which I presented a few the other day, and I propose to present a few to-day.

They have been raising of late the Royal Air Force in India, and they have been spending out of Indian revenues Rs. 2,26,50,000 every year. Out of this, Rs. 1,25,51,000 are spent in India, and Rs. 1,00,99,000 are spent in England. And how are they spent in England? If you look at page 308 of the budget estimates of expenditure on Military Services for the year 1928-29, the first item of payment is "Payments to Air Ministry for Troops serving in India". That means that Rs. 13,33,000 are to be paid to England for the loan of air troops for service in India; and as for their actual maintenance in India, who else shall pay but India? If they are on furlough and voyage, their pay is paid by India, Rs. 1,60,000. If they are married and produce children, their marriage allowances are paid by India, Rs. 9,33,000. Supposing they come to India and their health becomes a matter of anxiety, India must pay what is called National Health Insurance, and that comes to Rs. 16,000. Supposing they happen to be unemployed, India must also pay for their Unemployment Insurance because they have been serving India,—and that comes to Rs. 40,000. Their Contributory Pensions Act, 1925, costs us Rs. 48,000. Their consolidated clothing allowance comes to Rs. 26,670 which India has to pay. They want clothing besides, in India. India cannot produce clothing for them, and therefore Rs. 62,670 have to be spent in England for purchasing clothing for them for use in India. We have also to pay for what is called non-effective retired pay of troops for service in India and this alone comes to nothing less than Rs. 1,87,000. In all, what we have to spend on an Air Force in India, is Rs. 1,01,29,000 in England, and in India they cost us Rs. 1,25,51,000. Now, how many people are there in this Air Force? Having to spend more than two crores of rupees, how many people are there in the Air Force? British officers 224, and British other ranks 1,705, or 1,705 men and 224 officers, that is 1,929 men in all—and we have to spend on their account more than two crores of rupees. Yet, there is not one single Indian officer like the British officer, nor one single Indian airman like the British airmen in this Air Force of 1,929 men. We are told that India does not possess men capable of being turned out as efficient air officers or efficient airmen. But are these British officers and airmen, who are brought out here at such enormous expense, well trained in their art of airmanship? No. It is not that their education is complete, not that no further arrangements have to be made for their education, after they are brought out here; they have to be further educated and trained. Educational and instructional establishments cost us Rs. 41,760. The Royal Air Force education costs us Rs. 83,123; that is, Rs. 1,24,890 have further to be spent upon their general education and training as Air Force officers and

[Dr. B. S. Moonje.]

troops, after they are brought to India and after India has paid more than two crores of rupees for having brought them out. More than two crores of rupees to be spent from the Indian revenues for such Air Force! I ask my friend, Colonel Crawford, is there any country in the world which spends two crores of rupees and yet that country has not been able to produce one single air officer or one single airman? Perhaps India is the only unfortunate country which presents the melancholy spectacle to the world of spending more than two crores of rupees, and yet not having one single Indian in that force.

An Honourable Member: Shame!

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: There is the Aero-Club of Delhi.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I am one of the persons responsible for it. Now let us see how our finances are being spent for what is called the military efficiency of India, the military protection of India. There is some such service known as the Military Engineering Service, and I shall only mention one fact in this connection. There are about 63,000 British men and officers and about 1,70,000 Indian officers and men in the Standing Army of India. Housing accommodation has to be made for them. For about 63,000 British men, new works for their accommodation this year are estimated to cost Rs. 10,20,000, and for about 1,70,000 Indians only Rs. 13,94,000. I will repeat: for 63,000 Britishers Rs. 10 lakhs are required and for 1,70,000 Indians Rs. 13 lakhs. That is the way efficiency is to be maintained in India. Sir, I can understand efficiency in terms of competency,—educational, intellectual, instinctive leadership, personal bravery, courage and intrepidity in fighting. I can understand efficiency in these terms. I cannot understand efficiency in terms of colour, the colour of the person who is going to the battlefield. It has never been said that Indians, Indian soldiers, are wanting in fighting capacity or initiative leadership. I shall only quote from your own book which I have found in this Library. This book is called "Deeds of valour performed by Indian officers and soldiers from 1860 to 1925". This has been written by the Army Department and presented to His Excellency, our friend, Field-Marshal Birdwood. I am speaking here of only two of the qualities that go to make what is called military efficiency, initiative leadership and personal courage; these are the two qualities of which only two instances I shall quote here.

"On the 13th March, 1860, a large number of the Mahsud Waziris"

—of whom we are frightened so much by Colonel Crawford and European officers on the other side—

"On the 13th March, 1860, a large number of the Mahsud Waziris left their hills at the Zam Nullah with the avowed intention of plundering the town of Tank."

At the outpost there were no British officers and no British soldiers. They were all Indian soldiers under Indian officers. There were no British officers to guide or to hearten them or to put courage into them or to give any skill to Indian officers and Indian men. Their chief officer Ressaldar Ukwak Singh collected all his men, only Indian soldiers, at the outpost

and what did he do? He went out leading his men to meet the enemy in the face:

"The Waziris opened fire and Ressaldar Ukwak Singh finding it was not the place for cavalry to act"

—because there was the *nullah*—

"consulted with Ressaldar Shadut Khan and both agreed that it would be better to retire. . . ."

He consulted his brother officer and asked, "Is it right that we should give battle in this *nullah* or make a feigned retirement," which we Mahrattas are so very fond of, so as to give the enemy to understand that we have been defeated and bring him into our parlour. Ukwak Singh with the intrepidity and the initiative leadership that he possessed said "No, I shall not give battle in this *nullah*, but I shall make a feigned retirement and make the enemy think that the day was his":

"The movement succeeded admirably; the enemy thinking the day was their own, followed the cavalry until the latter had nearly reached Tank"

—that was the village which they wanted to loot—

"when the halt was sounded, the cavalry fronted at once, fired a volley into the enemy, drew their sabres and charged right away into the middle of them. This sudden and unexpected attack was too much for the Waziris, who turned and made off towards the hills, though at times they fought bravely in small bands when caught up by the cavalry . . . leaving between 200 and 300 of their tribe dead on the plains, out of the 3,000 they brought on the field . . ."

I am quoting this as one instance of instinctive leadership of which much is being made and in which, we are told, we Indians are wanting; it is being said that Indians are lacking in that quality of instinctive leadership and therefore British officers have to be imported at such a heavy cost. I want to quote another instance and that is of personal bravery, a little thing, as we are frightened with, a very little thing, a thing of frequent occurrence in the trans-frontier towns:

"Sowar Yhundah Singh attacked three Waziris single-handed. He cut one down with his sword and short the second, the third escaping among the bushes."

Well, Sir, these stories are not of my own making. They have been described by your own officers. And as for me, I might remind the House that the representatives of the East India Company, when they were thinking, about 150 years ago, of invading the territories of Tipu Sultan and Haider Sultan, thought that the Brahmins of Poona might best be called to their aid. Babu Gokhale, the last representative soldier of the Peshwas, died fighting in the last battle of the last Mahratta War. When Nadir Shah invaded and massacred the people of Delhi and looted them, all the way from Poona in those days when there were no railways, no telegraphic wires and no telephonic messages, that Brahmin fellow, Raghunathrao Dada Bharari, came and pursued him right up to Attock on the river Sind. Did you then inquire from him: Have you brought your certificate of efficiency from an English Sandhurst? (Hear, hear).

We are spending two crores of rupees in India on the Air Force. I do not know how much Afghanistan is spending on its Air Force, but I know it has only lately sent out 25 people for being trained in Italy. Some have already returned to Afghanistan after their training. And supposing there

[Dr. B. S. Moonje.]

is another Afghan war, as it was in 1919, and Afghan aeroplanes come right up to Peshawar and bomb it, I suppose your military authorities will go to them and ask them: "Have you brought your certificate of efficiency from Cranwell? If you do not possess it, you have no right to bombard us." (Laughter).

In the Military Engineering Service there are 102 commissioned officers, and not one of them is an Indian. Now, let us see how much they cost us. In the Military Engineering Service there are 189 British troops and 7,400 Indian officers and other ranks. Now, these 189 British troops cost us Rs. 4,98,030, that is, per head Rs. 2,635. 7,400 Indians cost us only Rs. 27,01,530, that is per head 365.

Now let us come to the pensions. As you all know money over the pensions is being spent in India and England. The total amount of the money that is spent on pensions in India is Rs. 3,35,01,880 and that spent in England is Rs. 4,91,52,000. In this connection, it should be remembered that the British Army in India hardly consists of 61,000 people, whereas the Indian Army consists of 1,58,000 men. Out of this sum of Rs. 3,35,01,880 that is spent in India on pensions, Rs. 32,57,530 are spent on the pensions of British officers and soldiers. So, on pensions alone we find by comparison that we spend on Britishers in India and in England Rs. 5,24,09,530 and on Indians we spend only Rs. 3,02,44,350.

Let us now see what is their efficiency. My friend, Colonel Crawford, and also His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief were very ^{1 P.M.} anxious about maintaining the highest efficiency in the military. I am also at one with them. The Commander-in-Chief said last year—Council Debates p. 3495—

"Closely allied to that, that is, adequate opportunity for Indians, is the question of efficiency which again is bound up with the maintenance of British recruitment."

This is exactly the thing which I have not been able to understand; and this is exactly the thing which no Honourable gentleman on the other side has been able to my knowledge to throw any light upon. Is it their intention to say that efficiency is a quality which resides only under the white skin and is a quality which is very rare or rather absent and lacking entirely under the black skin?

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Certainly not.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: My friend, Colonel Crawford, wanted to correct me and said that India does not spend 42 per cent. of her revenues, but only 33 per cent. I am not going to quarrel with him and I shall take his figure as he says. Is there any country, I ask him—let him name one country in the whole world—which spends as much as 33 per cent. of her revenues on the military

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I gave the Honourable Member the instance of Japan.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Japan, I should inform him, spends only 10½ per cent.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Is my Honourable friend alluding to the total defence expenditure or only to her military expenditure?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I do not know whether it is one or the other; this is a book written by an Englishman and I am quoting from it. It says that Japan spends hardly 10½ per cent. on her defence.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadaan Rural): May I ask Colonel Crawford whether he did not take the gross figures of revenue when he tried to determine the proportion of military expenditure to the total revenue of India?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: And now I will give him a present of what France is spending. I suppose.....

Mr. President: I think these figures were quoted on the last occasion by the Honourable Member. (Laughter.)

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I suppose he will not challenge my figures and my statement that France, as she is situated, has got greater dangers to expect from Germany than India situated as she is has; and if he wants to have a constructive proposal from me as to how the dangers of the trans-frontier tribes and the Afghan Army can be averted successfully, I will make him a proposal. Let him think over this proposition. You have got 60,000 British men in India. As an experiment, for three years, reduce it to 15,000, and increase the Indian Army which costs per head one-fifth or one-sixth of the British Army by, say, 50,000; that is, you will have 15,000 British soldiers and about 2 lakhs of Indian soldiers—sufficient for the needs of the defence of India. I will go one step further and say, recruit 50,000 more for the Indian Army; so that the Indian Army will be composed of 250,000 men, and the British will be 15,000. Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan said—and if I had known he was going to say it I would have given him quotations from English officers—that in trans-frontier fighting the Indian soldier is a thousand times better than the British soldier. Therefore, I am making this constructive proposal to the Government; and, if my friend Colonel Crawford has got any influence with the Government, let him take up this proposal to the Government and get it sanctioned. I am not touching at present the quota of British officers required, because I know India cannot produce officers to-day as you have not been training Indian officers so far and as we have no arrangements at present for doing so. So I will not touch the quota of the British officers at all, therefore. Colonel Crawford need not be anxious about the efficiency of the leadership in the Indian Army. All that I am saying is that the British Army may be reduced to 15,000 as an experiment for a period of, say, three years and the Indian Army increased to 250,000. You will still be saving ten to fifteen crores of rupees from the Indian revenues. Having increased to that extent your military resources of India and having saved ten to fifteen crores of rupees, I say, start an Indian Sandhurst here. You may modify, you may amend or you may improve the Dehra Dun College, and you will find that in ten years' time India will have produced materials for officership of which you had not the remotest conception before, or rather you pretended to suppose that there were no materials in the country for producing officers. That blood which 150 years ago was found in India for raising Empires and subverting Empires in India and which has already subverted Empires, that blood was in our grandfathers, and now do you think that that blood is wanting in their grandsons? My father and my grandfather were in the Peshwa Raj,

