

20th March 1929

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume III

21st March to 12th April, 1929

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1929



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1929

CONTENTS—concl'd.

Saturday, 16th March, 1929—

	PAGE.
Short Notice Question and Answer	1985
The Trade Disputes Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1986
The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1986-87
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Motion to re- circulate, as reported by the Select Committee, adopted	1987-88
The Presidency-towns Insolvency (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1988
Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways— Inspection	1989-95
Working Expenses—Administration	1989
Repairs and Maintenance and Operation	1989
Appropriation to the Depreciation Fund	1989
Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund	1989-91
Strategic Lines—Working Expenses and Miscellaneous	1991-92
Commercial Lines—New Construction	1992-94
Open Line Works	1994
Strategic Lines—New Construction and Open Line Works	1994
Appendix III	1995-97

Monday, 18th March, 1929—

Questions and Answers	1999-2020
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2020-37
Statement laid on the Table—Rules regarding the grant of scholarships to Indians for training in Civil Aviation	2037-43
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to con- sider adjourned	2044-86

Tuesday, 19th March, 1929—

Questions and Answers	2067-98
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to con- sider adjourned	2099-2149

Wednesday, 20th March, 1929—

Questions and Answers	2151-61
Short Notice Question and Answer	2161-64
Message from the Council of State	2164
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to con- sider adjourned	2165-2264

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 20th March, 1929.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PETITION OF USHA BALA DEBI IN CONNECTION WITH THE DISMISSAL OF HER HUSBAND, AN EMPLOYEE OF THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

1151. *Mr. D. V. Belvi: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if their attention has been drawn to the petition, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Department concerned, and addressed to the Honourable Members, Legislative Assembly, submitted by an Indian lady named Usha Bala Debi of Barisal, dated the 10th December, 1928, and which dealt with the question of the wrongful dismissal of the husband of the petitioner from the Posts and Telegraphs Department?

(b) If so, are the allegations in the petition true?

(c) Is it a fact that the petition of appeal of the lady's husband to the Secretary of State for India was withheld by the Government of India?

(d) If so, on what grounds?

(e) What were the circumstances under which the lady's husband was dismissed?

(f) For how many years had he served Government and what was his monthly salary at the date of the dismissal?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Yes.

(b) Many of the statements relate to matters with which the Government are not concerned. So far as they relate to me personally, they are wholly untrue. The main allegation, that the dismissal of Babu Janardan Chakraverty was due to an improper motive, is false.

(c) Yes.

(d) Two appeals to the Secretary of State were withheld; one as being time-barred (it might also have been withheld on other grounds); the other as being time-barred, improperly or disrespectfully expressed, and also as being an appeal which having regard to the status of the appellant it was open to the Government of India to withhold.

(e) The services of the official were dispensed with by the Postmaster-General, Bengal and Assam, on the establishment, as the result of a departmental inquiry of charges of breach of trust and cheating.

(f) Four years and a half. Rs. 70.

COST OF TICKET PUNCH SUPPLIED TO CREWMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1152. ***Maulvi Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Is it a fact that a costly nipper and ticket collecting punch has been ordered recently by the East Indian Railway?

(b) How many such nippers have been indented for and what is the price of each of them?

(c) Where have they been indented from? Is it a fact that such nippers are obtainable in India?

(d) Is it a fact that the cost of each nipper, with tubes for collection, is more than one and half times the pay of each crew-man?

(e) Is it a fact that the nipper cannot be put into the pocket nor can it be easily suspended from the belt?

(f) Is it possible to ensure cent. per cent. collection of tickets for roadside stations having a stoppage of two or three minutes?

(g) Is non-collection of the token left with the passenger an attempt to commit fraud?

(h) What arrangement has been made for refund on tokens surrendered below destination?

(i) Do Government propose to make suitable arrangements for collection at gates by raising the strength of the ticket collecting staff at stations?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The information is being obtained and will be communicated to the Honourable Member on receipt.

POLICY REGARDING THE ADMISSION OF FOREIGN SALT TO ALL PARTS OF INDIA.

1153. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Is it a fact that salt manufactured in Kathiawar is absolutely prohibited from entering British India, except in Bengal and Burma, while salt manufactured in foreign countries is allowed to enter in all parts of British India? Will Government be pleased to make a statement of their policy in this connection; and also indicate whether they are willing to re-examine their position and revise their policy?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The answer to the first part of the question is, broadly speaking, in the affirmative; but it should be understood that the prohibition so-called is the effect of treaties and engagements with the rulers of the Kathiawar States. With regard to the remark that salt manufactured in foreign countries is allowed to enter in all parts of British India, I would inform the Honourable Member that, though this statement is literally true, there is only a negligible amount of foreign salt consumed in those areas to which the market for Kathiawar salt would be limited by transportation costs, to wit, Northern Bombay, the Central Provinces and part of the United Provinces. Ordinary foreign salt has, owing to cost, no chance of competing in those markets with salt made at British Indian sources, and the only imports from overseas at Bombay consist of table salt and salt that has been used in packing.

and amount to about 5,000 maunds a year. As regards the second part of the question, I regret that I am precluded from supplying any further information, as the matter is one concerning the relations of the Government of India with Indian States, which they must accordingly treat as confidential. When I am in a position to make a clearer statement on the subject, I shall take the first opportunity of doing so.

PROVISION OF UNORTHODOX QUARTERS IN SIMLA FOR INDIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1154. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that even those Indians who are accustomed to live in an unorthodox style are not allowed to live in unorthodox quarters in Simla? Do Government propose to consider the question of removing this distinction?

(b) Is it a fact that the Indian Assistant Secretaries, etc., are eligible to occupy unorthodox quarters irrespective of the fact whether they are living in orthodox or unorthodox style? If so, are Government prepared to grant a similar concession to the assistants and clerks of the Government of India?

(c) Did Government receive any application from the clerks of the Government of India for unorthodox accommodation in Simla, and if so, what reply was given to the applicants?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) The Indian clerks' quarters in Simla cannot be classed as either orthodox or unorthodox; they are suitable for use by both classes.

(b) Assistant Secretaries are eligible for officers' houses, the design of which is, as a rule, suitable only for those living in unorthodox style.

(c) No such application can be traced.

PROVISION OF UNORTHODOX QUARTERS IN DELHI FOR JUNIOR INDIAN CLERKS.

1155. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that Indians who are in receipt of a salary of less than Rs. 225, although they are accustomed to an unorthodox mode of living, are not allotted unorthodox quarters in New and Old Delhi? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that Anglo-Indians, although in receipt of salary of Rs. 150 and below, are given preference over Indians accustomed to an unorthodox mode of living? If so, why is this distinction made?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) and (b). No, Sir.

ANOMALIES IN THE REVISED RULES FOR THE ALLOTMENT OF QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

1156. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that there are many anomalies existing in the revised rules regarding the allotment and conditions of occupation of quarters in New Delhi, although these rules claim to be statutory rules. If so, what steps have been taken to remove those anomalies?

(b) Is it a fact that Indians, certified by the Heads of Departments to be living in an unorthodox style, were turned out of such quarters owing to certain anomalies in the revised rules regarding the occupation of clerks' quarters at New Delhi, although some of them were occupying those quarters for the last two or three years?

(c) If the answer to part (b) is in the affirmative, do Government propose to give compensation to such clerks?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) No.

(b) Certain clerks had to vacate unorthodox quarters under the rule which provides that a clerk who has previously occupied an orthodox quarter cannot hold a lien on an unorthodox one. No anomaly is involved.

(c) Does not arise.

QUANTITY OF BEEF IMPORTED FOR THE ARMY DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

1157. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of beef they have imported from other countries for military food yearly during the last five years?

Mr. G. M. Young: No fresh beef has been imported. Approximately 56 tons of tinned beef were imported during the year 1924-25, 85 tons during 1925-26, 57 tons during 1926-27, 116 tons during 1927-28 and 47 tons during 1928-29.

QUANTITIES OF DRIED MEAT, HIDES, AND BLOOD CARRIED BY INDIAN RAILWAYS DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

1158. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of the following articles carried yearly from one place to another during the last five years by Indian Railways:—

- (i) dried meat,
- (ii) hides, and
- (iii) blood?

Mr. F. E. Rau: I regret the information asked for is not in the possession of Government.

QUANTITIES OF BONES, AMMONIA, ETC., EXPORTED FROM INDIA DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

1159. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of the following articles exported yearly from India during the last five years:—

- (i) bones,
- (ii) ammonia in different forms,
- (iii) other articles that are used for manures, and
- (iv) articles of fodder such as oil cakes, etc.?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: The Honourable Member is referred to the "Annual Statement of the Sea-Borne Trade of British India", a copy of which is in the Library.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: May I know, Sir, whether the Government of India sent any memorandum to the Royal Commission on Agriculture to the effect that no export duty should be levied on manures that are exported from this country?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I don't think, Sir, that that arises from my answer which is purely a question of figures.

REDUCTION IN THE ENGINEERING ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DELHI.

1160. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Is it intended that the establishment of the Executive and Assistant Engineers in New Delhi will be considerably reduced on completion of the construction work of New Delhi?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The question of the establishment required for the public works in New Delhi after the completion of the New Capital is at present under the consideration of Government.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF EACH COMMUNITY EMPLOYED AS ENGINEERS IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, DELHI.

1161. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of Executive and Assistant Engineers, including temporary Assistant Engineers, on the roll of the Delhi Public Works Department, showing separately the communities to which they belong?

(b) Is it a fact that an Executive Engineer was taken on deputation from a Local Government in or about the beginning of the current financial year? If so, to what community did he belong?

(c) Was that community represented in that service in excess of the authorised proportion laid down by the Government of India? If so, what were the reasons for his employment?

(d) Are Government aware that there is a great discontent prevailing in the community not proportionately represented in the aforesaid service?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) 7 Executive Engineers, including 3 Sikhs, 2 Muslims, 1 Hindu and 1 Christian. 7 Assistant Engineers, including 1 Sikh, 3 Hindus and 3 Christians.

(b) Yes. Muslim.

(c) No definite proportion is prescribed.

(d) Government have no information.