[Dr. B. S. Moonje.]

the Bhonsala Raj, and is it supposed that the blood that was in my father and grandfather is wanting in his grandson? (*An Honourable Member*: "No".) Sir, it is the Sikhs, it is the Rajputs, it is the Mahrathas and it is these in the Indian Mussulmans who have been responsible for our protection and defence, and, so long as these Sikhs, Rajputs and the Mahrathas will be found in India, we have no reason to fear the molestations, the aggressions, from the trans-frontier tribes and the Afghans. But with the policy that is now pursued by the British Government, what protection have we got from them? I will ask—what protection have we been getting from them, having spent, in the words of my friend Colonel Crawford, 33 per cent. of the revenues of India? I will reply in the words of my Honourable friend Mr. Howell who was in the Assembly last year in place of the Honourable Sir Denys Bray, the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India. From 1919 to 1925-26, raids on the trans-frontier border 324, 233, 129, 73, 45, 21 and 11. That is to say, in all these seven years the raids have come to 836. How many killed? 392. How many wounded? 564. How many lakhs of rupees worth of property was looted in these seven years? 16 lakhs and odd. All this has happened in spite of the subsidiary allowances, in spite of the gratuities that we are paying to the tribal people to purchase peace and friendship and immunity from molestations.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier: Nominated Non-Official): That was a state of war all over the world.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: But the war ended in 1918 and the history begins from 1919 and goes up to 1927. The figures I have just given relate only to two districts, namely, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan. And what are we spending for the administration of these two districts, for military efficiency, for protecting India, for the defence of India, so that Indians within the frontier of India may not be molested by these tribal people? What are the British Government spending for all that? Mr. Howell says:

"In view of the military and civil administration the expenditure comes to between 7 to 8 crores of rupees every year,"

and now it has been stabilised at between 3 to 4 crores of rupees. 3 to 4 crores of rupees are to be spent on two districts alone in the Frontier in order to get security and peace in the bargain—to what extent? To this extent—836 raids, 392 people killed, 564 wounded and 16 lakhs of rupees worth of property looted.....

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: A state of war existed in 1919. There was the Afghan War and the tribes had to be punished.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: And the Honourable Mr. Howell has not been unmindful of the argument that he thought that he must put forth in order to carry conviction to us that we are really getting value for what we are paying. And what does Mr. Howell say? He says: "You must understand Indians". You are spending 7 and 8 crores on these two districts. This is not enough for the efficiency in their administration. What you have got in return for your defence is much more than you have paid for. Why? Because, he says—he frightens us—"they (*i.e.*, the trans-frontier tribesmen of these districts) are not accustomed to pay for things themselves; they are accustomed to take the things they want". That is how he has described their frightfulness. That is how he has put those qualifications before us, so

that we may know them and we may be afraid of them. And the other day, yesterday, my friend Sir Denys Bray was so kind to us as to say that it was all for the protection of the Hindus; so that the Hindus who form the majority in this country may not object to the spending of this sum on two districts alone; so that he might come and say, "Look here, even this immunity from molestation will not be purchased in the future unless greater sums of money are spent, because the people with whom we have to deal are of this nature. Well, if that is so, I was going to say yesterday, if I had been given a chance, I was going to request my friend Sir Abdul Qaiyum to join hands with me and demand from the Government that the time has come when the Defence of India should be transferred to us and when the Defence of India is a transferred subject, no responsibility for the defence of India will lie on the shoulders of Englishmen and then they will not say that the reforms are not to be introduced in the North-West Frontier Province, because they interfere with their scheme of defence. Belonging as I do to the great Hindu community, I am not a man to allow the Hindu community to be used as a pawn in the game which my friend Mr. Kelkar called Machiavellian—and some one here calls it super-Machiavellian.

My friend Colonel Crawford was rather anxious to know whether we shall be in a position to produce officers whom men will follow. That is exactly what he said: "whom men will follow".

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I was anxious to know if you could produce such men; I said our object was to produce them.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I am glad he has changed his position. So now he is certain that India can produce men as officers whom men will follow. I suppose that is his position now. And if that is his position, all the argument based upon efficiency that he has been urging in this House falls to the ground. And let him come with me and join hands with Sir Abdul Qaiyum and myself in asking the Government that the Defence of India should be the one subject that should be transferred. I have given you a constructive proposal for saving 10 to 15 crores of rupees by which India will be prepared to produce the officers. Here is a constructive proposal in Army matters. My habit has never been to introduce politics or to introduce any kind of ulterior motive in matters military, that is, the defence of India. The pure idea that I have in mind is that if thus trained I shall defend India and also the English Empire in India, if it remains, and it is from that point of view I am looking at the defence of India and it is from that point of view I have been studying military problems.

My friend Mr. Mukhtar Singh had asked a question:

"Will the Government be pleased to state the number of officers employed in the military grass farms? Will the Government be further pleased to state how many of them are Indians?"

These are officers not for fighting, but for the cultivation of grass, for how to cut grass, how to stock grass, how to keep it in a wet and good condition for the ponies or horses for the military. He asked how many Indian officers there were and the answer was "None". The answer was:

"There are nineteen King's commissioned officers employed in the grass farms branch of the Military Farms Department. None of them is an Indian."

That is efficiency run riot! That is the heartlessness with which an irresponsible person squanders the money of a country which at present is not in

[Dr. B. S. Moonje.]

a position to make its voice felt with the responsibility and authority that it ought to. The other day His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief showed an amount of anxiety for the feeding of the Indian soldiers and he said, if I remember aright now, that the Indian soldiers are better fed in the Army than they are in their own villages. I think I am right in quoting him. Again my friend Mr. Mukhtar Singh had asked a question of the Army Secretary on the same subject. He had asked what was the Military Dairy Farm for? For milk, for cheese, for butter? And then he asked the question how much milk is being spent on, doled out or sold to the Indian soldiers. I will read the reply of my Honourable friend Mr. Young.....

Mr. President: Order, order. I think the Chair was after all right in not allowing the Honourable Member to catch its eye so long.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I do not understand you, Sir. Am I not relevant? (An Honourable Member: "Finish your remarks.") I shall only read out the answer and finish. I do not want to take one more minute, Sir. Mr. Young said:

"3,630 tons of milk and 358 tons of butter were produced and sold during the year 1925-26. * * There is hardly any demand for dairy produce from Indian troops and practically nothing was supplied to them."

No wonder, then, that an Indian soldier hardly costs Rs. 365 per annum whereas a British soldier costs about Rs. 2,635, as I have said above.

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

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

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

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): I propose to speak only for a short time on an aspect of the policy of the Military Department. That aspect concerns one of the nation-building departments of the Indian Army. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief told us that he has under him a large number of factories and that he is thus encouraging Indian industries. Sir, it is in connection with these factories that I wish to offer a few remarks. The Army Department claims to treat their employees very generously; specially they claim that the soldiers forming part of the Army Department are treated very generously. Perhaps they may be treated very generously, or they may not be treated very generously; I do not know much about that subject. But the Army Department do not treat their industrial employees fairly . . .

Mr. President: And therefore you wish to reject the Army Department Demand?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: If they do not treat their industrial employees very fairly I do not care if the Army Department is abolished altogether.

Sir, the Army Department do not treat the industrial part of their organisation very fairly. They maintain 9 or 10 factories called the arsenal factories, ordnance factories, ammunition factories, cordite factories, and clothing factories, and in these factories more than 18,000 persons are working. Some of them work for a long time, for 20 years, some work for 10 years, some for 5 years, but, Sir, out of these 18,000 persons who are working in the Army factories, not even 1,000 persons are treated as permanent workers, although out of these 18,000 workers, more than 6,000 workers have worked for more than 5 years. I have got figures here for 7 factories out of 9, and from these figures you will learn that nearly 700 people have worked for more than 20 years, 1,769 have worked for more than 10 years, and 2,158 people have worked for more than 5 years. Although these people have put in long service, such as 20 years and 10 years, most of them are treated as temporary workers. I do not know why the Army Department should treat the workers of these factories as temporary when they serve such long terms as 20 years and 10 years. The only reason is that the Army Department, calling these people as temporary workers, give them bad conditions of service and work. If they are called permanent, then according to the Civil Service Regulations they must be paid pensions, they must be given leave. If they are called temporary, then they need not be given any leave or paid any pension. This seems to me the only reason why the Army Department consider most part of the workers employed in their factories as temporary. Of course, amongst the temporary people they make distinctions. Some people are called ordinary temporary people. Some are called extra-temporary on monthly salary and some are called extra-temporary on daily pay. So amongst the temporary people themselves they make three divisions. Some get some small privileges such as leave and some do not get any leave at all. The extra-temporary men, amongst whom there are a large number of people who have served in these factories for 20 years, do not get even a day's privilege leave or casual leave unless they forfeit their wages for the days of absence. Then the temporary men get a small amount of leave but these temporary men who are considered to be little superior to extra-temporary do not get either provident fund or pension. I consider that the Army Department are not treating the workers in these factories fairly. For the last two or three years I have been asking questions on this point and I am told that the Army Department in their generous mood are now thinking of establishing a provident fund for some classes of workers in these factories. Sir, that provident fund has taken nearly three years to mature and I do not know how long it will be before the scheme comes into operation, and even that scheme, when it comes into operation, is not likely to be of much use to those people who have served for 20 years or a little longer. They are not likely to get much benefit out of the provident fund. I therefore hope that the Army Department, when they establish a provident fund, will take into consideration the case of people who have a long period of service and who will not benefit by the scheme of a provident fund which they propose to establish. Then, I want the Army Department to reduce the number of men who are called temporary men. It is no good calling them temporary after 10 and 20 years' service, and it is not fair and just. I therefore suggest to the Army Department that, if they want to treat their workers fairly, they should give them the privileges of permanent

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

men, and the sooner they do it the better. In this matter I must say that the Army Department are worse than the Railway Department. The Railway Department are maintaining some workshops and in those workshops even temporary men get some kind of provident fund and some kind of gratuity but the Army Department, which want to take care of their employees very well and therefore claim that more money is necessary for the Army and that the Army Vote should not be votable at all, do not treat their workers even as well as the railways are doing. The Railways give gratuities to their employees. When I studied this question at the cordite factory, I found that some gratuity was given to the employees out of the fines fund and the gratuity amounted to Rs. 10 or 15 after a man has served for 20 and 25 years. I feel that the Army Department are not justified in treating these men in this manner. The Army Department do not treat the men as permanent but at the same time they impose on them the responsibility of permanent Government servants. This to my judgment is unjustifiable. The workers in the cordite factory at Aravankadu have got a union and they wrote for the recognition of that union to the Army Department and the Army Department wrote to that union that as Government servants they cannot affiliate themselves to the All-India Trade Unions Congress and so, if they want recognition, they should disaffiliate themselves from the All-India Trade Unions Congress. I think, Sir, this is not quite fair. If the Army Department treat these men as temporary for pay and pension, let them not treat them as permanent Government servants for the sake of organisation, but for the sake of organisation they treat them as Government servants and impose on them the responsibilities of Government servants, that they should not take part in politics. If you want to treat them as Government servants, give them all the privileges. Give them the pension privilege, give them the privilege leave, the casual leave which is given to all other permanent employees of Government. If not, why should you say that these temporary men should not take part in politics? I hope the Army Secretary will see the injustice of not allowing these unions to be affiliated to the Trade Unions Congress. Then these people are not housed properly. I have seen how these workers are housed in Aravankadu. A number of these people have no proper housing accommodation to live in, and they are suffering from this disability. It is the duty of Government when they build factories at a place like Aravankadu, to provide proper housing for their employees. I therefore suggest that the Army Department should not stint money in building houses for the workers in these factories.