ABOLITION OF THE WESTERN CIRCLE OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

1162. ***Mr. Muhammad Ismail Khan:** (a) With reference to the reply given in the last Assembly to Mr. N. M. Joshi regarding abolition of the Railway Mail Service, Western Circle, will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the abolition of the Railway Mail Service, Western Circle, was a result of the Ryan Committee Report, wherein it was stated that the abolition of the Railway Mail Service will result in net savings of Rs. 81,260 annually?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing what savings have been effected by the abolition of the Western Circle?

(c) Is it a fact that, instead of savings, there has been an increase in expenditure due to clerks being transferred from Poona to Bombay and Madras on a higher scale of pay?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) No. As already stated by the Honourable Mr. McWatters in reply to the question referred to, the re-organisation was based on administrative rather than financial reasons. The figures quoted in the Posts and Telegraphs Committee's Report were only a tentative forecast of the ultimate possible saving as a result of the abolition of all the R. M. S. Circles.

(b) The abolition of the R. M. S. Western Circle is only a part of the general scheme, and it is not possible at present to say definitely what savings will accrue from each item of the scheme considered separately.

(c) There has been some increase in expenditure due to the causes mentioned by the Honourable Member, but Government are not yet in a position to say whether this will not be more than counterbalanced by economies in other directions which will ultimately result by the adoption of the scheme.

**EXPENDITURE INCURRED FOR BONUSES AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES
IN CONNECTION WITH THE ABOLITION OF THE WESTERN AND EASTERN
CIRCLES OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.**

1168. ***Mr. Muhammad Ismail Khan:** (a) Will Government state the amount which has been spent in connection with the abolition of the Western and Eastern Circles of the Railway Mail Service in the shape of bonuses and travelling allowances in connection with the transfer of officers and clerks to Bombay, Madras and Nagpur, and from Calcutta to Patna and Lucknow?

(b) Will Government state the approximate cost of the abolition of the Northern Circle in connection with bonuses to clerks and travelling allowances to officers and clerks to Lahore, Lucknow and Karachi?

(c) Is it a fact that clerks of the Northern Circle, on their transfer to Lahore, Lucknow and Karachi, will get increments on account of going to a higher scale of pay? If the reply is in the affirmative, will Government state the annual expenditure that will be incurred on this account?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Separate information in respect of officers and clerks only is not available, but will be collected and furnished to the Honourable Member in due course.

(b) The approximate cost on account of bonus and travelling allowance amounts to Rs. 4,700 and Rs. 4,170, respectively.

(c) It is a fact that rule 22 of the Fundamental Rules, under which the pay of these clerks, when brought on to the higher scale, will be fixed, will give them some increase of pay, the approximate annual cost of which will be Rs. 2,840.

REMOVAL TO KARACHI OF THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE "K" DIVISION OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

1164. ***Mr. Muhammad Ismail Khan:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is under contemplation to shift the Railway Mail Service, "K" Division headquarters to Karachi? Will Government please state what extra expenditure this proposal will involve?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative.

As regards the second part of the question, it is not possible, at present, to say what, if any, extra expenditure will result from the change.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Will not Sukkur be more convenient and economical than Karachi, as it is in the centre, and will it not be less costly?

Mr. H. A. Sams: No. My information is that Karachi will be more convenient.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: And also economical?

Mr. H. A. Sams: So far as economy is concerned, we cannot say at present until the whole scheme is worked out.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Will Government enquire into the comparative economy of the two places, and if they find that Sukkur is more economical, will they substitute Sukkur for Karachi?

Mr. H. A. Sams: I will make an enquiry, but I cannot undertake to substitute Sukkur for Karachi.

TRANSFER TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE OF CERTAIN POSTAL DIVISIONS.

1165. ***Mr. Muhammad Ismail Khan:** (a) Is it a fact that, in 1903 and 1904, the whole of the Railway Mail Service of Sind, Baluchistan, and the Punjab was under one officer, who was then the Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, Punjab Division?

(b) Is it also a fact that the Railway Mail Service, "M" Division, was placed under the Postmaster-General, Madras, in 1920 and that both these divisions were again placed under the control of the Deputy Postmasters-General, Railway Mail Service, Northern and Western Circles?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons why these divisions were again transferred to the jurisdiction of the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Yes. The Superintendent, Punjab Railway Mail Service Division, was then under the control of the Postmaster-General, Punjab.

(b) Yes, the Railway Mail Service, "M" Division, was placed under the Postmaster-General, Madras, in 1920 as an experimental measure, and both this and the Punjab Division referred to in part (a) of this question were transferred to the jurisdiction of the Railway Mail Service in 1921 and 1907, respectively.

(c) The Punjab Division Railway Mail Service was transferred to the Inspector General, Sorting, Northern Circle, on the creation of that post in 1907 on the re-organisation of the Railway Mail Service in four Circles, each under an Inspector General, Sorting, as a consequence of the policy of placing all Railway Mail Service work in India under these officers. The Railway Mail Service, "M" Division was retransferred to the Deputy Postmaster-General, Western Circle, in 1921, on the expiry of the experimental period (for which it had been placed under the Postmaster-General, Madras), in the interests of homogeneity and co-ordination, as it was not considered administratively advisable to have a single Division of the Railway Mail Service organised and controlled on different lines from all other Railway Mail Service Divisions in India.

SUB-LETTING OF CONTRACTS BY REGIMENTAL CANTEEN CONTRACTORS.

1166. ***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the sub-letting of his contract by a regimental canteen contractor is permissible either in part or in entirety to sub-contractors with or without the knowledge or sanction of the Officer Commanding a regiment?

(b) Are Government aware that such sub-letting of contracts is rife on a very large scale in the British troops of His Majesty's Forces—the Army circulars on the subject notwithstanding?

(c) Are Government aware that more than one contractor holds contracts for more than one regiment, in fact, in certain cases a contractor holds contracts of as many as six to eight regiments?

(d) Are Government aware that, although the authorised rate of rebate is Rs. 3-4-0 per head, a number of contractors are charging as much as Rs. 4 to Rs. 9 per head in proportion to the number of branches sub-let, such as wet canteen, supper-bar, bakery, tea, etc.?

(e) Are Government aware that there are cases in which the contractors have received as much as Rs. 25,000 on account of advance, in a lump sum, on account of rebate for branches of the contract sub-let?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) No, Sir. It has never been the intention of Government to permit sub-letting, but before September, 1928, the regulations on the subject could be interpreted to mean that sub-letting was permissible under certain conditions. The rules have since been made clear, and the intention has been explained to all Commanding Officers.

(b) Certain complaints of sub-letting have been received, but, with two exceptions, they referred to periods before September, 1928. One of the exceptions is under investigation, and the other was rectified in December, 1928.

(c) Government are aware that some contractors hold contracts for more than one unit, but this does not imply that they sub-let their contracts.

(d) There is no standard rate of rebate. The rate is arranged mutually between contracting parties, with the approval of the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief.

(e) The answer is in the negative.

SUB-LETTING OF CONTRACTS BY REGIMENTAL CANTEN CONTRACTORS.

1167. *Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: (a) Are Government aware that, a short while ago, in a Cantonment (Ambala) a sub-contractor memorialised the Officer Commanding to the effect that the contractor had taken on another sub-tenant on payment of a large amount of rebate, and had refused to refund the balance of advance still due to the ex-sub-tenant?

(b) Are Government aware that this sub-tenant had his case represented to the Commanding Officer concerned through a British ex-officer, and that the Commanding Officer informed the aggrieved party that, in this particular case, "sub-letting was provided for in the original agreement made with the contractor by his predecessor, and he was therefore helpless in the matter"?

(c) Have Government ever had an inquiry to investigate into this state of affairs?

(d) Do Government now intend to inquire into this matter with a view to put it on a satisfactory footing in future?

Mr. G. M. Young: Government have no information about the particular case to which the Honourable Member refers, nor, in view of the very clear instructions on the subject that have recently been issued to all Commanding Officers, do they consider that any general inquiry is necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE McALPIN COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO REVISE THE SALARIES OF THE STAFF OF THE BENGAL SECRETARIAT AND THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

1168. *Mr. N. C. Ohunder: (a) Are Government aware that a Committee was appointed by the Government of Bengal in 1921 to revise the salaries of the Bengal Secretariat staff?

(b) Was the said Committee also asked to report on the revision of the salaries of the staff of the Calcutta High Court?

(c) Is it a fact that the said Committee recommended, having regard to the then existing economic conditions, an increment of 60 per cent. in respect of the pay of the staff of the Bengal Secretariat and other offices, and an increment of 12½ per cent. only in the case of the staff of the Calcutta High Court?

(d) If so, will Government be pleased to state the reason for this differential treatment?

(e) Will Government be also pleased to state for what special reasons the Government of India sanctioned for the Calcutta High Court staff an increment of 12½ per cent. only, although in the Bengal Secretariat and other offices a 60 per cent. increase was given?

(f) Is it not a fact that the same rates of pay existed for the Calcutta High Court staff as for the Bengal Secretariat staff before 1919?

(g) Is it a fact that the Calcutta High Court strongly protested against the recommendations of the McAlpin Committee, so far as they related to the staff of that Court?

(h) If so, will Government state what and why any particular action was taken by the Government of India in the matter?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 1168 to 1173 together. The information asked for is being collected and will be furnished to the Honourable Member when ready.

RESOLUTION OF THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF McALPIN COMMITTEE.

†1169. ***Mr. N. C. Chunder:** (a) Are Government aware that a Resolution was passed by the Bengal Legislative Council at its sitting of the 6th September, 1921, recommending to Government the grant to the High Court ministerial staff of the same standard of pay and status as that suggested by the McAlpin Committee for the Bengal Secretariat?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether a copy of the Resolution, with the views of the Government of Bengal thereon, was duly forwarded to the Government of India?

(c) If so, will they be pleased to state what action was taken by the Government of India in the matter?

(d) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the correspondence (if any) that has passed between the Government of Bengal and the Government of India on the subject of the revision of the pay of the ministerial staff of the Calcutta High Court arising out of the recommendations of the said Committee or otherwise between the years 1921 and 1928?