Not only are these industrial workers treated badly, but even the clerks in these factories are not treated fairly. Some years ago the Government of India appointed a Committee to enquire into the question of the position of the clerks in these factories. That Committee made certain recommendations in order to safeguard the rights of the clerical establishment. They recommended the creation of the post of Personal Assistant to the Superintendent, but the Government did not accept it. They recommended other things to Government which the Government would not accept. Then, Sir, the salaries were revised but were not adequately increased. The clerical establishment sent a memorial to

Government but nothing came out of it. Among the clerical establishment there are a number of section clerks who are not treated as permanent men. Some are treated as permanent, others as temporary men, and these clerks are not also properly housed in Aravankadu in the cordite factories. I do not know what conditions apply to other factories, but in Aravankadu they are not properly housed. Then the section clerks do not get the benefit of pension, provident fund and leave privileges. I suggest to the Army Department that, as the fighting portion is important and are given all the privileges concerning leave and pension, this industrial army of the Government of India should also be treated generously, fairly and justly.

I hope the Army Secretary will give proper consideration to the grievance of the men of these factories.

Mr. G. M. Young (Army Secretary): Sir, in attempting the annual and, in this House, somewhat forlorn task of defending military expenditure, Government has always been confronted first with the argument about the proportion which that expenditure bears to its other expenditure. This occasion has been no exception to the rule. My friend, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, said that he did not see why my friend, Colonel Crawford, should anticipate my statistics in this connection. As a matter of fact he has not entirely done so. I have one or two statistics to bring forward on this ever-fresh topic. It is admitted that the military expenditure of the Government of India bears the proportion of 41 or 42 per cent. to other expenditure from central revenues. Why that particular comparison should be taken I do not know. It seems to me meaningless. All it shows is how much of the central revenues are expended on subjects other than military. It would be a conceivable position that central revenues should be earmarked for defence alone. In that case my Honourable friends opposite would be able to point triumphantly to the fact that we spent a hundred per cent. of our revenues on military expenditure. But we must of course take the revenues of the country as a whole, and the expenditure of the country as a whole. If we do, the proportion of military expenditure amounts to about 26 per cent. If we go . . .

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Much more than that.

Mr. G. M. Young: If we go further and take the gross expenditure, without deducting what is earned by commercial departments, it comes to between 18 and 19 per cent. Now, Sir, I would be the last person to deny that even that proportion is high as compared with other countries. But before explaining or attempting to explain some of the reasons why it is high, I will deal with another hardy annual that comes up, the charge that we are incurring this great expenditure, and that we are maintaining this large army, for purposes outside India and not for the defence of India itself. No serious ground has ever been shown for that allegation. Honourable Members allege that we keep in India an army ready to go at the beck and call of the British Government, leaving India undefended (and they think that India would be quite happy undefended), and to attack other nations who may happen to be at war with Great Britain. That, Sir, is quite untrue. The strength of the Army in India is very carefully calculated. It is subject to constant revision, and the sole criterion of its strength has been and will always be external and internal defence of India. I am quite aware, Sir, that it will be my lot and the lot of my successors

[Mr. G. M. Young.]

to repeat this statement every year in the Assembly, and that it is unlikely to be believed. Nevertheless the statement should be made. As I have said, I admit that the proportion of military expenditure is still high compared with other countries. There are of course other factors to be taken into consideration, besides the revenue and spending capacity of the country itself. I do not think that that is even the most important factor to be considered in estimating whether your military expenditure is too high or too low. My friend, Colonel Crawford, drew attention to the question of vulnerability and the extent of the frontier. There are other considerations which may make it necessary for one country to spend money on its defence, and which do not operate, possibly, in the case of another country. However, the fact remains, Sir, that under the present system of Government of India, we cannot expect any very great economies in the Army. We do all we can and we are always on the look out for some way of reducing that expenditure; but those modifications that we can make, or hope to make in the next few years, will be nothing very much. It must be patent that a country which has a foreign government will spend more on its defence than a self-governing country. We all readily admit that; there can be no doubt about it. The remedy, as my Honourable friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar points out, is perfectly simple. India can become self-governing and manage its army to-morrow; the British can withdraw and take their army away with them. Simple as it is to state, it is not so easy to carry out. And that brings me to one of the main reasons why the Army in India is more expensive than other armies. British troops have to be maintained, and British troops in India are more costly than Indian troops in India and more costly than British troops in Britain. The number and the ratio of British troops depend upon strategic considerations. Suggestions have been made for reducing the ratio. I think there was a suggestion made in this House that we could defend the frontier with one quarter of the troops that are at present engaged in defending it. That proposition, Sir, is perhaps rather too definitely stated, but the number of troops required for the defence of the frontier is under the constant examination of Government. It is however a strategic question, essentially a question for the experts. The same thing applies to internal security. It has frequently been suggested—and here we find everybody against us, even my friend Colonel Crawford—that we can do with fewer British troops for internal security than we have now, that we could substitute Indian troops and armed police. Well, Sir, I repeat that that also is a strategical matter, on which we must be guided by the advice of our experts. Those of us who have been district officers know that in certain parts of India—I will not say the whole of it—in certain parts, conditions are such that British troops are the best insurance against internal disturbances. I am not speaking of the time when the disturbances have broken out. Any disciplined force of course can be made to undertake the terrible duty of quelling riots by force. I am speaking of the time precedent to that. If you can display a small number—it may be—of British troops in time, you very often can make sure that there will be no disturbance. It is the masses, the lesser educated masses, particularly in large towns, who for one reason or another—I do not know what it is—find confidence in the appearance, not of armoured cars or machine guns, but of British troops. And the third reason, Sir, for the maintenance of British troops in the requisite proportion in the Army in India is that they do form an integral part of the scheme of that Army. It is not a question

of counting heads and saying that one Indian soldier is just as good as one British soldier. The Indian Army is composed of some of the finest fighting material in the world. (Applause.) Everybody knows that. We always endeavour on our side to avoid that sort of comparison, but the fact remains that there are certain things which British troops do better, and there are certain things which Indian troops may do better, especially some of the older units, who have served and fought with us for a very long time. That is why we maintain a proportion of British troops. It may be said, if you feel inclined to put it that way, that the one stiffens the other.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Will the Honourable Member kindly speak a little louder?

Mr. G. M. Young: I was rather afraid that my Honourable friend Pandit Kunzru would prefer his usual complaint that I am inaudible to him. I will attempt to raise my voice again.

That is one inevitable reason for the fact that the cost of the Army in India is greater than it would be in a self-governing country. Honourable Members may blame us for that. I have another reason for which, I think, Indians themselves must bear a portion of the blame. Take the case of mechanical transport. It is one of our very largest items of expenditure, and its proportion to the whole is bound to increase as time goes on. Now, Sir, why is it that our mechanical transport is so expensive? It is due to the simple fact that in the whole of India, with all its resources, there is not a single firm that can make an internal combustion engine. Any other country will draw upon its civil industries for its mechanical transport. It will pay less for the vehicles, and the money that it pays goes into the general prosperity of the country. I do not know whether the time will come when indigenous firms will be manufacturing motor engines in India, but, until that time comes, there is a method by which economy can be effected in this particular line. It was indicated by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief when he was speaking the other day. At present we have to import all our mechanical transport vehicles and keep them, as the saying goes, in cotton wool, until we require them on mobilization. It is a most expensive and wasteful system, but it is the only one that at present can be worked. Now, the whole of India, as Honourable Members know, is seamed with motor omnibus lines running from railway stations to places not on the railway, or joining up one railway line with another. At every station almost you see two or three of these vehicles waiting to take passengers. If we can only get the owners of such concerns to use a kind of vehicle which would also be useful to the Government in time of war, we should get over a great part of this difficulty. It would pay us hand over fist to subsidize such firms: and I hope that, perhaps during the investigations of the Road Committee, this question will be seriously taken up.

Now, Sir, I will turn to some of the individual criticisms that have been made in the course of this debate. My Honourable friend Pandit Kunzru drew attention to a recommendation of the Inchcape Committee which was to the effect that by increasing the strength of the reserve, Government should be able to reduce the size of units maintained on the permanent peace establishment by, I think, 20 per cent. He asked what had been done? Well, Sir, in the year 1923, sometime after Mr. Burdon had made the statement on the subject to which he referred, the peace establishments of Indian infantry battalions

[Mr. G. M. Young.]

were reduced by 64 men. That is not of course as high a percentage as the Inchcape Committee recommended. On the other hand, we have got as yet nothing like our full reserve, the reason of that being that the men have not yet had time to pass in full numbers from service with the colours to the reserve.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: What is the prescribed size of the reserve?

Mr. G. M. Young: I am just going to give my Honourable friend some figures. The authorised strength of the reserve of infantry is 24,320 men, and the actual numbers are—the Honourable Member will find all these figures in the budget statement—18,160. That is to say, we are short by 25 per cent. in infantry alone. In the artillery, the authorised strength is 2,520, and the actual strength is 1,258. In the cavalry the situation is even worse. The authorised strength is 2,943, or practically 3,000, and the reserve at present consists of 917 men. I do not think I need trouble the House with details of minor services. But I have said enough to show that if the peace establishment of battalions is to be further reduced, we have got to wait until our reserve is full.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: May I ask the Honourable Member to explain one thing, if he does not mind it? The size of the reserve for infantry is stated in the estimates as being a little over 26,000. How does he give us the figure of 18,000 for it?

Mr. G. M. Young: I am afraid my Honourable friend is still unable to understand me. What I said was that the authorised strength is 24,320.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: It is given here as 26,320.

Mr. G. M. Young: It may be 26,320. My Honourable friend has the book before him. Anyhow the actual strength is 18,160. Those are all the reserves that we have. That is my point: we have not got the authorised strength. I hope I have made myself clear.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend, Colonel Crawford asked me a number of very searching questions; and he began by inquiring whether I was satisfied that the Army was in a full state of efficiency, whether I was satisfied that their equipment was exactly what it should be in all respects, whether I was satisfied that the Army could mobilise exactly as it ought to mobilise and in the quickest possible time, and finally whether I was satisfied that our troops can contend against an attack by air in which gas would be used. Well, Sir, if I were not fully satisfied about these points, does my Honourable friend for one moment think that I should get up and admit that publicly? I wish to say that we are satisfied that everything is being done, that all money that can be spent is being spent, and that we shall leave no stone unturned to ensure that when the day of mobilisation comes, which I hope never will, we shall go into the field equipped satisfactorily in all respects. But I cannot at any particular stage get up and tell my Honourable friend, supposing it were the case, that we are short of this or short of that. I can only tell him that we shall see to it that when the time comes we shall be short of nothing.

He then raised a subject which has been occupying the consideration of Government for a considerable time, and that is the accommodation of

our officers. This is a difficult and thorny problem. In some of our cantonments Government own all the bungalows, and have sufficient space to build more when required, and there is therefore no difficulty. But in the great majority of cantonments the housing of officers is done by private landlords who were granted, many years ago in the case of the older cantonments, sites on which to build bungalows for occupation by military officers. That was the reason for which the landlords were granted those sites. And as I say, in the case of many cantonments these sites were granted some time ago, and the terms of the grants were not too clearly defined. Well, as time went on, Honourable Members know that it became increasingly common for Indian gentlemen to come out of their houses in the cities into the neighbouring civil lines. It is exactly the same in cantonments. Landlords, who own perhaps only one house, there naturally say "Why should we not come out and live in our own houses?" The answer of course, is, "You were given the site to build a house for the accommodation of officers". Anyhow the number of officers in a particular cantonment and their requirements in the way of houses fluctuate, and in several cantonments we find that landlords have been finding their way into their own houses, and in some cases a very acute situation is arising or will shortly arise. Now, the Government are by no means blind to the situation. It is not a problem which you can solve by a general policy for all cantonments in India, because the circumstances vary. In one cantonment the other day there was a certain amount of trouble about the landlords not keeping up the houses properly—it is very difficult to make them do so even under the House Accommodation Act which was passed a few years ago in order to solve this problem. We sent an officer down there and by private treaty—we had a little money to spare—he bought up every bungalow in the station and the situation in that cantonment is now quite satisfactory. The landlords have got very good prices for their bungalows, and the officers have secured the necessary accommodation. In another cantonment the position is very different. The city is tremendously congested and the cantonment is none too spacious. It is the headquarters of a very important military district, and the number of officers is very great. Further, that cantonment has the advantage of being an armed camp behind barbed wire in a locality which is none too secure. The natural tendency of the landlords is, therefore, to come out of the city and get into their own houses in the cantonment. About that particular place inquiries are being made, a special officer is being deputed for the purpose, and I hope that we shall be able to come to a satisfactory arrangement there again with the landlords.