PAY OF THE STAFF OF THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

†1170. ***Mr. N. C. Chunder:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the pay of the staff of certain offices under the administrative control of the Government of India, located in Calcutta, was revised during the last six years with the result that the staff of those offices enjoy a much better scale of pay than that of the staff of the High Court, Calcutta?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what principle was followed by Government in putting the staff of those offices under the Government of India on a better scale of pay than that of the High Court staff?

(c) Will Government be pleased also to state why the same principle could not be followed in the case of the staff of the Calcutta High Court?

PAY OF THE MINISTERIAL STAFF OF THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

†1171. ***Mr. N. C. Chunder:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the High Court has recently submitted proposals to the Government of India for bettering the prospects of the ministerial staff of the High Court?

(b) If so, what orders have been passed by the Government of India in the matter?

(c) If no orders have yet been passed by the Government of India, will Government be pleased to state at what stage the matter is at present and when the orders of Government are likely to be passed?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1168.

PROPORTION OF HIGHER TO LOWER GRADE POSTS IN THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

†1172. ***Mr. N. C. Ohunder:** (a) Is it a fact that the Calcutta High Court recommended in March, 1920, the following proportion of higher grade posts to the lower grade posts?

	Higher grade.	Lower grade.
Judicial Department	26	70
English Office	16	27

(b) Is it a fact that the proportion of the higher grade posts to the lower grade posts was reduced as follows in 1928?

	Higher grade.	Lower grade.
Judicial Department	10	86
English Office	11	34

PAY OF THE MINISTERIAL STAFF OF THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

†1173. ***Mr. N. C. Ohunder:** (a) Are Government aware that the High Court Retrenchment Committee, appointed in 1928, recommended a reduction in the pay of the ministerial staff on the Appellate Side of the Calcutta High Court, and thus deprived them of the benefits offered by the McAlpin Committee in 1922?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether such recommendation was covered by the terms of reference of the said Committee?

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

PURCHASE BY GOVERNMENT OF THE TANJORE DISTRICT BOARD RAILWAY.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: With your permission, Sir, I beg to put the following short notice question. Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have taken any and, if so, what steps for buying over the lines of the Tanjore District Board; and
- (b) whether they have made any and, if so, what provision in the budget for the coming year for the purpose, and whether they will afford the Board and the people of the district sufficient time and opportunity to consider the terms and conditions as now proposed, and not fix a time limit before the end of the present year?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) It has been arranged that the ownership of the Tanjore District Board Railway will be transferred to the Government of India with effect from the 1st April, 1929, on certain conditions which have been agreed to by the District Board. I am sending the Honourable Member a copy of the correspondence with the Government of Madras, which states the position in detail, and am also laying a copy on the table of the House.

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1168.

(b) No provision has been made in the budget for 1929-30 on this account. No cash transaction is involved, and the arrangement merely means an adjustment in the accounts of the undertaking. Government have had no information as to the terms in which the Government of Madras have communicated their orders to the Tanjore District Board, but so far as they are aware, there is no question of a time limit. Since in the terms of the present arrangements are included all the conditions on which the Tanjore District Board agreed to part with the Railway, there does not seem to be any necessity for further consideration of principle, but if the Tanjore District Board wish to make any particular suggestions as to the detailed arrangements, they will be fully considered by Government, even if they are received after the beginning of the next financial year, from which the transfer is to take effect.

No. 2933-Ry.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS AND LABOUR DEPARTMENT.

From

C. A. SOUTER, Esq., I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Government of Madras.

To

The Secretary,
Railway Board,
New Delhi.

Dated Fort St. George, the 22nd November 1928.

Tanjore District Board Railway—Merging of the District Board Capital in that of the South Indian Railway Undertaking.

SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. 384-Ry., dated the 22nd February, 1927, I am directed to forward a copy of letter No. R. C. 3267/D. B. of 24, dated the 4th October, 1926, from the President, District Board, Tanjore, together with the District Board's resolution expressing its willingness to part with its Railway subject to certain conditions.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd.

for Secretary to Government.

From the President, District Board, Tanjore, No. R. C. 3267/D.B. of 1924, dated 4th October, 1928.

In continuation of my letter R. C. No. 3267 D. B. of 1924, dated the 31st January, 1927, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the District Board's Resolution

No. IV-12, dated the 29th September 1928, expressing the Board's willingness to part with its Railway on the following conditions :

- (1) that the capital expenditure on the Railway be brought into the account of the South Indian Railway Company undertaking as capital of the District Board, and be ranked equally with the Secretary of State's capital and the South Indian Railway Company's ordinary capital for the purpose of dividends, with the guarantee of a minimum dividend of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum,
- (2) that the Tirutturaipundi-Agastiampalli line be extended as far as Point Calimere,
- (3) that none of the existing stations on the Railway be closed without the consent of the District Board, and
- (4) that the stations the opening of which has so far been sanctioned by the District Board be opened as early as possible.

The main reason which has ultimately prevailed with the District Board in getting over its objection to the handing over of the Railway to the Government is its anxiety to see the Railway extended to the South from Arantangi to Manamadura which while opening up that portion of the country, will also serve as an additional chord line. It is, therefore, urged that the Government will be pleased to immediately take up the work of extension from Vedarauinion to Point Calimere and from Arantangi to Manamadura.

Extract of the proceedings of the Tanjore District Board passed at its meeting held on Saturday, the 29th September, 1928.

PRESENT.

M. R. Ry. Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannir Salvan Avl., Bar.-at-law, President, Dt. Board, Tanjore and others.

IV-12. Correspondence ending with this office letter No. R. C. 3267 D. B. of 1924, dated 31st January 1927, forwarding to Government a copy of the District Board's Resolution No. VII-1, dated the 29th January, 1927, resolving that the Board might adhere to its original view that it would be in the interests neither of the public nor of the Board for the Government to take away the Mayavaram-Arantangi line from the ownership of the Board and that if the Government should persist in their view that the Mayavaram-Arantangi line should be taken over on the score of that line having to be converted into a main line, the railway line might be handed over on certain conditions.

Proposed by Mr. N. R. Saniappa Mudaliar that the Board is agreeable to parting with its Railway on the following conditions :

- (1) that the capital expenditure on the Railway be brought into the account of the South Indian Railway Company undertaking as capital of the District Board and should rank equally with the Secretary of State's capital and the South Indian Railway Company's ordinary capital for the purpose of dividends (i.e.) the District Board will receive on its capital an annual return at the same rate as the annual return which the South Indian Railway Company receives from its ordinary capital with the guarantee of a minimum dividend of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum,
- (2) that the Tirutturaipundi-Agastiampalli line is extended as far as Point Calimere,
- (3) that none of the existing stations on the Railway are closed without the consent of the District Board, and
- (4) that the stations the opening of which has so far been sanctioned by the District Board are opened as early as possible.

Seconded by Mr. S. Subramania Ayyar.

Resolution—Carried.

No. 2671-F.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.
(RAILWAY BOARD.)

Dated New Delhi, the 4th February 1929.

To
The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works and Labour Department.
Transfer of ownership of Tanjore District Board Railway to the Government of India.
SIR,

I am directed to reply to your letter No. 2933-Railway, dated the 22nd November, 1928, communicating the resolution of the District Board of Tanjore expressing its willingness to part with its Railway subject to four conditions, of which the last three relate to certain minor points which were not included in the offer made by the Government of India to the District Board.

2. The Government of India have no objection to these conditions, and I am directed to convey sanction to the transfer of the ownership of the Tanjore District Board Railway to the Government of India, with effect from the 1st April 1929, on the following conditions:—

- (i) The capital expenditure on the railway on the 1st April, 1929, will be brought into the accounts of the South Indian Railway undertaking as capital of the District Board, ranking equally with the Secretary of State's capital and the South Indian Railway Company's ordinary capital for the purposes of dividends; the District Board will receive on its capital the return which the South Indian Railway receives on its ordinary capital, with the guarantee of a minimum dividend of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum.
- (ii) The District Board will not part with its interest or any portion of its interest in the South Indian Railway line except to the Government of India. The District Board will be under no obligation to sell its interest in the line at any time, nor will the Government of India be under any obligation to buy it; but if they mutually agree to a transfer of the interest in the line to the Government of India, the terms of the transfer will ordinarily be based on the average return received during the three preceding years by the District Board on its capital, as contrasted with the rate at which the Government of India is borrowing at the time of purchase. For example, if the average return to the District Board had been 7 per cent., and the Government of India rate of borrowing 5 per cent. the purchase price will be the equivalent of $1\frac{2}{5}$ ths of the capital of the District Board.

Instructions have been issued for the carrying out of the adjustment in accounts consequent on the transfer, and for the payment, in due course, of the dividends due to the District Board.

3. The Government of India are addressing the Agent, South Indian Railway, on the question of the extension of the Tirutturaipundi-Agaetiampali line to Point Calimere and are instructing him to pay due attention to the wishes of the District Board with regard to the other two matters, namely, that none of the existing stations on the railway are closed without the consent of the District Board, and that the stations, the opening of which has so far been sanctioned by the District Board, are opened as early as possible.

4. In view of the fact that the District Board have not said anything about the funds spent by them on the Mayavaram-Tranquebar Railway, it is presumed that they desire that the amount should be returned to them with interest thereon. I am to request that the Government of India may be informed at an early date whether this presumption is correct.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

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

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State have, at their meeting held on the 19th March, 1929, agreed, without any amendments, to the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1894, for certain purposes which was passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 6th March, 1929."

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—contd.