In other cantonments this problem is not present. I went to a cantonment the other day in the south of India and asked officers how the house accommodation was. They said they were perfectly happy, there were plenty of houses extremely cheap, the compounds were good, the landlords were friendly and did not exhibit any desire to turn officers out of their bungalows. So it will be seen that it is a problem which has to be tackled cantonment by cantonment. I assure my Honourable friend that this question has been exercising the thought of the Government for a considerable time and that Government are by no means blind to the situation.

He then referred to the question of travelling allowances. That is rather a small question. He mentioned that officers did not get enough

[Mr. G. M. Young.]

for travelling between Simla and Delhi to cover their expenses. The reason of that, Sir, is that military officers there are not subject to the military travelling allowance rules, but to what are called, I think, the Simla Hill Allowance Rules. Those are the rules which govern officers' travelling between Simla and Delhi: and though, under these rules the lower paid officers, both civil and military, do get ample travelling allowance, the higher paid officers—I am one of them myself—are always out of pocket over their journey. If my Honourable friend wishes to have that matter put right, I suggest that he should apply to some unbiassed person like the Honourable the Finance Member.

Another question he raised was the question of furlough pay. Government are fully aware of that difficulty. The rates of furlough pay in India are very much higher than the rates of furlough pay in England, and it is a fact that officers, young married officers who go home on furlough, are apt to spend, unavoidably, more than their furlough pay, and to return to this country to a certain extent in debt. That is a question which Government are considering. I cannot say, of course, what the result of the consideration will be.

My Honourable friend Mr. Joshi made some remarks about the employees in Government factories. I think he gave necessarily a rather one-sided picture. In these matters we are guided by the prevalent conditions in the labour market of the locality. I do not say that we do not admit that it is up to Government to lead the way. We do. For that very reason we have arranged for a provident fund, as mentioned by my Honourable friend, with a Government contribution; and that fund will come into force from the 1st of next month.

My Honourable friend Dr. Moonje talked about grass farms and dairy farms. I gathered that the burden of his complaint was that there were no Indians in those and other departments. The explanation is quite simple. It is not that Indians are debarred from going to those departments, but one cannot go into those departments as an officer until one has passed the promotion examination. We have not had Indian King's commissioned officers sufficiently long in the Army for more than a very few to have passed the promotion examination, as yet. As soon as they have done so, if they wish to go into any of these departments in preference to serving in battalions—and there are indications that several of them will wish to do so—there is nothing whatever to prevent them. Honourable Members are aware that King's commissioned officers are already eligible to serve in the Foreign and Political Department. They are also eligible to serve in the Cantonments Department. Only the other day we accepted an Indian King's commissioned officer candidate for the Cantonments Department. For the purely military departments it rests, as I say, upon passing the promotion examination. It is only a question of time before Indians are found in those departments.

My friend Colonel Gidney had a few remarks to make about Anglo-Indians. He asked what part the Anglo-Indian community would take in the new Army. As far as the reorganisation consequent upon the recommendations of the Skeen Committee is concerned, I can only tell him that Anglo-Indians will continue to be eligible for commissions in the Army under our scheme. The new scheme has not yet come into force, but under the present scheme an Anglo-Indian went

to Sandhurst last summer. But perhaps he was thinking more of the rank and file. He mentioned the question of organising an Anglo-Indian unit. As the House is aware, our Army at present is constituted on a class system under which we recruit only from certain classes. Those classes have varied from time to time, but remain generally the same. We sometimes consider taking out one class, and sometimes fresh classes are recruited. My Honourable friend's community comes in with all other communities that claim service in the Army in that respect. Their claims are considered simply and solely from the point of view of military efficiency,—what material in the opinion of the military authorities makes the best army. He complained, as he has often complained, that his community is in an anomalous position. Nobody denies that the circumstances are such that its position must be anomalous. But one result is that my Honourable friend sometimes has it both ways, and I think he should recognise that fact instead of putting forward the theoretical complaint that his community is in an anomalous position.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: It has an anomalous position in the Army.

Mr. G. M. Young: My friend Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Khan spoke about taking officers from the Territorial Force. He said that we ought to have some scheme of taking officers from the Territorial Force; and if I remember aright, he said he would go into the lobby and vote against the Government on this occasion because we had not done so. Well, Sir, I turn to the recommendations of the Skeen Committee in this matter. They say:

"We are aware that in the United Kingdom commissions in the regular Army are granted to suitable officers of the Territorial Army. We are, however, of opinion that the Territorial Force movement in India is not yet sufficiently developed to warrant the adoption of a corresponding practice for the present."

I think it is rather hard, Sir, that we should be condemned at the same time for objecting to some proposals of the Committee and for agreeing with others. Here is a proposal of the Committee which we have followed. It is eminently sound. The Territorial Force movement is by no means far advanced in this country. It is a matter that we should keep our eye upon, no doubt, and take up later if we see any chance of success in it.

Now, Sir, I come to the Indian Sandhurst Committee's Report once more. My Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall—I think it was—said that under our present scheme of vacancies, it would be 280 years before the Army was Indianised, and somebody else said 300 years. I find great difficulty in following that argument and seeing what it means at all. (*An Honourable Member:* "Simple arithmetic.") Of course, if the vacancies remain at 25 for all time, the Indianisation of the Army will certainly be deferred 300 years and a great deal more—indeed, for ever. But that is not the point. It is nobody's intention that the number of vacancies should remain still for all time. Our difference with the Indian Sandhurst Committee consists, as Honourable Members know, in the fact that they laid down an annual programme which they wanted us to follow. They fixed a number for one year, some other number for the next year, and so on, and said to us "Accept this time table; of course modify it in the light of experience if you do not get the men; but this is our time table. We want to tie you down to this." We say, "No. We throw open the initial number of vacancies and we will wait and see." As I said in speaking in the House the other day, these 10 vacancies that we are now having

[Mr. G. M. Young.]

at Sandhurst have in only one year produced 10 officers, the average is about 6, and that although we are allowed to supplement vacancies which occur by cadets failing to pass their retention test at Sandhurst. In some years we have had, for instance, as many as 14 to make up the deficiencies in previous years; but still the outturn has never been more than 6 on an average. If that is the case, what is there unreasonable in waiting for a year or two at any rate to see whether the various recommendations of the Committee to improve the number and quality of Indian cadets for King's commissions have effect? Taking the direct commissions, if in a few years we get as many as 17 or 18, that would be time enough to push the number up. But we have not yet had the position in which an Indian candidate has had to compete for his vacancy. The indications therefore are that the recommendations of the Committee will take some little time to show an increased number of entrants; and we simply say that for the first few years we have a number that we think will be sufficient. If we are wrong, we shall be able to increase it. Many Honourable Members, in talking about these proposals, have assumed that we have definitely turned down anything like a progressive scheme; and that when we say we open 20 vacancies of direct commissions and 5 vacancies for the Viceroy's commissioned officers, we mean that is all we are ever going to do. That is not the case. It is not the case with direct commissions and it is not the case with Viceroy's commissioned officers. My Honourable friend, Colonel Crawford, said the other day that we were doing very little for the Viceroy's commissioned officers. I do not know whether he is quite aware of what we are doing, and I do not know if he is as fully informed on the subject as the Committee themselves. He ought to know about the King George's Royal Indian schools at Jhelum and Jullundur and also about the scheme for the Kitchener College. We have started by saying that there will be 5 vacancies open to Viceroy's commissioned officers, and that number may be increased to 10 if there is a corresponding shortage in the number of 20 reserved for direct commissions. But, as I say, that is not a number we are going to stick to for all time. If we think that we can get Viceroy's commissioned officers in large numbers we shall certainly make use of that source of supply. My own view is that that will be a very important, if not the most important, source of supply of Indian officers, for the Indian national army of which we are trying to lay the foundation. I am surprised at my Honourable friend, Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Khan, saying that he is going to go into the lobby against us because we are not doing enough for the Viceroy's commissioned officers. It will be some time before we get the standard of education high enough for young Viceroy's commissioned officers to be considered for King's commissions. Before that time comes we shall probably do a good deal in the way of waiving the age limit in favour of most suitable candidates. (*An Honourable Member*: "What is the age limit?") The age limit is 25. The scheme is an expansible one; we are not tied down to anything, and we are out to get the Viceroy's commissioned officers if we possibly can.

Then I turn to another subject raised by my Honourable friend, Pandit Kunzru. He spoke of the scheme for reorganising units on the British pattern; and although, like many other Honourable Members, he thinks that the scheme will not mature for an infinity of time, he

was not slow to point out that the entire Indian Army reorganised on the British pattern would involve colossal expenditure because there would be 8,000 King's commissioned officers whereas you have now only 3,150. The answer to that is that the scheme is a gradual one and that we can adapt it as it goes on according to results. At first when we start replacing Viceroy's commissioned officers with these new King's commissioned officers, there will be quite enough opportunities for openings to the Viceroy's commissioned officers in other battalions of the same group or in other groups. It will leave a full field of advancement for the rank and file, and for the Viceroy's commissioned officer. Later something more will have to be done, and eventually when you get a large force officered entirely by Indian officers with the King's commission, there will be no justification of course to pay that establishment of officers the full rate of pay of a British officer serving with the Army in India, nor will the officers expect that pay. It is reasonable that they should receive a pay which corresponds to the pay of a British officer serving in Great Britain, and not to the pay of expatriated officers serving in a foreign country. That is a thing which will be worked out in time. When Indian officers are serving, as they are now serving, side by side with British officers, in their units, there is little justification for doing more than creating an overseas element, even though we are now neutralising the whole of the extra expense which education in Sandhurst has hitherto cost. We are thinking out a scheme of that kind. I cannot say for certain but I do not think it very likely that any difference in pay will be made in the first three or four years of service. It is hard on a young boy coming to the Army to draw less than his fellow officers. But as time goes on and we get our Indian officers, we must derive the advantage of economy from Indianisation: and long before the period which my friend Pandit Kunzru visualises has been reached, there will have been made a suitable adjustment in the matter of pay. My friend Pandit Kunzru was also rather alarmed about promotion. He was afraid that this scheme for the reorganisation of units was simply in order to prevent Indian officers getting command over British officers in what he called mixed regiments. I think he must have meant larger formations than regiments, that is, when you have got beyond the units. It is a difficult matter to explain, but His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief did explain in his speech the reorganisation of units on this pattern and its effect on promotion. An officer does not get the command of a company or squadron, as the case may be, until he reaches a certain seniority. It is perfectly true that under his system when you get more officers and the number keeps going up, a larger number will reach the point of qualifying for the command of companies than there are companies for them. That, of course, will be the moment to expand your system by taking up other units. Now, the prospects of promotion in the British service are fairly comparable with the prospects of promotion in the Indian Army. One of the reasons of the better promotion in the Indian Army is that it has a larger number of departments. And those departments, as I have often told Honourable Members in this House, are and will be open to Indians in every way.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Is it intended that further progress should be made by the Indianisation of more units?

Mr. G. M. Young: Now, Sir, I think I have said on this occasion and on others all that I need say about the Indian Sandhurst Committee's Report. My Honourable friend, Mr. Goswami, speaking yesterday, in the course of a very eloquent passage asked us, I think, to be honest about granting self-government—gradually, if we would. Well, Sir, we think we are honest about it: and we do not see how self-government can be attained by India gradually unless you let us take the initial step. But what happens every time? On four occasions in this House this year an attempt has been made at a start in the direction of self-government. On each occasion the attempt has been repudiated in its initial stage, for one reason or another. There is the attempt to found a national bank. I am not sufficiently expert in finance to know the reasons which induced the House to reject that attempt. There was an attempt to set about founding a whole constitution for India, through the Statutory Commission. I never yet could understand why the House saw fit to reject that attempt. The other day we came to the House with a proposal to lay the foundation of an Indian Navy. We came to the House in the only way in which we could come to the House, by asking them to pass a Bill which would apply the British Naval Discipline Act, and thereby confer on the officers and men of the Royal Indian Marine, British and Indian, present and future, equal status with the British Navy and the Navies of the Dominions. What happened? My Honourable friend, Mr. Chetty, who led the opposition, spoke of that as if it were something loathsome. He said that he would not touch it with a pair of tongs. Sir, what is the meaning of those words? Honourable Members may not approve of our methods. You may think we are not setting the right way about it, but how, unless you accept our initial move and make something of it yourselves, can you expect us to do anything for you? The Honourable Members immediately opposite me are content simply to sit and criticise and vote against Government. If they had any real determination, they would take the things we offer, bad as they think they are, and would make something better of them. The same applies to this scheme of the Government on the recommendations of the Indian Sandhurst Committee. (*An Honourable Member:* "It would be putting a noose round our necks".) I can quite see that our proposals in many respects are unlikely to commend themselves to certain sections of opinion in this House. I think they commend themselves more to those parties who have made a study of military matters. Those who have made none and do not profess to have made any are content to sit still or get up and speak on generalities and then go into the lobby and vote. Their attitude is that they will not help. (*An Honourable Member:* "Which party do you mean?") My Honourable friend opposite knows which party I mean. Condemn whatever you like in our scheme, but do take it, and help us to make something of it. (Loud Applause.)

Mr. President: Order, order. The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced by Rs 5,70,999."

The Assembly divided.

AYES—66.

Abdoola Haroon, Haji.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sesha.
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
 Birla, Mr. Ghanshyam Das.
 Chaman Lall, Diwan.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Chunder, Mr. Nirmal Chunder.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Dutta, Mr. Srish Chandra.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
 Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.
 Kartar Singh, Sardar.
 Ke'kar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.
 Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. Dharendra Kanta.

NOES—51.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Ahmad, Khan Bahadur Nasir-ud-din.
 Alexander, Mr. William.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.
 Ashrafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur Nawabzada Sayid.
 Ayangar, Mr. V. K. Aravamudha.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bhuto, Mr. W. W. Illahibakhsh.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Chatterjee, The Revd. J. C.
 Chatterji, Rai Bahadur B. M.
 Coatman, Mr. J.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Couper, Mr. T.
 Courtenay, Mr. R. H.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Crerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
 Dakhan, Mr. W. M. P. Ghulam Kadir Khan.
 Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hussain Shah, Sayyed.
 Irwin, Mr. C. J.

The motion was adopted.

Lajpat Rai, Lala.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jammadas M.
 Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
 Mitra, Mr. Satyendra Chandra.
 Moonje, Dr. B. S.
 Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
 Naidu, Mr. B. P.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
 Phookun, Srijut Tarun Ram.
 Prakasam, Mr. T.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Rahimtulla, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim.
 Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
 Roy, Rai Bahadur Tar't Bhusan.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib Harbilas.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Shervani, Mr. T. A. K.
 Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
 Singh, Kumar Ramanjaya.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Sinha, Mr. R. P.
 Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar.
 Tok Kyi, U.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr.

Jawahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar.
 Kabul Singh Bahadur, Captain.
 Keane, Mr. M.
 Kikabhai Premchand, Mr.
 Lamb, Mr. W. S.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
 Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Rao, Mr. V. Pandurang.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sams, Mr. H. A.
 Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
 Sharmaldhari Lall, Mr.
 Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
 Subrawady, Dr. A.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Taylor, Mr. E. Gawan.
 Willson, Sir Walter.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.
 Zulfikar Ali Khan, Nawab Sir.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Re. 1 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 81,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Executive Council'."

On the principle that there should be no square pegs in round holes.

***Diwan Chaman Lall:** Sir, I move: -

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 80,999."

This cut has been given by me for the reason that I do not think the Members of the Governor General's Executive Council deserve the confidence of this House. I think the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council have woefully betrayed the trust that could be placed in them by the people of India. There was a splendid opportunity, at least for the Indian Members, to show their regard for public opinion when the question of the Simon Commission came before them. I regret to say that not one of the three Indian Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council took it upon himself to tender his resignation; as self-respecting Indians they should have tendered their resignation on this most vital question which affects the honour of this country. I further find that the departments that are managed by the six Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, although every one of them gets Rs. 6,666-10-8 as his pay every month, are not being managed in the interests of the people of this country. We have recently, only a little while ago, seen an exhibition on the part of the Government in regard to military expenditure and we have found that our protests year in and year out have gone in vain and that not one Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council has taken it upon himself to protest against this expenditure. We have further seen that, as far as the liberties of the people are concerned, they have been absolutely negligent of all the elementary canons of civilized government. They have imprisoned people without formulating charges against them: they have imprisoned and kept in confinement a large number of people in this country under a system which has been condemned by every reasonable thinking man in this country. I am glad to note that a certain number of them were released the other day, although no announcement was made on the floor of this House to this effect, yet an announcement was made in the other place. But even then all these years these Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council have been giving their tacit consent to a system of government in this country which has been proved to have been injurious to the best interests of this country. They have been carrying on this government under a system which can only be described as entirely autocratic: and I consider, Sir, that under these circumstances we are perfectly justified in passing a vote of censure upon the Members of the Executive

* Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

Council. I do not wish to indulge in personalities. I gave one reason here when I moved this cut, that the Members of the Executive Council were square pegs in round holes. It was no reflection. I want to say to the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett, that although, as a friend of mine once said, he stands four-square and his figure is very square, there was no reflection upon him. It was a reflection upon the whole system; and it was no reflection, I might say, on Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra personally. It was, Sir, no reflection on Sir Muhammad Habibullah. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya the other day in a very eloquent speech stated—and that statement has not been contradicted—that Sir Muhammad Habibullah was the only Member of the Executive Council who was against this present constitution of the Simon Commission which has been announced. Not another Member,—neither of the other two Indian Members, took up the stand which the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah took up. Of course we are not in the secret of the Viceroy's Executive Council; but the statement was made on the floor of this House and it has not been contradicted. I want to ask the two Members, why did they not take a similar stand? If it is true that he did protest, why did not the other two Members protest? And knowing perfectly well the feeling in the country on this question, why did they not tender their resignations as self-respecting men? There they are. We cannot touch their salaries. It is not possible for us to touch a single anna of their salaries. Nor is it possible to touch a single hair of their heads. But what we can touch is the votable portion of this Demand and that votable portion of the demand comes to a sum of Rs. 81,000. Under the rules I now ask the House to record its protest, its censure against the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council for continuing a system of government in this country, for giving their assent to a system of government in this country which has been condemned by the people's representatives and which is neither a civilised system, nor one which guarantees freedom to the people of India.

I therefore, Sir, move my cut.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting the cut of my friend Diwan Chaman Lall who has proposed that the Demand under the head "Executive Council" be reduced by Rs. 80,999. In doing so, I want to make three specific charges against the Members of the Executive Council. My first charge is concerning their attitude in regard to the appointment of a purely Parliamentary Commission. The Honourable the Home Member, replying the other day to the Debate on the Commission, resented the censures of this side of the House and said:

"The fact that censures of that kind have been directed against the Government of India indicates a total misapprehension of the true constitutional position."

And then, Sir, he treated us to a lecture on the true constitutional position. To my understanding what he wanted us to believe was that in the matter of the Statutory Commission the Government was as innocent as an unborn child. Pandit Malaviya in his speech on the 18th February asked the Home Member as to where had the proposal that the Statutory Commission should be a Parliamentary Commission first emanate from. He enquired:

"Is it a fact that this proposition went in the first instance from India to England, from the Government of India to His Majesty's Government? I ask my Honourable friend to deny that this is a fact."

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

Some other questions asked by him were also to the same effect. I expected, and in fact the whole House expected, a specific reply to his specific questions. When the Honourable the Home Member got up to reply to the debate I leaned forward to hear his answer to the challenge. But what is it that he said? He said:

"I regret that in the brief space at my disposal I cannot follow in detail the clouds of surmises and assumptions which underlay the questions which Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya addressed to me."

I submit, Sir, that it is unfair on his part to characterise the specific questions of Pandit Malaviya as clouds of surmises and assumptions. In fact this answer is an insult to the intelligence of this House.

Sir, there is one thing further that has got to be noted. He said "I cannot follow in detail, etc., etc.", which meant that he was going to give at least some sort of replies to the questions put by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I read carefully the whole of his speech from the beginning to the end and I do not find a single reference to these questions. "Silence is a sign of acknowledgment," says a Sanskrit proverb, and I cannot but conclude that the part which the Government of India have played in the matter of the appointment of the Parliamentary Commission cannot bear the light of day, unless the Honourable the Home Member stands up and answers the questions put by the Honourable Pandit. I think, Sir, this House will be perfectly justified in supposing that the Government of India have played the most ignoble part in this matter.

My second charge against the Government of India is, that in the matter of Hindu-Muslim disputes, in the matter of communal questions in this country, they have played an equally ignoble part. Last year, when we were discussing this very Demand, Sir Alexander Muddiman replying to the speech of my Honourable friend Maulvi Muhammad Yakub, referred to the communal question and said:

"It is a question that you yourselves must solve for yourselves."

Sir, the *ex-Home* Member's superior air of impartiality was too much for me to bear and I interrupted him by saying: "If you allow". Then Sir Alexander Muddiman retorted by saying:

"If the suggestion is that we are not doing everything we possibly can do to deal with the situation, I do believe there is no man in this place who is prepared to repeat it."

And, Sir, to my utter bewilderment I found that there was not a single Member in this House to get up and support me. But I am glad to say that in this Session Member after Member has got up and said the same thing. Nay, Sir, they have made the definite charge against the Government and said that they are responsible for the communal trouble in this country. I stand up to-day to add my small voice to their voices.

Now, Sir, I would be asked to substantiate this charge. Let me point out that this is a self-evident proposition and everybody in the country feels the truth of this. But if my Honourable friend the Home Member wants me to substantiate it, I would not disappoint him. It is a matter of common knowledge to students of British Indian history that the principles which underlie the rule of the British Government in India were determined in the middle of the 19th century, in the years just preceding and following

the Mutiny. Sir, in those years when the principles and policies which were to govern this country were being discussed, a British officer signing himself as "Carnaticus" wrote in the *Asiatic Review* in the year 1821 as follows:

"*Divide et impera* should be the motto of our administration whether political, civil or military."

About the time of the Mutiny, Lieutenant-Colonel John Coke, Commandant of Moradabad, wrote:

"Our endeavour should be to uphold in full force the (for us fortunate) separation which exists between the different religions and races, not to endeavour to amalgamate them. *Divide et impera* should be the principle of the Indian Government."

Lord Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay, in a Minute, dated the 11th of May 1850, wrote as follows:

"*Divide et impera* was the old Roman motto and it should be ours."

Now, Sir, he will be a bold man who stands up in this House to-day and says that the British Government by now have changed their policy in this matter. We have been seeing every day that this principle of "divide and rule", which was adopted in the 19th century, is being followed with zeal in this 20th century. Yesterday, while discussing the frontier question, my Honourable friend Lala Lajpat Rai plainly told the opposite Benches that the Government were afraid of laying their cards on the table in the matter of the introduction of reforms in the Frontier Province, because they thought that if even that small question was settled, one of the causes of friction between the two great communities will be removed. To be frank, Sir, whenever I find the British officials

4 P.M. shedding crocodile tears over this communal question, I am afraid that they are inspired by some sinister motives. In the last Simla Session considerable anxiety was shown by them regarding the Hindu-Muslim unrest prevalent in the country. Now, Sir, my belief is that this was merely a sort of preparation for the exclusion of Indians from the Statutory Commission. They wanted to concentrate the attention of the whole world on the fact that there was a serious communal question in this country so that no one could be justified in blaming them for not appointing any Indian on the coming Commission. This is the only thing which can explain their great solicitude during the Simla Session.

My third charge against the Government is that they have been very unfair to the Nationalist Members of this House. Last year, Sir, I entered a protest against it in the course of my speech on the Steel Protection Bill. I find, Sir, that this year matters, instead of having improved, have gone worse. My Honourable friend, the Deputy Leader of my party, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, has made a reference to this matter and so I do not wish to detain the House long on that account; but I would like to point out that even the *Pioneer* has condemned their criminal culpableness for "exhibiting a phase of British regime in India" which, the paper rightly says, "all right-minded people would like to see abolished immediately". (Applause). Now, Sir, where does the origin of this haughtiness and this arrogance lies? Certainly it lies, as the origin of all arrogance lies, in ignorance. The origin of the haughtiness and the pride of these people is in their ignorance. And, Sir, the *Pioneer* aptly

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

remarks that they are absolutely "ignorant of the real conditions in India". But I say that though this paper has discovered it only now, the ignorance of the bureaucracy is not a new thing. Even Sir Bampfylde Fuller, who was admittedly not a friend of India, says very uncomplimentary things about them. Here is a quotation from him:

"Young British officials go out to India most imperfectly equipped for their responsibilities. They learn no law worth the name, a little Indian history, no political economy, and gain a smattering of one Indian vernacular. In regard to other branches of the Service, matters are still more unsatisfactory. Young men who are to be police officers are sent out with no training whatever, though for the proper discharge of their duties an intimate acquaintance with Indian life and ideals is essential. They land in India in absolute ignorance of the language. So also with forest officers, medical officers, engineers and (still more surprising) educational officers."