Mr. President: The House will now resume further discussion on the motion that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, yesterday I was stating that, even if you left out of consideration the larger political issue, it was impossible for any self-respecting elected Member to support the consideration of the Finance Bill, and I wish to show that from the Honourable the Home Member down to the Foreign Secretary, every Department has worked in defiance of public opinion, and therefore deserves no funds. I forgot to include the Secretary of State for India, but as the time is short, I will include him in the consideration of the Honourable the Home Member's Department, and deal with both of them together, because I think it will be admitted that, so far as the Secretary of State for India is concerned, the Honourable the Home Member is more near to him than any other Department of the Government. Three questions arise, even if we casually consider the Secretary of State and the Honourable the Home Member, namely, firstly whether freedom is broadening from precedent to precedent in this country, secondly, whether the personal liberty of the subject is at all secure, and thirdly, whether Government are doing all they can to promote the general political advancement of the people of this country, and the answer to all these three questions will unfortunately be in the negative. Freedom is not advancing in this country. The personal liberty of the subject is still dubious and, as regards the political advancement of the people generally, the Government are doing all they can to retard it, instead of advancing it. Take the question of the liberty of the subject first. Is the personal liberty of the subject absolute? Can anybody in this country feel secure that he will not be clapped into jail without being given an opportunity of defending himself? Sir, personal liberty, this elementary right of every citizen in a civilized Government, still remains to be established and placed beyond doubt. Today every one of the 88 crores of people in this country has his liberty in the hollow of the hand of the Honourable the Home Member and the Secretary of State for India. No person is safe. From Mahatma Gandhi, downwards to the humblest individual like myself, no individual in this country can say, here is a government under which I shall not be taken into custody without being prosecuted. This elementary right which every civilised government ought to have as the foundation of its government is wanting in this country, and far from that right becoming more established every day, this week or next week, one more fetter is to be forged for limiting that right or such of it as exists, or to make the fetters more fierce and more definite. The question of the detenus is almost now an eternal question. Our countrymen in Bengal are more unfortunate than other provinces and the arrest and custody of individuals, without showing any reason, without bringing them to an open trial has ceased to arrest any attention.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): They are no longer in detention.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: My friend, you know little. I will tell you there are many still, and if you agree with me I hope you will vote with me.

Mr. K. Ahmed: No.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Now, in order that my Honourable friend Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed may not be under any doubt, I shall quote from a reply which the Honourable the Home Member himself has given to a question put by my Honourable friend Mr. S. C. Mitra regarding persons detained under Regulation III of 1818.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What is the date?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is the 18th March 1929. It is not only up-to-date, but almost up to the second. Here is the reply, given by the Honourable the Home Member to a question put by my Honourable friend Mr. Mitra:

"I lay on the table a statement giving the names and dates of arrest of the persons referred to in the Honourable Member's question. I regret I cannot undertake to give information about the places of detention."

Then, Sir, follows a list in that statement supplied only day before yesterday, and I find that the number of the people who have been deprived of their personal liberty without any trial is 48.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Very small.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It is not one or two

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar (Home Member): May I point out that the great majority of these come under a special category? They are Afghan refugees, whose temporary detention is due to special circumstances.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The question is whether there has been any detention of any subject without trial. What is this plea of special circumstances? When you deprive a person of his liberty without bringing him before a court of law, what difference does it make that you call that action special in one case and not special in another. What is the difference?

Mr. K. Ahmed: It has nothing to do with Bengal.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It has got to do with Bengal. The number of people who have been detained without arrest or trial is, as I said, 48 and some of them have been detained for nearly ten years, and even more. Now, here are three names. One is Santa Singh, another is Gajjan Singh and the third is Dasaunda Singh.

Mr. K. Ahmed: They are not Bengalis.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I am not concerned with Bengal alone. I am for the liberty of the humblest citizen in every nook and corner of this country, including the liberty of Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed. Then, Sir, so far as the Indian States are concerned, the ex-Maharaja Ram Singh of Bharatpur has been under detention since the 24th November 1908, that is 26 years,—a whole generation. (*Cries of "Shame."*) Then Chinga Khamta Sana Chauba Singh of Manipur has been under detention for 11 years. Then Ripudaman Singh *alias* Guru Charan Singh, ex-Maharaja of Nabha, since 22nd February 1928. Then there are 12 gentlemen from Burma who have also been kept in custody for nearly a year and a half. The name of the first is Dulung Sinwa. I shall not read the names of the rest in order to save time, but the last gentleman's name is 'NBao Tang, so that from Burma we have 12 people who, for a year and a half, have been kept under custody without being brought to trial. Then comes a list of 80 more people who have been kept under custody from various dates, beginning from 16th

July 1915, right up to the 18th January 1929. Well, Sir, is the Honourable the Home Member proud of his achievements? Is he prepared to say that any civilised government in times of peace can lock up in jail, or keep under detention, people against whom you can prove nothing? Has he not any imagination to see that, if these 26 nominated official Members were clapped into jail from 1908, and kept there till 1929, the whole Empire would be convulsed, would be shaken to its very foundation? This would happen even if a single European were treated as you are treating the people in this country. You remember an English girl, Miss Ellis, was carried away by some frontier tribesman about six years ago, and from Royalty downwards, the whole Empire immediately demanded that this girl should be set at liberty and brought to India again. And all the machinery of this powerful Government was brought into requisition to bring that young lady within a few days back to her home. Even so, if the Honourable the Home Member were really the Home Member of a self-governing country, he would be called upon, at the peril of his office, to produce within 24 hours people whom he detains without trial in times of peace. And what is his master, the Secretary of State for India doing? He seems to be one of the most wonderful public officials during recent times in any country. His ignorance seems to be increasing with his experience of India. (Laughter.) Ordinarily a person learns as he grows old. This gentleman unlearns as he grows old. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, only today in the papers we get a reply which the Noble Lord, Earl Winterton, gave in the House of Commons. Replying to Mr. Thomas Griffiths with regard to the number of persons still detained under Regulation III of 1818, Earl Winterton referred to his reply of December 3rd and said the number of persons detained was still six. The Government of India were now considering the case of three. I have before me the list supplied by his representative in this country, in which 48 are admitted to be still detained under Regulation III of 1818.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I must point out again that a large number of those detentions date from a date after the one referred to in the reply quoted by the Honourable Member and were due, as I have already explained, to certain occurrences which rendered it necessary for us to take special precautions in respect to our duties with regard to another State.

Mr. K. Ahmed: This is *sub judice*; we cannot refer to it at this stage.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: He may make any exceptions, but let him say if the reply given is correct, that only six people are detained in custody today under Regulation III of 1818.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The reply clearly did not apply to the cases of recent date to which I have referred.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: But why should they be excluded? Can the Honourable Member explain? I pause for a reply. Let him say why the other cases should be excluded.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The information given related, as I understand, to matters as they stood on 3rd December. As I have pointed out, these other cases are more recent.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is no explanation. Was the number of cases 6 when he gave the reply? I wish to know clearly whether on the 3rd December, when he gave the reply the number was 6? Will the Honourable Member reply whether on the 3rd December the number was 6?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The reply, if correctly reported, would not be accurate as a statement of the present position, to which, however, I do not understand it to apply. As I pointed out, a large number of the cases referred to are due to the special circumstances which occurred, owing to disorders in a neighbouring State. I cannot state anything further on that point, without going beyond what I am entitled to do in this House.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: How can that be true? Even on the 3rd December it was not true, and the Honourable the Home Member admits that it was inaccurate. Is the Noble Lord ever accurate in matters that matter? (Laughter and Applause.) The other day he tried to distinguish between the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and his non-arrest. When is an arrest not an arrest? (Laughter.) I am afraid, Sir, the way in which the representative in the British Parliament for Indian affairs misleads the world, either deliberately, or through colossal ignorance, is becoming a scandal, and if he cannot state facts or truth when, as an official, he is called upon to reply, he should be packed off and should no longer hold the responsible position of Under Secretary of State for India, which he has done everything to disgrace.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why don't you vote money enough to appoint officers to study facts, to give you true and accurate information?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It is not merely a question of personal liberty under Regulation III of 1818. There are other cases which are occurring and the portents are that before long, the personal liberty of hundreds and thousands may again be challenged under the repressive policy which is looming on the horizon. There is the case of Manoranjan Ghosh, member of the A. I. C. C., Secretary of the Khadi Board, who had gone to Bezwada on life insurance business. He was arrested in the middle of the night when in high fever, because the Simon Commission was to pass through Bezwada! Bail was allowed after great difficulty. Now, Sir, I do not want to dwell upon this case much longer, as it may be said that it is *sub judice*, but the way in which the personal liberty of the subjects, and even their safety, has been attacked when the Simon Commission has been passing through this country does no credit to the Government responsible for it.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I do not think the Honourable Member is entitled to enter into the merits of an alleged arrest which he himself suggests is *sub judice*.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I am not. I am speaking generally. I have left that case after mentioning the facts. If you wish to have a demonstration against the Simon Commission, you have not even that much freedom; even though you take the amplest care that, when the Commission is passing, nothing untoward should happen. Only the day before yesterday, I was told every lamp post contained a sepoy and every tree a soldier, and every available avenue or corner was guarded either by military or civil police, when there was not even a crow anxious to have a look at the Commission. Not a single soul wants to see the Simon Commission. In Bombay when they arrived on their second visit, they arrived like thieves in the night and were packed off to Poona from the Bundur. Why this nervousness? There may perhaps be some foundation for this nervousness, because of a story which I heard last year, when the Simon Commission first arrived

in India. I am told that some members of the Commission were staying in the Western Hostel and when they were about to retire at night, the jackals in New Delhi began to yell, and the members of the Commission, not being familiar with conditions in this country, thought these were the protestants who were coming in to attack them. (Laughter.) The jackals, as we all know, begin to yell and yell more as midnight advances, and the Commissioners thought the demonstrators were coming nearer and nearer to the Hostel in order to attack them. (Laughter.) Some say that they even covered themselves with their bed-sheets. I suppose this nervous fright has begun from that day. Everywhere they are mistaking some shadow for an object of dread and everywhere the liberty of the subject is interfered with. Some people are beaten with lathies; the Simon Commission leaves a trail of blood wherever it goes, and has thus further trenched upon the liberty of the public.

Sir, this is not all. The Arms Act is administered in a manner which prevents the people from exercising the right of self-defence. The Commissioners who drafted the Indian Penal Code were very anxious to give ample right of self-defence to the people, but today the Arms Act is worked and administered in a manner which allows no liberty, except to certain chosen people, to carry fire arms. How many hundreds of people die every year of snake bite, because they have not got any license for carrying fire-arms. How many people's lives would be saved if only they were given licenses for fire-arms. How many people are attacked by wild animals while passing through various jungles. All these lives could be saved if only the Government would trust the people with more fire-arms.

There is one case in Bombay where a request for fire-arms was refused, in spite of the fact that the recommendation in favour of the applicant came from people whom Government are delighted to honour. One Mr. Nathalal Lalji is required in the course of his business to travel in some parts of Gujerat which are infested with wild animals and robbers.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member had put down a question on the subject and that question was disallowed. Now he is bringing up this matter in another way. The Honourable Member knows that that is a provincial subject with which the Government of India have nothing to do.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is perfectly true. Might, I, with your permission, Sir, say that the administration of the Arms Act prevents the public from defending themselves in cases of necessity.

Mr. President: A general statement to that effect has already been made. I cannot permit the Honourable Member to go into details.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: With your permission, Sir, I will only say, a Member of the Council of State, a Member of this Honourable House, two Members of the Bombay Legislative Council, and several Justices of Peace and Members of the Bombay Municipal Corporation recommended that Government should issue the licence, and yet, such is the suspicion, such is the rigour with which this Arms Act is administered, that this individual, although the necessity for giving fire-arms to him was proved beyond a shadow of doubt, was not allowed the license for a revolver.

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

Then, Sir, the third point is whether the Government are working for the political advancement of the people. Sir, the one factor which will create healthy political conditions is the promotion of harmony and peace and goodwill amongst the various communities. Can it be said, Sir, that this Government is doing all it can to promote this harmony? Far from it. On the contrary, in various parts of the country, the Local Governments are creating circumstances which drive the various races ever apart from one another. In Bombay, Sir, recently one of the Honourable Members moved a cut of Rs. 8,000, because one Government official, named Mr. Sanjana, was misusing his position as an Assistant to the Oriental Translator to write to the *Times of India*, daily creating and widening the gulf between the Hindus and the Muhammadans by quoting from rabid communal papers. Why was no action taken against him under section 153-A, Indian Penal Code? If ever the use of section 153-A was justified, it is in the case of the *Times of India* where, under the caption, "Through Indian Eyes", a daily stream of poison is poured out in its columns dividing community from community. The Government often take action against vernacular papers which write rabid articles, but here is an assistant to the Oriental Translator, a public servant, who misuses his position to make use of such rabid articles, perverts them and adds his own personal venom and poison, so that anybody who reads these articles in the *Times of India* must come to the conclusion that the Hindus and the Muhammadans of this country will never, never unite. If the writing of Mr. Sanjana is permitted, I would respectfully invite the attention of the Honourable the Home Member to the mischief, the harm and the havoc which this writer is creating amongst the communities.

Mr. M. Keane (United Provinces: Nominated Official): On a point of order, Sir. Is not this defamation, Sir, against the individual who is attacked? The Honourable Member is abusing his privilege by making such statements against an individual who has no power to answer him in this House, and under the rules of debate, he is forbidden to use language which amounts to defamation.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: May I say, Sir, that the whole question was debated in the Bombay Council, as I am debating it here. His name was mentioned not once but several times.

Mr. J. A. Shillidy (Home Department: Nominated Official): On a point of order, Sir. Is not this a provincial subject, and should a debate thereon be permitted in this House?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, the fact is that Mr. Hotson, the Government representative in the Bombay Council, not only did not assure the public that such a thing would not be done again, but he virtually said that he saw nothing objectionable in the writing. Now, Sir, the Government of India is either responsible for the goodwill, peace and harmony amongst the various communities, or it is not. If under their very eyes and nose a statement of that kind is made in one of the provincial Councils on behalf of the Government that they will allow a public servant to use or misuse his opportunities for the purpose of poisoning the public life of this country, the Government of India have no alternative but to prevent this

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: No such statement was made.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: What statement?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The Honourable Member himself implied that a Member of the Provincial Government had said that he did not intend to interfere with activities intended to disseminate matter likely to arouse racial disharmony. That is not the purport of what the Honourable Mr. Hotson said.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I wish the Honourable Member was sure of his facts before he stated them. Sir, here, in view of the Honourable Member's contradiction, it becomes necessary for me to point out what happened. Sir, in view of the Honourable the Home Member's statement, I am obliged to take the time of the House a little more than I originally intended. Now, Sir, here is an article in the *Indian National Herald*, dated the 2nd March 1929. This is what is stated:

"That Mr. Sanjana is guilty of repeatedly violating the rules governing the conduct of Government servants is clear. One of these rules, let us repeat, says distinctly that:

'A Government servant may not, unless generally or specifically empowered by the Local Government in this behalf, communicate directly or indirectly to Government servants belonging to other departments or to non-official persons or to the Press any document or information which has come into his possession in the course of his public duties or has been prepared or collected by him in the course of those duties, whether from official sources or otherwise.'

Mr. Hotson, in his reply to Mr. Majumdar's question tacitly admitted . . . "

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: "Tacitly?"

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Yes, "tacitly". I am reading that:

"tacitly admitted that Mr. Sanjana is the author of the contributions appearing in the *Times of India* under the caption 'Through Indian Eyes' as well as the notes dealing with communal matters in the 'Current topics' column of the same journal. From the variety of extracts from vernacular journals quoted by Mr. Sanjana in his articles, it is clear that he is making free use of the journals received in the office of the Oriental Translator's Department, as well as of the materials prepared for submission to the Government, for his press articles. He quotes not only from the obscurest of obscure vernacular journals, but also from journals in the Kanarese and Telugu languages—languages of which he has no knowledge, but articles which are translated into English by the staff in his office. Is it permissible for a servant of Government to utilise thus the services of his office staff, as well as documents which have come into his possession in the course of his public duties?"

Is this in the public interest?

"Again, the Rules lay down that:

'A Government servant may contribute regularly to the press, but he must confine himself within the limits of reasonable and temperate discussion, and if his action in the press is contrary to the public interest, the Local Government may withdraw his liberty to contribute.'

Now, Sir, I shall come to the question and answer in the Bombay Legislative Council.

Mr. T. Gavin-Jones (United Provinces: European): Do not stop, go on.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I will go on in my own way.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Have you not prepared your thesis already?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The following is an extract from the interpellations in the Bombay Council regarding "Government servants and contribution to the Press":

"*Mr. N. G. Majumdar* (Sholapur City): Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether their attention has been drawn to the leading article in the *Indian National Herald* of November 15th, 1928, regarding a Government officer in the Oriental Translator's Office constantly contributing to the *Times of India* notes and articles under the heading 'Through Indian eyes', 'Current Topic' and those under the signature of 'Hystericus';
- (b) whether the rules permit Government officers to contribute to the Press;
- (c) whether Government have made any inquiries in the above matter, and, if so, with what result;
- (d) the name of the officer;
- (e) whether Government have issued to him any instructions in the matter;
- (f) whether they will be pleased to place a copy of the same on the Council Table?"

This is the reply given by the Honourable Mr. J. E. B. Hotson—the Honourable the Home Member said it was not admitted—to the specific question "whether the rules permit Government servants to contribute to the Press" the reply is 'Yes'. The name of the officer is admitted. And to the question "what instructions have been issued", the answer is 'No'. I will recommend the Honourable the Home Member to read the whole debate in the Bombay Council in order to save time and to see whether the action of the Government of Bombay does not amount to a condonation of the activities of Mr. Sanjana. The whole Government voted against this cut which was moved with a view to discourage the activities of Mr. Sanjana. What more do you want to show that the Government is behind this systematic, this deliberate, this continuous attempt to create poison between the various communities by a Government officer who is paid for merely translating and supervising the translations of vernacular writings in his department?

Mr. T. Gavin-Jones: What has it got to do with the Finance Bill?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The whole of the Government of India comes under review under the Finance Bill.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What about the daily allowance of the Swarajist Members? That will also come under this.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, this is not merely an isolated case. Government are doing that in other departments also. Take the case of Mr. Coatman. I had put down a motion for the reduction of the grant of his Department to nil. Why? Because, Sir, anybody who reads this annual publication would think that some cousin of Miss Mayo was being employed for the purpose of creating a difference between the various communities in India. In his reference to the Simon Commission, he tried to point out that the boycott of the Simon Commission by the Muhammadans was no boycott at all. On the contrary, it is supported by them.

Mr. J. Coatman (Director of Public Information): What has that got to do with Miss Mayo?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It has everything to do. Anybody who tries to create ill-will or disharmony between the various communities is a cousin, second, third or a hundred times removed, of Miss Mayo.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Exactly like the Nehru Report—is that not so—which has brought into the country disunion, difference, disturbance, etc.?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: He had the temerity to say that the only prominent Muhammadan politician who objected to the Simon Commission was Mr. Jinnah. Was he not present in this House when the motion of Lala Lajpat Rai regarding the boycott of the Simon Commission was carried, when not Mr. Jinnah alone, but more than ten Members of the Assembly, who were leading Mussalman politicians, voted in favour of the motion? Is not this a statement of fact? Mr. Coatman, Sir, might have his own opinions, but is he entitled to manufacture facts for his own purposes?

Mr. K. Ahmed: Owing to *Ramzan (Rozah)* holiday—that is a fasting day—we were all absent on that day.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: And yet when the Honourable the Home Member is questioned about this, whether this book, which is annually published at Government cost, has or has not got its approval, he says that the Statute requires such a book to be placed before Parliament, showing the material and moral advancement of the people of this country. Sir, it is a Government publication, and the Government of India are responsible for it. The Government of India pay for it; but when questions are asked about the contents of the book, the Honourable the Home Member says that the Government are not responsible.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: May I correct the Honourable Member? That is not what I said. I said that the Government of India did not accept responsibility for any particular expression of opinion contained therein.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: What is the use of this evasive reply?—that the Government of India do not take responsibility for any particular thing. The Government of India are responsible for every bit of it, every line and every letter, because they have paid for it.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: Certainly not.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Who pays for it? I pay for it, and I say that you shall be responsible to me if you write at my cost; and it is the Honourable the Home Member and the Honourable the Finance Member that must control Mr. Coatman's activities. This book must be a record of facts and truth, not a record of misstatements and misrepresentations, and a book for political propaganda on behalf of the bureaucracy. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I do say that the activities of this Department are becoming an eye-sore to every man in this country.