Now, Sir, the ignorance of the bureaucracy is equalled only by its selfishness. This state of affairs was quite recognised by Mr. Montagu and he warned the British House of Commons against the danger of attaching too much importance to the opinions of the British officials. Speaking in the House of Commons he is reported to have said:

"Let me put it to this House. After all, the Civil Servant in India is not very different from the Civil Servant in this country. Who ever heard of a political reform in any office in this country coming out of the Civil Service? This House is the place for political reform. You will never get it carried out by the Civil Service. As time goes on, that Service must carry out the wishes of those who dictate the policy. It must be first in this House, and ultimately in India, that that policy which the Civil Service is to carry out must be dictated to it."

Now, Sir, I submit that as long as Mr. Montagu was in office the bureaucracy was not always allowed to have its own way. But now that he is gone, I see that the bureaucracy finds itself entirely the master of the situation. It seems it is from these people, as Pandit Malaviya says, that this question of a Parliamentary Commission and the consequent exclusion of Indians from it emanated. Sir, I say after deep consideration that the just interests of the British Parliament can be reconciled with the just claims of Indians. If the British people want to have us in their Empire as their honourable partners they can make some sort of settlement with us. If they will take an enlightened and not a narrow view of their interests I am sure they will come to some sort of agreement with us. But I submit, Sir, that the interests of the bureaucracy are diametrically opposed to Indian interests, and as long as it is in the power of British officials they will try their best to delude the Parliament into believing that it is possible to rule India for ever. British historians are fond of saying now and again that the British people conquered India in a state of absent-mindedness. I want to declare from the floor of this House that if the bureaucracy is allowed to deceive Parliament as to the real conditions prevailing in India a day will surely come when England will lose India in a state of similar absent-mindedness. Sir, I have done.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, many charges have been laid—and serious charges too—against the Government during the last 4 or 5 days, but the charge which I am going to lay at the door of the Executive Council this evening is one in which I hope almost all the non-official Members of this House will agree with me, including, I think, the non-official European group also, and it is, Sir, the insufficient and small number of

non-official days which are allotted to this Assembly for carrying out non-official work. Sir, from the statistics which were supplied to me by the Legislative Department we find that since this Assembly came into being, that is, 1921

Mr. President: Order, order. The Governor General in Council has got nothing to do with the allotment of days for non-official business. It is the Governor General that allots days.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: I submit, Sir, that although it is the Governor General who allots days for non-official business, I believe it is on the recommendation of the Executive Council that these days are allotted, and therefore, I submit, Sir, that I would be in order if I level the charge of allotting an insufficient number of days at the door of the Executive Council. Sir, in the beginning of this Session when I found that in a Session of 2 months only 5 days were allotted for non-official work, i.e., 2 days for non-official Bills and 3 days for non-official Resolutions, I gave notice of a motion in this House to the effect that the Honourable the President of the House should represent to His Excellency the Governor General the insufficiency of the number of non-official days. But I am sorry to say, Sir, that the motion was not consented to by the Leader of the House and, therefore, I could not discuss it here. This shows, Sir, that it is the Governor General in Council

Mr. President: The Honourable Member knows that the matter has been settled to some extent to his satisfaction.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: I do not think, Sir, that it has been settled to my satisfaction, because, after all that correspondence, 2 extra days were allotted in this Session. But it is as a matter of favour. I want, Sir, that it ought to be as a matter of principle that more days for non-official work should be allotted to the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Leader of the House): On a point of order, Sir. If I say, Sir, that I shall be unable to reply as this is outside the sphere of the Executive Council, you will therefore perhaps think it undesirable that this discussion should continue.

Mr. President: I agree with the Leader of the House that this is outside the sphere of the Executive Council.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: I bow, Sir, to your ruling. I would only submit that I have a cut to this very effect on the Demand under the "Executive Council" and that cut was allowed and it is on the agenda paper to-day

Mr. President: Every cut that is on the agenda is not necessarily in order. Its admissibility has got to be considered by the Chair when it reaches.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: Very well, Sir, if that is your ruling, I bow to it.

Mr. O. Duraiswamy Aiyangar (Madras Ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, after hearing all these criticisms some Honourable Member from the Government side will rise in his seat and give the stereotyped reply that neither the iniquities of the Executive Councillors nor their failings would be covered by the tour expenses, and some Honourable Member from the Treasury Benches is sure to say that whatever their iniquities may be, they are committed in their office rooms

[Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar.]

in their lounge chairs and not during their tours. The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett is sure to say that in spite of the fact that we may vote down this expenditure of Rs. 81,000 he is sure and safe in his seat so long as his Rs. 4,83,000 is untouchable. I therefore take it as a settled fact that the irresponsible executive of this country is fixed in its seat so long as Rs. 4,83,000 is secure, non-votable and untouchable, and therefore, Sir, it becomes immaterial to me so long as these two things are there whether it is the brown elephant or the white elephant that I am feeding. But I shall confine myself within the four corners of the tour expenses and I would like to ask Honourable Members seated on the opposite side how they justify the expenditure of Rs. 81,000 over their tours. I take first the Honourable the Finance Member himself. He is the Leader of the House also for the time being. I would ask him to explain how he justifies the expenditure that is incurred out of the Indian revenues for his tour expenses. In the ordinary course of events I should have expected that the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett would not move this motion in laconic words but would have made clear to the House the extent and utility that was achieved in the past by these tours, as indicative of what is likely to be expected by us in the future in the coming year. Sir, taking these tours, I have not been able to find any literature which will give us an idea of the extent and utility of these tours so far as the people of this country are concerned. If we get any information at all it is due to the Associated Press, India, or the Free Press, and from what I have been able to gather from the papers. Let me take the example of the Finance Member. So far as I have been able to read from the newspapers I find that sometimes he likes to kill the monotony of the Simla chillness by going over to Calcutta and from thence to Bombay and back to Simla. In Calcutta he would meet the Chambers of Commerce, he would have a dinner at the European Association, there will be an exchange of mutual adulations, closing with a pious wish expressed by the host as well as the guest at a toast that some day ten centuries hence there must be Swaraj for this country, not as a consequence of the political agitation, but as a reward for the docility of the political leaders if they maintain that attitude for that period. Then he departs from there and his saloon takes him from Howrah to Bombay and it is only there that the saloon is detached. There he meets the merchant princes, has his own talks about exchange and ratio and goes back to Simla, unless it is to pay a visit to his favourite Ghazipur factory to see if the opium manufactured therein is all well made up. Excepting these things, I have not been able to find what the Honourable the Finance Member during the last five years has done by his tours. I ask him point blank to answer me whether in any one of these tours he has gone outside the capital of any Presidency, whether he has visited at least the capitals of all the Presidencies and provinces in this country, whether he went out of any capital city to see a single poor man, to see a single cottage, to see a single agriculturist to know in what condition he is . . .

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: It is the absence of visits, like what even the Simonites are making, that accounts for the fact that with great levity he goes on putting on a salt tax of Rs. 1-4-0 per maund . . .

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: As I do not expect to have an opportunity of a speech, I may say I have been many times in the places where I am supposed not to have been.

Mr. O. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: So far as I have been able to gather from the literature that I have been able to get, I thought that even Sir Basil Blackett would find it difficult—when he goes back to England and when some of his friends out of curiosity ask him what sort of agriculturists there are in India—he would describe them as people with boots and trousers, neckties and collars. I would ask him to explain what tour he has carried out in order to understand the difficulties of the people, the burden of their taxation and the conditions under which they live. Take again the Commerce Member who is also the Member for Railways. Even Sir Charles Innes, who was employed in Madras, never came there after he became a Member of the Executive Council. If I have to vote anything for the Commerce Member, I would vote for him not a bug-proof saloon but a third class fare, not even the one and three-fifths fare which we are getting, so that he may understand the difficulties of the third class passengers and redress their grievances. Take again the Industries Member or the Law Member. What are they doing in their tours? The Law Member came to Madras once and presided over a meeting of the Justice Party, apparently because law and justice must go together, and made a mess of Endowments Act and came back. Sir, if this is the kind of tours which the Executive Councillors are going to carry out, I submit we are justified in withholding the amount for their touring expenses. If in future they carry on their tours not only for the benefit of merchant princes, not for the benefit of mill-owners and not for the benefit of Chambers of Commerce but for the benefit of the poor agricultural population of this country, then I am willing to vote a supplementary Grant in the course of next year in spite even of a mandate of my Party.

Sir Walter Willson (Associated Chambers of Commerce: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, on the principle of there being “no square pegs in round holes” I have something to say. I want to draw the attention of the Government to a question which was commented upon by Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford in their report of 1917. On page 267 of that report, they say referring to the slowness with which the Government departments in India work—this is paragraph 269:

“One reason why the departments can move quickly in England is because their day to day administration runs itself. In India the higher staff of the secretariats is not permanent because, rightly or wrongly, it has always been held desirable to maintain touch between headquarters offices and the districts. We express no opinion on the system but it requires detailed examination. Indeed the Viceroy has already signified to his colleagues his intention of causing it to be examined after the war.”

Lord Chelmsford carried out this intention in appointing the Llewellyn Smith Committee which considered this matter amongst others during the last three years of Lord Chelmsford's viceroyalty. The Committee were impressed by the undoubted disadvantages of the present system under which at times all responsible officers of Government departments are mere birds of passage, that is to say, practically the whole of the permanent traditions of the department are the exclusive possession of the office establishment. They did not propose any revolutionary changes in this system, under which the posts of Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries are temporary.

[Sir Walter Willson.]

because they were alive to the disadvantages of cutting the Secretariat off from living contact with the higher administrative work in the provinces, which might outweigh the immediate advantage of making those officers permanent. They did, however, consider three years an unduly short maximum period for a Secretary or Deputy Secretary to hold his office and recommended that it should be increased to four years. Unfortunately, the Government of India did not see their way to accepting even this moderate proposal, and in their Resolution of 15th September 1920 in the Home Department they decided to retain three years as the maximum period a Secretary or Deputy Secretary should hold office.

Now, Sir, eight years have passed, and that in itself is a sufficient reason for me again to direct the attention of Government to this matter. Since that Committee reported this House has come into existence, but I am afraid that from the point of view of the Secretariat its proceedings and in particular the childlike, if not childish, passion of some Members for asking a multitude of questions, has immensely increased the labour of the Secretariat without necessarily increasing the effectiveness of that work. But, above all, Sir, I venture to express the opinion that the work of the Secretariat has become immensely more technical. To give a concrete instance, the adoption of a policy of discriminating protection, with the consequent Tariff Board Reports, has added a vast volume of important and highly technical work to the Commerce Department. Every new Factory Bill, every amendment to the Indian Mines Act, means that the Government of India, like every Government in the world, is undertaking additional responsibilities which formerly were not considered to fall within its sphere.

That tendency appears to me to affect the decision of 1920 on both sides. In the first place, it is every year becoming harder for a District Officer, however able and however typical of his service or his versatility, to come into the Secretariat and take over a responsible post without recent and continuous experience of the Department. In the second place, this changed state of affairs makes the need for all Secretaries to retain recent experience of district work less great. The Secretary to the Finance or Commerce Department is not likely to be greatly assisted in his very specialised and technical work by having recently been a Commissioner in the Central Provinces. All experience admittedly is of value, but three years in the Department as a Deputy Secretary would have been time more profitably spent.