Then, Sir, there is one more thing about this Home Department with which I shall conclude my reference to that Department. I take it that the Honourable the Home Member is responsible for distributing Rs. 70,000, which is included in the budget of this year, for the various news agencies.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: For what?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: For news agencies. He will buy such telegrams from news agencies as he likes, give them such facilities as he likes, and withhold help from such agencies as he does not like. Now, Sir, I want to know if the taxpayer in this country is to be saddled with Rs. 79,000, if it is to be spent after propaganda of a particular type. I have in my hand a statement showing that the Government are spending Rs. 79,000 for giving facilities to some news agencies. These agencies have the privilege of using the trunk telephone without making any payment. May I know, Sir, what will be the annual amount that would have to be paid if a private individual wanted to use the trunk telephone in the way in which these news agencies are using it? Then the other privilege of the news agencies is—of course excluding the Free Press—a railway first class pass granted by the Railway Board, the privilege of booking certain classes of Press telegrams

12 Noon. at the ordinary rates, for the purpose of payment, when they are treated, for the purpose of transmission, as express telegrams. The ordinary rate for Press messages is 8 annas per 48 words while the express rate is Re. 1. Certain confidential telegrams, as indicated in the Telegraph Guide, are booked at ordinary rates and treated as express telegrams. I am sorry the Honourable Member, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, is not here, otherwise he might have enlightened me; but my point is that so far as Government patronise news agencies, they must do it with impartiality. I do not wish to deprive any news agencies of any facilities that they may be enjoying today. Let them have the facilities by all means; but if there is any other news agency which is catering to the public, and if it applies for facilities of a similar character, the Government should not refuse to grant them. The only Indian news agency in this country is the Free Press of India. It has a paid up capital of a lakh of rupees and distinguished Indian gentlemen are its Directors. If any news agencies are to be supplied with special concessions

Mr. President: Order, order. I have been carefully listening to the speeches of Honourable Members on the Opposition Benches, and I am bound to give a warning to them that, if they go on at this rate, they must be prepared to sit till the middle of April.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I am entirely in your hands, Sir, but I have made engagements after the 28th March relying on the Government statement that their last day would be the 28th March. And how can they sit on after that date?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: Sir, the Government have made no such statement and we consider it necessary to sit.

Mr. President: A similar request has been made by some other Honourable Members also to me; but the length of the Honourable Members' speeches does not give me any encouragement to hold out any hope to Honourable Members.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, the catalogue of the wrongs of this Government is so long that any speech that I can make can only dimly, inadequately describe them. There is a Sanskrit verse which says that, even if the whole ocean was used as ink, and even if the whole earth were used as paper and if the goddess of learning began to write, she could not complete, even if she wrote to all eternity, the full list of the merits of God. Similarly I say, if the God of Destiny used the ocean as ink and the earth

as paper, he could not complete the catalogue of the wrongs which this Government is inflicting on the people of this country. (Opposition Applause.) I plead my inability to do so in five days

Mr. President: I repeat the warning I gave just now, that Honourable Members must be prepared to sit till the middle of April if they go on at this rate.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I am entirely in your hands. I shall certainly try to curtail my speech, but I do not wish to sit after the 28th.

Honourable Members of the European Group: Restrict your remarks to the Finance Bill.

Mr. President: Honourable Members must also remember that the business of this Assembly must take precedence over all other engagements.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, if it becomes necessary, I am always at the service of the Assembly, let it be the 15th April, 15th May or 15th December. But when we get, during the year, only once, an opportunity to review the entire administration of Government without limit of time, I submit that ample time be allowed to us for the purpose of telling this Government what we think of them and why we think so.

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member show any instance in the past when the consideration stage has lasted more than a couple of days?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, neither can I show another instance of a Government more absolute; and therefore if the time taken is becoming longer, the fault lies at the door of the opposite Benches. I do not want that anybody should be deprived of any facilities that he may be getting at present. I only want that any Indian agency which is sufficiently and properly established and is catering to the requirements of the public should get the same facilities as other news agencies are getting.

The last thing, Sir, which I cannot forget, is the Bombay riots. Sir, there again the Government did not take sufficient measures to protect life during those unhappy days in the City of Bombay. In the presence of Magistrates, people were murdered, and I received a letter from my son, during the riots, stating that the military were playing cards on the Sandhurst Road when the riots were going on.

Mr. K. Ahmed: They were able to disperse unlawful assemblies all the same.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: And what is more, Sir, these riots, from which the military and police are supposed to protect us always, and for which we pay crores upon crores of rupees,—these riots are not prevented, their extent is not minimised, life is not properly saved,—and yet these riots are used for the purpose of telling us that, had it not been for the strong arm of Britain, there would have been more bloodshed. (*European Group:* "Of course!") Sir, there would have been no bloodshed but for the strong arm of Britain. It is their way of dividing community from community, that is daily leading to an increase in the volume and intensity of communal strife, and I see no signs of the Government abating their policy by one jot or tittle. But I can only warn them that this kind of thing, preventing

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

communities from coming together by policy, by statute, by administrative measures will one day visit itself on the Government, when nothing will save them from the combined, infuriated attack of the people of this country. Today they may ward off the evil. They may hold their power for a few years longer, because of this cleavage, but as certainly as night follows the day, when all the communities realise that it is not to their advantage to remain distant from each other, then the Government will find that they have blundered and blundered gravely.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why don't you set the example earlier?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I will give you one case of communities suffering in spite of, or rather because of the so-called safeguards of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. The communal electorates have not prevented these communities themselves suffering from ruinous taxation. I will take the case of the Bombay Presidency. During the years which have followed the introduction of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, the Government of Bombay have, under the new constitution, taken nearly 60 crores by way of additional taxation, and for this they have secured the support in the Council of what I would call the non-Brahmin and the Sind block, by appointing Ministers from these communities, by giving some jobs like Public Prosecutors, etc., by giving a little grant to a school here, or a school there, and by a few scholarships to the depressed classes; and all these unhappy communalists think that they are getting something. They believe that they are making hay while the sun of communal electorate shines, and they are flocking into the lobby of the Government simply because a ministership is given here or a school grant there, and 60 crores of additional taxation have been agreed to. I want my friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, to follow what I am saying. 60 crores of additional taxation have been granted by the Bombay Council as a result of the non-Brahmin and the Sind Block. When you take into account the fact that the Muslim population of the Bombay Presidency is 20 per cent. of the whole, you will see that 12 crores of additional taxation have been paid by the masses of the Muslims for the doubtful advantage of a ministership here and a crumb there, and a public prosecutorship elsewhere. (*An Honourable Member:* "Hear, hear.") This Muslim block, under the belief that they were getting benefit under these Reforms, have voted 12 crores to be paid out of the pockets of their own kith and kin. Even in an ordinary financing of a loan the broker gets 2 per cent. If I raised a loan of 60 crores for somebody, I would get 120 lakhs by way of brokerage. These communal Ministers did not get even a 2 per cent. brokerage for selling their country and for selling the masses of their own community. When the Muslim mind comes to know of it, when the Muslim taxpayer knows this, that it is for this doubtful benefit of a ministry or a grant for a school or *madrassa* that his so-called representatives, for their own personal aggrandisement, are voting taxation to the tune of 12 crores, few will remain to question the wisdom of the Nehru Report. Sir, I am simply stating what is happening, and I ask you to beware, when you talk of communal electorates, safeguarding the rights of the minorities. What has happened to the Muslims has also happened to the non-Brahmin community in the Bombay Presidency? What is the number of Brahmins after all? A few hundred thousand like Mr. Kelkar, Dr. Moonje and others? I am not a Brahmin, Mr. Jayakar is not a Brahmin, you, Sir, are not a Brahmin; but all of us are suffering,

because one non-Brahmin gets a ministership. 90 per cent. of the remaining population of the Bombay Presidency pay an additional 48 crores of taxation, which has been voted during the last ten years of reforms. What for? Because A, a non-Brahmin gets a ministership, and B, a non-Brahmin gets something else; and that happens in the municipalities and in the local boards, communalism is rampant, poisoning the life of the body politic. This, Sir, is the way in which you are governing the country. This is the way in which, for the sake of a few paltry crumbs that you throw, our own countrymen are misguided and misled into believing that they are getting their communal rights safeguarded. Nothing of the kind: communal rights cannot be safeguarded by this Government. The Nehru Report alone can safeguard the communities. I shall call the Honourable the Finance Member as witness to what I am stating. The Hilton-Young Report says that the communal electorate is a necessary corollary of the adult franchise. So soon as you establish adult franchise, communal electorates will follow as a matter of course. That is the opinion of the Hilton-Young Report—not of Jamnadas Mehta. And, Sir, adult suffrage is provided for in the Nehru Report. (*An Honourable Member*: "No.") Yes, Sir, please read it. Universal adult suffrage is provided for, and the moment you agree to it, communal electorates are a corollary, says the Hilton-Young Report

An Honourable Member: Stick to the Finance Bill.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Finance is the bed-rock of every activity of Government, and therefore every activity must come under review under the Finance Bill. Therefore I say that these attempts to divide communities from communities are resulting in grinding taxation on the very communities which think they are being protected or can be protected under this system of Government. They can only be the willing tools and instruments for taxing their own communities—the non-Brahmins and the Mussalmans. These non-Brahmins and Muslim countrymen of ours are today under the belief that, under communal electorates, they are safeguarding their rights, but they are unfortunately living in a state of the utmost misapprehension.

Sir, there ends the catalogue of the Home Member's Department. Now I turn to something cognate, namely, the Foreign Secretary's Department. . . .