I have heard it suggested that the time is now coming when the Indian Civil Service will have to be to some extent divided into specialised categories. The machinery of Government is becoming now so complicated and complex that you will require specialised mechanics to run it. The officials of the Treasury or the Board of Trade or the Ministry of Health at Home spend a life-time in mastering the intricacies of their subject. It would be considered absurd there if the Permanent Under-Secretary to the Foreign Office were transferred to the Ministry of War or the Secretary to the Admiralty to the Home Office. Was it any less absurd to transfer Mr. Burdon, when he had acquired a real knowledge of the Army Department, to the Finance Department, or Mr. McWatters after all the experience he had in the Finance Department to that of Industries and Labour? Do we, commercial men, not know, for example, how intensely valuable to us was the experience of Mr. Clow in the Indian Labour Department, and

how he knew everything about it? Therefore, Sir, it is in the hope of calling the Government's attention to these changes purely as examples and to show how undesirable they are from our point of view generally that I have ventured to speak on the subject of "square pegs in round holes"; and if my friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, succeeds in cutting the Grant by Rs. 80,999, I shall do my best to take away the last rupee after that.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, I am not concerned with the tour programme of the Executive Council; I am rather concerned with the Executive Council itself, and I maintain that the present Members should not be here at all. I maintain that some of us should be on the other side of the House, I maintain that there should be no Executive Council but a Cabinet elected by the majority of the non-official Members of this House and I maintain that there should be no official representatives on the floor of this House. To every demand of ours for progress and self-determination the Executive Council always puts forward obstacles.

We have got very small reforms, very little indeed, of these blessed reforms. We have got instead ever-growing top heavy expenditure. But when we see the great expansion of the Secretariat of the Government of India, which is under the direct control of the Members of the Executive Council, when we see the alarming number of Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries—a few years ago the number was 17 or 18; it is probably 30 or 40 now—and the very small number of Indians in the large number of Secretaries, Deputy and Under Secretaries, I feel that the Executive Council is not doing its duty, not even the Indian section of that Executive Council, with regard to the Indian view-point. Sir, since the Reforms, taxation has gone up by leaps and bounds, expenditure has gone up proportionately, and for that the Executive Council is responsible; it is responsible for the alarming growth of expenditure and mismanagement of Indian revenues. And it is high time that the Executive Council should go and be replaced by non-officials, so that the Indian tax-payers' money may be spent for the benefit of the tax-payers, and not for maintaining a costly establishment for which India has no need.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I am at one with my friend Mr. B. Das in submitting that the present Executive Councillors should now be replaced by non-official and Indian Executive Councillors. But it is not on that score that I wish to support the cut of Diwan Chaman Lall. If a person is an idiot, if a person is insane, we are not to blame that person, because God made him so. If the Executive Councillors are irresponsible to the Legislature, we cannot blame them, for the Government of India Act made them so. But what I blame them for is that they are not responsive, and therefore I have given notice of a cut on that score. I wish, irresponsible as they are, that they should not be irresponsible to public opinion and to the public weal. I am myself a responsivist and I wish that they all became responsivists at least in this sense, that they have the public weal and the poor man's interest at heart.

Now, Sir, I will just illustrate my point by referring to one or two matters. In the first place, there was just a reference by the Army Secretary to the Reserve Bank muddle. There was also a reference to the Skeen Committee affair and it was said that this side of the House was irresponsible. Now, Sir, I do not wish to go into the old story whether the hen came first or the egg came first, whether we are irresponsible

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.]

or they are irresponsible, and I will leave it to be judged by the public in general and by the Executive Councillors themselves. I would ask them if they were in the same position in which we are, would they have accepted these measures and welcomed those who are responsible for these measures. Now, just take the Navy Bill. Am I to understand that any Member of the Executive Council would have behaved in a different manner from that in which we behaved if they sat on these Benches? That is the true touchstone by which you can judge whether you are irresponsible or we are irresponsible. Similarly, take the case of the Skeen Committee. It is said that this House is not taking half a loaf which will enable it to qualify itself to get a full loaf. But is there half a loaf or any loaf at all in the recommendations made by the Government in this particular case? By temperament and by creed I am one of those who are ready to respond to any call which is reasonable, but in these two or three matters I can assure the Executive Councillors, who are blaming us, that no self-respecting person would behave in a way different from the one in which we have behaved. Now, in the matter of the Reserve Bank, it has been said many a time in this House that the Leader of the House was not responsible for the *impasse* in which the House found itself and that there were forces behind the scenes which were really responsible. Now, I am not one of those who would put the blame on the Leader of the House if he is not blameable in this matter. I am not blaming him for his irresponsibility, but I am blaming him for his irresponsibility. We heard in those days that the Leader of the House had resigned, but the news was found to be incorrect, or rather it was found to be unfounded. In a matter like this, I would certainly expect that any honest person, any person who says that he is true to the salt of India, would respond and would make a protest. The same thing happened in the case of the Simon Commission. I do not know how things happened, but supposing they happened in the way in which our honoured leader Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya said they happened, does it not stand to reason that Indians had every right to expect at least of the Indian Executive Councillors that they would feel the public pulse and resign their posts and vindicate their patriotism? Similarly, in the matter of the Skeen Committee, I, for one, most humbly and respectfully say to the Indian Executive Councillors . . .

An Honourable Member: Why respectfully?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: My friend asks why I should say "respectfully". I say it because by their age, by their position, they are entitled to respect from me. I am a responsivist and therefore I respect their age and their position, but I do not respect their patriotism, and this is to say the least. I had expected that on a question of this moment, the Indian Councillors would show the same spirit as was shown by their predecessor, Sir Sankaran Nair of those days, when the question of martial law in the Punjab came to be discussed in the Executive Council.

Now, Sir, leaving these two points, I would mention one more point in this connection and that is the report of the textile industry. To my mind, in matters of this kind, when the Government appoints certain Committees which go into these questions of detail and submit their report, it is generally shelved. And what do we find? The Members of this House are not allowed to take the initiative in matters of that nature, and we have to depend upon the Members in charge of particular departments to take the initiative. What happened? We thought a Bill in

respect of this matter would be introduced. Up to this day we are waiting for a Bill in which there would be an import duty on cloth. But it is too much to expect, because as I have said the divine quality of responsiveness is wanting in this system which is too wooden, in the words of Mr. Montagu.

Now, Sir, besides these three things, I would respectfully submit that our Executive Councillors should have a searching of heart and consider whether, in view of the Budget this year, they would like to be judged from the poor man's standpoint. The salt tax is there as it was. The railway fares in respect of those persons who travel fifty miles or less are the same as they were before. The postal rates are there and last of all there is one point that I want to submit for the consideration of the Executive Councillors, and they should see whether they have been able to make any improvement in the matter. The whole of the Government of India—look at it from any standpoint—is a representation of the old accursed caste system. You will be able to see that in matters military, in matters civil, in matters relating to the distribution of posts and the loaves and fishes of office, the racial question comes in everywhere; and though the Indian Executive Councillors are not homogeneous by way of caste—they are hybrid—at the same time this incubus of racial discrimination they also cannot eschew. Even now there are certain services which are only open to Europeans and Anglo-Indians (*Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney*: "Are there any?") If you want to know the names of those services I will just mention them. Take for instance the Military Engineering Services. (*Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney*: "Leave aside the Army.") Am I to consider that the Army is a subject which is untouchable by itself? That is the greatest proof that racial discrimination is rampant in at least one branch of the Indian Government, that is the Army. I understand that in this matter Colonel Gidney occupies a much better position than we on this side of the House occupy. He belongs to the favoured caste himself; whether he admits it or not is a different question; but he represents a class for which the Railway Department is a preserve; and the Europeans represent a class for which the Army is a preserve; and we are yet to see the day when our Executive Councillors will bring about a state of things in which the humblest Indian will be able to say that he can aspire to the highest post in this land and when they will become responsive to the woes of the people. This is a desire which is not unnatural in any person, even though he has got the constitution which we have got here. I should like that the day to be very near when the Executive Councillors would be responsible; but before that I would expect that they at least become responsive; and if they become responsive, we can perhaps hope that they will some day become responsible also.

Mr. T. A. K. Shervani: Sir, I move that the question be now put.

Mr. G. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Executive Council stands between India and the light of the world, and it is for that reason that I stand up to place on record my sympathy with the motion of Diwan Chaman Lall. Sir, there is one compelling consideration, and that is their having lent their support to the tour in this country of what the *Englishman* described as "seven white rabbits with pink spots" (Laughter)—that is how the *Englishman* described the Simon Commission. I think that is adequate so far as the

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

support of this motion is concerned. Sir, it was the duty, it is the duty, of the Executive Council to represent the opinion of India to Great Britain: but the Executive Council has been misrepresenting India's opinion to Great Britain. It was the duty of the Executive Council to place on record what Indians feel. After all, they are supposed to be sitting on those Benches and sympathising with our aspiration for responsible self-government. Their sympathy for responsible self-government must also carry with it a certain amount of responsiveness. How have they responded, I ask, to Indian aspirations? They have been for the last eight or nine years, listening to Indian opinion, to Indian aspirations and to Indian feelings which have been given expression to from this side of the House. How have they respected that Indian opinion? Sir, the Executive Council helped the Viceroy in putting the recommendations of this House regarding the Lee Commission into the waste paper basket. The Executive Council again—the Executive Councillor who was responsible for 'his is now elevated to the position of the Governor of a province—the Executive Council helped the Viceroy in not going very far in the direction of reforms. We all know what they did in regard to the Muddiman Committee's Report. And now, Sir, when we did not want a Royal Commission, when we passed a unanimous and united Resolution for a Round Table Conference, the Executive Council did not care to give effect to our wishes in the matter. They did not even represent to Lord Birkenhead, the Secretary of State, that it would be a great insult to India if Indians were excluded from the Commission. They were not prepared to recognise, I admit, the extreme Swarajist opinion in the matter; but they could at least have conceded to the feelings of the Moderates in the country, men who have co-operated with them for the last ten years. The Executive Councillors owed their present position in India's Legislatures to the reformed constitution. The reformed constitution would have been broken up in spite of the support of the Executive Councillors of to-day and their predecessors. The non-co-operation movement could not have been destroyed but for the help of the Moderates. And what did the Executive Council Members do when they had it in their power to represent at least Moderate Indian opinion to His Majesty's Government? They acted like ancient despots, when they let down the friends of their adversity. Sometimes they talk in this House as friends of India, but, as Gibbon said of the Roman Tribunes, talking the language of friends of India, they are walking in the footsteps of despots. That is what they have been doing. They did not represent to Great Britain what we feel, and they do not propose to do so either. Therefore, Sir, it is the duty of the Members of this House to vote for the removal of the Executive Council. In other countries the Executive Council must be responsible to the people. In Great Britain and in the Colonies, after an adverse vote of the Legislature, those gentlemen will not be sitting there. We have defeated them time and again, and it is only the shamelessness of the constitution that enables them to continue to sit on those seats. (Laughter.)

Sir, this is not the opinion only of Indians on this side of the House. I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member to read the opinion of a demi-semi-official newspaper, I mean the *Pioneer*. And what does the *Pioneer* say about the Executive Councillors? Sir, the *Pioneer* was once described by Sir Bhupendra Nath Basu as "a solitary raven on the sand-

banks of the Jumna and the Ganges, croaking". (Laughter.) But those were days when the *Pioneer* was a demi-semi-official organ, and I thought it was a demi-semi-official organ until yesterday, and this is what one of their own friends says about the Executive Councillors whom my friend Diwan Chaman Lall has rightly described as square men in round holes. I mean, Sir, his is a case of intelligent anticipation, a case again of prophetic instinct, for I do not think Diwan Chaman Lall could have written the editorial in the *Pioneer*, but the *Pioneer* has certainly used his anticipated phrase (which he had given as his reason for this cut) when it says "it is a case of square pegs in round holes".

Mr. K. Ahmed: Some of them are very round.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: And then the *Pioneer* goes on to say:

"If they are incapable of accommodating themselves to the rapier thrust and the interplay of opposing blades of a parliamentary assembly, they have no right to be where they are, and no amount of expert knowledge can excuse their failure."

Sir, the parliamentary incompetence of the Executive Councillors has been accepted by the *Pioneer*. Then the *Pioneer* goes on to say:

"If, on the other hand, their attitude is one of benevolent arrogance, they deserve all they get in the way of parliamentary rebuff, and they are criminally culpable for exhibiting a phase of the British regime in India, which all right-minded people would like to see abolished immediately."