An Honourable Member: He is not here.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It is somewhat cognate, but as he is not here I shall not devote much time to it, but only mention what is happening in Wadhwan and Rajkot, where recently an order has been issued by the political authorities which lays down that any person may be expelled from the civil station limits of Rajkot and Wadhwan with or without assigning any reasons therefor, with a proviso added that it shall not apply to *bonâ fide* residents of those places. The point is that all persons in the civil stations of Wadhwan and Rajkot are now liable to be deported without assigning any reasons, or without showing any cause, except in the case of what are called the *bonâ fide* residents of those civil stations. This, Sir, is how the spirit behind the Public Safety Bill is extending in various directions. The Public Safety Bill is intended to deport certain supposed foreigners. This order in the civil stations of Wadhwan and Rajkot is intended to deport the people of this country, simply because they happen ordinarily to live outside Rajkot or Wadhwan. Sir, I was born and bred

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

up in Kathiawar. I have passed the best part of my life in Kathiawar; and if I go to Rajkot or Kathiawar, simply because I am living in Bombay, if it pleases the Political Agent, without assigning any reason whatever, he can order me to vacate. Sir, is that what the Government is doing for broadening the basis of liberty and freedom in this country? Is this strengthening the civil rights of the people? Is this what the people may expect on the eve of the great Commission which is now sitting to investigate whether the people of this country should have some further dose of freedom or not? I hope, Sir, that Sir Denys Bray, who I am sorry to see is not here, when his attention is drawn to it, will take steps to see that this last act of bureaucratic and autocratic power will be withdrawn, and the people in Rajkot and Wadhwan will breathe freely whenever they are pursuing their normal avocations or are on some business visit there.

That, Sir, finishes the political question and the Political Department . . .

Mr. T. Gavin-Jones: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Now, Sir, I must turn to the other departments. The next department I want to touch upon is the Commerce Department. Sir, the Commerce Department is presided over by my Honourable friend Sir George Rainy. The sweetness of his words and the amiability of his manner have often been described in this House. But now I am slowly getting a conviction that behind his velvet gloves he conceals something more dangerous. And that whatever he does, he does with such a determined purpose, that no amount of public opinion to the contrary, no amount of opposition from this House, no amount of prayers or requests, will move him to deviate one single inch from the policy that he intends to pursue.

Now, Sir, take the question of the protection of the mill industry. In the September session, in the year 1927, as a result of the Report of the Tariff Board, which recommended some duty on the import of foreign cloth, there was some legislation, but the Honourable Sir George Rainy did not accept the recommendation of the Tariff Board in this behalf. He only imposed some duty on the import of foreign yarn, and at that time he had the combined, continuous representations from the millowners of Bombay and of other parts of India to the effect that something must be done with a view to save the Bombay mill industry from throttling and eventual extinction, and that some kind of protection against the import of foreign cloth was necessary. This House also pressed that there should be some protection to the mill industry by way of an additional duty on the import of foreign cloth, but the Honourable the Commerce Member remained adamant. It was shown that this duty on yarn would harm the handloom industry; it was shown that the handloom weavers deserved as much protection as anybody else, that these handloom weavers were hard hit by the raising of the ratio, that the number of handloom weavers was by no means small, that they produce nearly 29 per cent. of the cloth that is used in this country, and that nothing should be done which would prejudice them or handicap them in their competition, either with mills or with foreign importers. But, as I said, Sir, the Honourable Sir George Rainy remained adamant. With a frail constitution, he has an indomitable will. He refuses to yield to the popular voice or to the public opinion, however strongly expressed, or however earnestly and unanimously pressed upon his attention. Sir, sweet words are welcome, but they cannot take the place of

wise deeds and sweeter action, and let me hope that, before this year is over, we may still be able to persuade the Honourable the Commerce Member that this national industry, which has been built by the combined enterprize of the Indian capitalists and Indian labour, on which depends the cotton grower for the prices of his cotton, on which depends a multiplicity of other trades, and on which depends the prosperity of the trade of Bombay, that that industry will receive some encouragement, some assurance, that a helping hand will be given in order that it may live again and flourish.

Then, Sir, the other day we passed, unfortunately, I think, a motion for the appointment of a fifth Member of the Railway Board, and in spite of all our entreaties, in spite of all our requests, in spite of all the arguments that were advanced by the majority of the elected Members of the House, the Honourable the Commerce Member would not yield but carried his purpose

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not entitled to reflect upon a vote of this House.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Is there any time limit during which I should not reflect upon a vote of this House? I want information, Sir.

Mr. President: It can be done on a substantive motion.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Then, Sir, I will leave the Railway fifth Member to the joy of his new office. But as regards Customs, I have to urge two important points. I had occasion, Sir, some years ago, to point out that the increase of duty on saccharine had really resulted in the loss of revenue to Government on account of smuggling of saccharine into this country. That complaint still remains. I do not know whether the Government revenue from saccharine has shown any expansion as a result of bringing down the duty from Rs. 20 to Rs. 5. I think, Sir, the smuggler is still getting the better of the Commerce Member, and in the interests of the customs revenue, it is his duty to look into this smuggling of saccharine, and protect the *bonâ fide* saccharine trader. Instead of that, I hear that in Bombay, people, who had assisted Government in getting at the smuggler, are being harassed, and their houses are being raided, although nothing is found.

And what is happening in regard to saccharine is happening in regard to diamonds. I am not pleading for any decrease in the duty on diamonds, simply for the sake of making them cheaper for the richer classes. That is not my object at all. But the diamond is such a handy article, it is such a small article, that its smuggling is even more easy than the smuggling of saccharine, and the cargo of Indian Princes who now come and go to England and Paris every year, bring with them these diamonds and it is difficult for Government to get at them, unless the princes themselves are made to submit to customs inspection. I therefore think, Sir, that the time has arrived when the Government might look into the question of revising the duty on diamonds, with a view to protect their own revenues, and also to make diamonds more accessible to those who may want them, without reducing the Government revenue because, after all, as I say, it is not the diamond user who should be protected, but it is the public revenue which should be protected, and I understand the Diamond Merchants' Association of Bombay have sent a representation to the Central Board of Revenue—I do not know whether it is the Central Board or the Commerce Department, or the Finance Department which deals with this matter,—but as the facts are before you, I

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

do not think I should be justified in taking more time of the House, except to draw attention to this aspect of the question

Then, Sir, take the steel industry. This industry was last given protection in the year 1927. Now, Sir, the whole idea of protection is this. There are three or four stages through which protection works, if it is to fulfil its function. First of all, full foreign prices, *plus* import duty are charged to the consumer, and that raises the prices which give fair profits to investors. The second stage is, the profits of the investors increase as a result of full foreign prices, *plus* import duty, and because the profits of the investors increase, more companies come into being in order to manufacture the article protected. So that there is fresh capital, fresh production and a fall of foreign imports under protection. Therefore, prices fall, profits remain fair, industry expands, employment grows and the country prospers. In the last stage, when capital has been sunk in an industry to the fullest requirements, internal competition sets in in full force, foreign imports go down to the lowest figures, only fair profits are made, and lowest prices to the consumer are the result. This is the order in which protection moves. Let us see whether Government have acted in the case of the steel industry in a way which leads to the expansion of the iron and steel industry. We are not concerned here with one concern or two concerns. What we want is that this country should be self-supporting in the matter of its iron and steel industry and iron and steel requirements. It should be possible to ensure, in a reasonable distance of time, that all our requirements of iron and steel are manufactured in this country by indigenous concerns with Indian capital and with Indian management, and that the foreigner has no hold on us in the matter of such a key industry as iron and steel.

Now, Sir, we have been protecting the steel industry since 1924. We are now in the year 1929. Has any other concern been started? How can it be started? Even the existing concern is unable to pay a dividend to the investors. Speculation grows in Bombay for two months, falls in another two months; people live in hope that some day the Tata steel industry, with protection to the extent of crores of rupees, which the taxpayer is paying and the consumer is paying,—that some day this industry will flourish. But up till now, from 1924, this key industry of the country has failed to show any strength.

Mr. K. Ahmed: You are to be blamed because you voted for it.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Therefore, I would request the Honourable the Commerce Member to see whether this legislation is fulfilling its own function, its own purpose, whether the industry is being protected, and whether the time when the consumer will have to pay lower prices for all his steel requirements is drawing nearer. Otherwise, the consumer pays, the industry languishes, the foreigner flourishes, and the whole of the sacrifice made by the country only enures to the benefit of the alien importer. On the other hand, when protection was given, it was assumed that the prices had reached the rock bottom in Europe, that in Belgium, France and other countries, at any rate, in England, the prices had reached the bottom, and on that assumption the tariff was fixed. I ask the Honourable the Commerce Member whether or not during the course of the last two years, the trend of prices has not been higher by several rupees on the various

articles that have been protected. If it is so, will he not look into this, and see whether such articles, in which the Tata Company or any other indigenous concern is dealing, or manufacturing,—whether these articles get any protection at all, or whether the benefit of this import duty only goes to the foreigner, and whether the consumer of such foreign articles as are not manufactured by the Tatas is not being penalised for nobody's advantage in particular. This is my submission on the question of industries.

Then, Sir, coming to the railways, the Honourable the Commerce Member must have heard of the strikes of gangmen on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. I understand that there are 12,000 workmen, who have struck work between Bombay and Palghar—I do not know exactly whether it is a little further or a little nearer. Although the Agent has offered an increase of Rs. 2 and Re. 1, that has not eased the situation, and now these workmen are being threatened with dismissal if they do not submit immediately. I would like to know what the Honourable the Commerce Member has got to say on the question of this strike, where 12,000 men are concerned whose daily wages are now under consideration. I do now know whether the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Agent is dealing with the matter in the manner it requires or whether we are simply drifting into a situation which will make the solution of the problem more difficult later on, unless it is handled with tact and sympathy in the beginning. On the Commerce Department I have something more to say. I want to know how much of the recruitment to the various railway higher services and subordinate services is being done through the Public Service Commission as is done in the case of the other Secretariat services, and if these railway superior services and subordinate services are not recruited through the Public Service Commission, what is the reason for such special treatment, because there is an impression, for which there is a good deal of foundation, that the reason why these appointments are not submitted to the Public Service Commission is anything but the ground of efficiency, and that those in charge of affairs want to retain, to have discrimination and discretion in matters appertaining to those services. And this is creating a good deal of heartburning amongst those who are legitimately entitled to the various superior jobs in the railway services. I therefore hope that the Honourable the Commerce Member will, during the course of this debate, let us know and take us into his confidence in respect of these various important matters to which I have referred just now.