Sir, one of the phases is the Executive Council itself, whose constituency is Viceregal Lodge. The *Pioneer* goes on to say:

"The Leader of the House, Sir Basil Blackett, Mr. Mackworth Young and the Commander-in-Chief, . . ."

all Members of the Executive Council, excepting of course Mr. Young, I think, whose name I should take out of it and apologise to him for having mentioned it even by way of a *Pioneer* quotation:

"were all, in various degrees, guilty of bad parliamentary tactics, of a display of arrogance to which their official record of achievement does not entitle them, and of a deplorable want of knowledge of the art of persuading men. Let the facts be carefully considered. On Thursday afternoon Mr. Jinnah, following Sir William Birdwood's announcement of the Government's new Indianisation decisions, gave notice that he would either move the adjournment or a reduction of the estimates on the Commander-in-Chief's statement . . ."

Mr. President: The Honourable Member might lay it on the table.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, suppose I lay the paper on the table, will it appear in the proceedings?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member knows that every Member of the House has read it.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, the portion I am reading are very original. The *Pioneer* is one of those birds that have to be plucked when it suits us. (Laughter.) Anyhow, Sir, as you do not want that I should continue this quotation I will conclude with what the *Pioneer* says in conclusion. Speaking of the Executive Councillors it says that they:

"would do much better and would not get themselves into such hopeless messes as they have done recently if they were to take the trouble, collectively and individually, to attend vacation courses at Westminster studying the methods of parliamentary procedure."

Sir, that is the whole case for the abolition of the Executive Council. Those gentlemen have no business to be Members of this House. They are thoroughly incompetent. They are unfit for self-government or other Government. They make admirable Secretaries. I am sure with my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar or Pandit Motilal Nehru as Leader of the

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

House, in a self-governing India, I am sure the gentlemen who happen to be the Home Member and so on and so forth would be admirable Secretaries. When we, Sir, say we must abolish the Executive Council we do not for a moment say that we should dispense with the services of the Honourable Member, Mr. Crerar. He will make an excellent Secretary; he is no good as an Executive Councillor. By an "Executive Councillor" you mean that he is to execute the will of the people and not to execute the people themselves, not to resort to Regulation III of 1818 which, as we have seen, is no respecter of patrician or plebian, peasant or prince, but be truly respectful by understanding the will of the people and also the aspiration of the people, in one word by trying to get into the skin of the people as it were. It was Kitchener who said that the greatest fault of foreign administrations was their incompetence to get into the skin of the people. If only the Honourable gentlemen over there had imagination, if only the Executive Councillors of this country had imagination, they could have killed the hunger for freedom with the food of self-rule. The people of India, Sir, are a very grateful people

Mr. President: I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I would like him to leave a few minutes for the Government reply.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Oh yes, thank you. I thought, Sir, it was the privilege of non-official Members to reach the guillotine, but I would rather have the official reply before the guillotine falls.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar (Home Member): Mr. President, I am greatly indebted to the Honourable gentleman opposite who has just resumed his seat for giving me a few brief moments at the steps of the guillotine. Had it not been for the speech of Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar I should have felt it incumbent upon me to apologise for, indeed, Sir, I almost felt that I should have had to request your directions as to whether I should be in order in making any observations on the subject of the tour allowances of the Members of the Executive Council. However, I propose to make a very few remarks on that point. I think that one of the allegations which was most prominent in the speeches of the various gentlemen who have spoken to-day has been the allegation that the Executive Council hold themselves unduly remote from the current of men and things, and yet, on a proposition which would permit Members of the Executive Council to do something to place themselves in personal and vivid contact with men and things outside their own office, we are immediately criticised. I think that is a somewhat unreasonable attitude. I can speak myself with a certain detachment in this matter, because during the 12 months in which I have from time to time held office as a Member of the Executive Council, I have so far never yet been able to make a tour at all, and I hope that the House will give me a reasonable opportunity of doing so in the near future. That, however, appears not to be the question which occupies the House now. I cannot indeed in the brief space at my disposal attempt to travel over the wide, and not in all respects attractive landscape which Honourable Members have spread before my gaze and to which they have invited my footsteps. I shall only endeavour to disabuse Mr. Chaman Lal in particular of his views either as to the squareness of the Honourable Members to whom he refers or as to the roundness of the holes which they occupy.

Well, Sir, the attack has been general, not, I think, specifically on the Executive Council as at present constituted, but on the Executive Council as

it exists under the law. I claim that even in the course of the present Session—if Honourable Members are prepared to debate this matter on the basis of evidence—that even during the course of this Session evidence has been brought forward which shows that the Executive Government of this country has been carrying on its duties with a large measure of success. I will mention in the first instance the state of India's public credit. In modern conditions there is perhaps hardly one single index which is more generally accepted and which in point of fact is more truly indicative of the good administration of a country than that country's credit in the markets of the world. That is my first point. My second point also is a financial point. Whatever Honourable Members may say with regard to the Budget, they cannot say that that is the budget of a country which owing to maladministration is suffering from depression, from poverty, and from all the other evils of maladministration. The third point is this. My Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, also presented a budget to the House, the Railway Budget. It has not been seriously contended in the criticisms, some of which for aught I know may be valid, but the majority of which I suspect are not entirely valid,—in none of the criticisms directed against the administration of the Railways has any one seriously contended or been able to contend with any plea of plausibility that the record set forth in that Budget was not a record of prosperous conditions and of a good administration.

Well, Sir, I have merely adduced three or four instances from matters which have been before this House during the present Session. I have not said anything with regard to matters which concern my own department. Indeed I cannot, as I think the House will recognise, in the few minutes at my disposal, it would not be reasonable to expect me to do so, because if serious criticisms are made of the operations of the Home Department I should hope to answer them seriously. I will only claim this, not as regards the Home Department, but with regard to the administration of India generally, that not only do the instances which I have cited afford me good ground for claiming that, with all its faults, with all the inherent difficulties of the case, with all the disabilities under which the Government of India labour and under which India also labours—in spite of those things I maintain that the administration of this country since the conclusion of the war is one on which the Government of India and the Members of the Executive Council and the Governor General have no reason whatever to be ashamed. The years which have elapsed since the War have throughout the world been years of the greatest difficulty and danger to every civilised State, whether they were concerned as combatants or not in that War. Those years, to many of those States, have been fatal; some have approached the abyss of annihilation, and some have even gone beyond it. India also had her own difficulties. If in some respects she suffered less than other States who were combatants in that War, she nevertheless had difficult problems, extremely grave dangers to face during those years. But India has successfully passed, or at any rate has with a large measure of success and with no great degree of disaster, passed through those critical, those perilous years, and am I not entitled to ask that some share of the credit at any rate should be assumed by the public authority which was charged with making most of the public decisions during the course of those years? At any rate, I will claim this that whatever errors may have been made, whatever misfortunes may have been suffered, the course of Indian history

Mr. President: Order, order.

(It being five of the Clock, Mr. President put the question.)

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 80,000."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—58.

Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
Birla, Mr. Ghanshyam Das.
Chaman Lall, Diwan.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Chunder, Mr. Nirmal Chunder.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit N. Iakantha.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Dutta, Mr. Srish Chandra.
Goswami, Mr. T. Q.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.
Kartar Singh, Sardar.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. Dharendra Kanta.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.

NOES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Ahmad, Khan Bahadur Nasir-ud-din.
Alexander, Mr. William.
Allison, Mr. F. W.
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.
Ashrafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur Nawabzada Sayid.
Ayangar, Mr. V. K. Aravamudha.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bhuto, Mr. W. W. Illahibakhsh.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Bray, Sir Denys.
Chatterjee, Revd. J. C.
Chatterji, Rai Bahadur B. M.
Coatman, Mr. J.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
Couper, Mr. T.
Courtenay, Mr. R. H.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Crerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
Dakhan, Mr. W. M. P. Ghulam Kadir Khan.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Gidney, Lieut. Colonel H. A. J.
Graham, Mr. L.
Hussain Shah, Sayyed.
Irwin, Mr. C. J.

The motion was adopted.

Mitra, Mr. Satyendra Chandra.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi Sayyid.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Phookun, Srijiut Tarun Ram.
Prakasam, Mr. T.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rang Behari Lal Lala.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
Sarda, Rai Sahib Harbilas.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Shervani, Mr. T. A. K.
Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
Singh, Kumar Rananjaya.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Sinha, Mr. R. P.
Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar.
Tok Kyi, U.
Yusuf Imam, Mr.

Jawahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar.
Kabul Singh Bahadur, Captain.
Keane, Mr. M.
Kikabhai Premchand, Mr.
Lamb, Mr. W. S.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rao, Mr. V. Pandurang.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Roy, Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan.
Sams, Mr. H. A.
Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
Shamaldhari Lall, Mr.
Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Sykes, Mr. F. F.
Taylor, Mr. F. Gawan.
Willson, Sir Walter.
Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Young, Mr. G. M.

(At this stage Maulvi Muhammad Yakub moved from his seat.)

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must resume his seat. (The Honourable Member did so.)

The question is :

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Re. 1 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 18.—SALT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 19.—OPIUM.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Opium'."

The motion was adopted.

(At this stage some Honourable Members on the Congress Party Benches tried to leave the Assembly.)

Mr. President: Honourable Members should not rise when the Chair is putting questions.

(The Honourable Members resumed their seats.)

DEMAND No. 20.—STAMPS.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 21.—FOREST.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Forest'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 22.—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.

Mr. President: The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,61,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 23.—INDIAN POSTAL AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES.)

Mr. President: The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,88,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the ‘Indian Postal and Telegraph Department (including Working Expenses)’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 24.—INDO-EUROPEAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES.)

Mr. President: The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the ‘Indo-European Telegraph Department (including Working Expenses)’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 25.—INTEREST ON DEBT AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

Mr. President: The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,05,87,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Interest on Ordinary Debt, and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 26.—INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. President: The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,85,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 27.—STAFF, HOUSEHOLD AND ALLOWANCES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,81,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 29.—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,87,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Legislative Bodies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 30.—FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,08,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Foreign and Political Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 31.—HOME DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 32.—PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,17,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Public Service Commission'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 33.—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 34.—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,97,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 35.—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 36.—SEPARATION OF ACCOUNTS FROM AUDIT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Separation of Accounts from Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 37.—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 39.—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,76,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 41.—PAYMENTS TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,28,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency subjects'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 42.—AUDIT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 85,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 43.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 44.—POLICE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,77,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 45.—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 46.—SURVEY OF INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 31,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 47.—METEOROLOGY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 48.—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 49.—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50.—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,76,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 51.—ARCHÆOLOGY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,64,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 52.—MINES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,71,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53.—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 54.—EDUCATION.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 55.—MEDICAL SERVICES.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,08,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 56.—PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,92,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 57.—AGRICULTURE.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,28,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 58.—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,66,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 59.—INDUSTRIES.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 60.—AVIATION.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 61.—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1929, in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 62.—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 63.—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,66,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 64.—JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Joint Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 65.—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 66.—INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 67.—CURRENCY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 45,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Currency'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 68.—MINT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,65,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 69.—CIVIL WORKS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,63,64,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 70.—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 71.—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,78,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 73.—REFUNDS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 65,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Refunds'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 75.—BALUCHISTAN.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76.—DELHI.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 40,16,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 77.—AJMER-MERWARA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,54,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 78.—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 42,92,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Andamans and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 79.—RAJPUTANA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Rajputana'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 80.—CENTRAL INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Central India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 81.—HYDERABAD.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,92,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Hyderabad'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 83.—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND—HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India'."

The motion was adopted.

Expenditure charged to Capital.

DEMAND No. 84.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SECURITY PRINTING.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Security Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 85.—FOREST CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Forest Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 86.—IRRIGATION.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,74,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Irrigation'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 87.—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 69,87,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Indian Posts and Telegraphs’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 88.—INDO-EUROPEAN TELEGRAPHS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Indo-European Telegraphs’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 89.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CURRENCY NOTE PRINTING PRESS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay on Currency Note Printing Press’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 90.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 47,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 91.—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of ‘Commutated Value of Pensions’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 92.—NEW CAPITAL AT DELHI.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,38,39,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the ‘New Capital at Delhi’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 93.—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 93,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Interest-free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 94.—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,00,43,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Loans and Advances bearing Interest'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 16th March, 1928.