This finishes the Commerce Department. Now, although I should like to go on with the other Departments, I am getting tired myself. (Laughter.) I think I should take another opportunity, namely, the third reading of the Finance Bill (Laughter), because what I have said already is nothing compared to what I have still to say. (Laughter.) I have only dealt with one-fifth of the bulk of papers that I have prepared for indicting this Government, and in order that, on the second reading, other Honourable Members might also join with us in voting down this consideration motion, I would only mention one thing and then take my seat. That is the question of the subsidy to the air service between Karachi and Delhi. The Director of Civil Aviation in India, in a speech in December 1927, said:

"Wherever the spirit of enterprise exists in India, now is the time for it to declare itself. India is right in the centre of the picture and must get traffic in both directions, and it behoves us all to see that all traffic through her territory is carried by Indian aircraft owned and operated by Indian companies."

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

I want to know what has happened since then, that we are hearing and reading in the Press that this policy is being abandoned in favour of another policy, whereby Indian companies can neither operate nor own, except partially, these concerns and take the fullest benefit of being right in the middle of the traffic. If Government have an intention simply to make these air services a part of the military organisation, let them say so. If, on the other hand, they want to encourage aeroplane services, aeroplane enterprise, let them say so in the beginning. Let them act in a manner which will give some encouragement to the intending investor and to the people who have some enterprise or earnestness and brain to devote themselves to aviation as a commercial proposition. If Government discourage from the beginning private companies and simply want to make this organisation a part of the military machine, I should like to know their reasons. It appears from the newspapers that the policy, as defined in December 1927, is not the same and my only observation is that the Government should make it clear what that policy is, whether it has changed and if so why it has changed, and whether the original policy was not right. Sir, I have done for the moment.

The Revd. J. C. Chatterjee (Nominated: Indian Christians): The Demands for Grants are so arranged that it is practically impossible to bring questions relating to the Delhi administration or the needs of this microscopic province before the House. My only remedy therefore is to take the opportunity afforded by the discussion on the present motion, and I do hope that I shall have your indulgence for a very few minutes, while I draw attention to what I consider is without exaggeration the earnest desire and the demand of the vast majority of the people in this small province. At all events it ought to provide rather an interesting interlude, and a respite after the long tales of woe recounted by my Honourable friends opposite—of commissions and boycotters, of the howls of jackals and of the wrongs of the various departments of Government.

Sir, the other day we heard a great deal about the desirability of the Reforms being extended to the North-West Frontier Province. The House championed the cause of that province, and I wish that province every good luck in obtaining these reforms. But I think that the House, as well as the Government, are sometimes apt to forget the old proverb, "Charity begins at home", and if the North-West Frontier Province is to have the Reforms, I think the province which lies so near to the Government as well as to the seat of this House ought to have the Reforms much earlier. I may be told that the Reforms are not worth having and therefore we need not worry about them. I am not going to discuss the merits or otherwise of the Reforms. I will only say that, the mere fact that so many gentlemen from such distant parts of the country consider it right to come and sit in this House, which is the product of these Reforms, and spend so many days, and talk so long, shows that there is after all, something in the Reforms, so that if the people of this Province also want to share in them, they should have their wish. The second question is that, if the people of the Frontier Province are fit to have the Reforms, is not Delhi just as ripe for them? The latter question need hardly be discussed, because Delhi is the most—I better not say the most—but it certainly is one of the most royal and one of the most ancient cities of the East. If any training is necessary, the

people of this city have had training in the art of Government longer than those of any other city in this country. To my mind there are only two cities worth living in, in the world. One of these is sometimes described as the Eternal City of Rome. That may or may not be so, but I am sure, Sir, you will agree with me that Delhi is certainly the only other city which is fit to live in. That being so, I hope the House will champion the cause of Reforms being granted to the City of Delhi where the people, because of their glorious ancient history, their culture and civilisation, and long established institutions, are certainly fit to receive whatever benefits that result from the present system of Reforms.

It is not merely because of sentimental reasons that I am pleading for the extension of the Reforms to the Province of Delhi. I plead that it should be so extended as to make it possible to have a reformed Council and other self-governing institutions. The people of this small province are labouring under very serious handicaps because of its microscopic size and because of the absence of a Council and other institutions that go with a major province. Take, for instance, the question of educational facilities. Now, is it not surprising that at the very seat of the Imperial Capital there should not be a medical college, or an engineering college, or any other technical colleges. There is not even a Government Arts College here. The result is that students from this place are obliged to migrate to neighbouring provinces, to the Engineering College at Roorkee, and to other technical colleges, and get admission with the greatest difficulty and only after the Government of this Province has paid a heavy premium for the education of these students. The revenues of this province being small, it is extremely difficult for the Government, even if they so desire, to pay these heavy premiums. It is not only a question of the training and education of our young men. There is also the question of their subsequent careers. A province like this has not much scope for employment. The prize posts are held by members of the Imperial Service—so it is no use discussing them. But even if we look at the personnel of the subordinate services of this province, they are all filled by recruitment from other provinces, and very few of them fall to men from Delhi. Any one who reads the newspapers will find that, whenever jobs are advertised in the other provinces, especially in the United Provinces, it is clearly stated that no one need apply, or be considered eligible unless he has resided for so many years in that province. The result is that our young men are debarred from finding suitable careers in other provinces. Therefore, I ask, where are these young men to go, after receiving their training? Again, in this small province there is only one municipality and the civil lines as well as the City of New Delhi in which this House sits are excluded from the jurisdiction of the Delhi Municipality and their affairs are managed, either by a notified area, or by a municipal committee where the membership is largely or practically all confined to nominations by Government. Therefore, not only are we deprived of the benefits of a reformed Council, but we are also deprived of learning the art of self-government and of exercising of the functions which the people of most other Indian cities enjoy.

What I want to point out to the Government is, that there is, throughout this small province, a widespread and unanimous demand that the Delhi Province should be extended. During the last winter a committee of

[The Revd. J. C. Chatterjee.]

the citizens of Delhi sat and worked out a scheme for an enlarged province of Delhi. That committee included men of all political opinions and of all communities. There were Congressmen, people of the moderate and even of the ultra moderate school, and men belonging to every single community. That committee and its various sub-committees sat for several months and worked out a very comprehensive and, I think, an excellent scheme for an enlarged province. It asked that two or three divisions, specially the Agra Division, and the Meerut Division should be added to Delhi from the United Provinces, and that the Punjab should contribute the Ambala Division. We would then have a province, homogeneous in its population, with the same culture and with the same kind of people living in it. That Report clearly showed that the province would be self-supporting, so that it would not be a burden financially to the other provinces. That Report was submitted to Government and also made available to the people in the country. But when I interpellated Government on that subject and asked them whether they had any intention of taking action on that Report, or whether they intended considering the question of an enlarged province of Delhi, the reply I received was neither illuminating nor encouraging. There is in this city a most energetic daily, commonly known as *The Hindustan Times*. That newspaper is particularly clever at forecasting the minds and secrets of the Government of India. Sometimes the paper is correct—sometimes its forecasts go wrong. It has been telling us lately that Government have no intention whatever of extending the province of Delhi, and that they have made no suggestion on that subject to the Simon Commission.

I have made the speech mainly in order to draw the attention of Government to this widespread demand for the extension of the province and to point out to them the handicaps that we suffer because of the smallness of our province. I also want to get information as to whether the forecast made by this energetic daily is correct and, if correct, why Government desire to turn such a deaf ear to the wishes of the people of the city, which ought to be very near and dear to their hearts. If Government are not able or willing to extend the province, it would be far better that Delhi Province should be amalgamated with the Punjab, or what is more natural, be joined on to the United Provinces, of which it formed a part before 1857.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this is an occasion which I think can best be utilised for three purposes. One is criticism of the past action of Government, the second is suggestions for a change of policy in order to inspire confidence, and the third is the ways and means of reducing the expenditure and thereby doing away with the necessity of additional taxation in the years to come.

I think, Sir, that, if there is any speech which has stood that test, that has been delivered in this House, it is, I think, the speech of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. It may look awkward for a member of his Party to praise his speech or the speech of his Deputy Leader, but having regard to the speeches I have heard from the Congress Benches, I cannot help saying that the masterly speech of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas should be an eye-opener to my Congress friends. (*Cries of "Hear, hear" from the Swarajist Benches.*)

Pandit Motilal Nehru, the Leader of the Opposition, for whom I have a very great respect

An Honourable Member: Have you?

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Yes, I have more than you,—Pandit Motilal Nehru rightly pointed out that there were two sets of speeches delivered in this House. One set was for the support of the Bill, and the other was to oppose the Bill. Now, Sir, instead of putting it that way, I think a better way of putting it is that one set was to put before this House constructive proposals, and the other was nothing but destruction. (Applause from the European Benches and Ironical Cheers from the Opposition Benches.) If the Independent Party is rising to support the Finance Bill, it is because they want to tell the Government that we want to give you finances for the future year, but your policy should be so and so. (Ironical Cheers from the Opposition Benches.) Those who have come here for destruction, I must tell them, that this is not the place (Cheers from the European Benches.) If they want constitutional agitation, they must adopt constitutional methods to their grievances remedied (Ironical Cheers from the Opposition Benches and Applause from the European Benches.)

My friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, in his long speech has dealt with a number of items, but I wish he had not touched the item of communal representation, of which he knows very little. I may tell him, Sir, that where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I agree with you!

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: This was not the opportunity in which either to support or oppose the Nehru Report, nor was it the opportunity for defending the Nehru Report. This is not the place for that, as the Honourable the President has rightly pointed out, but if he believes that the Mussalmans accept the Nehru Report I say he is very much mistaken.

The other point which he made was that Muhammadans always walk into the Government Lobby. I take great exception to this remark.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I never said anything about the Lobby.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: The Lobbies do not belong to Government (Applause from the European Benches.) The Lobbies are for "Ayes" or "Noes", and if anyone wants to vote on a particular measure, he can go to either of the Lobbies.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: May I ask the Honourable Member not to put into my mouth what I did not say?

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: You said they go into the Government Lobby.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I did not say anything of the sort. I referred to the Sindhi block and the Non-Brahmin group.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: What does it mean? Are not the Sindhis Muhammadans?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Not all of them.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Most of them. Even if you say that even one goes to the Government Lobby, I say it is a misstatement of fact and a misrepresentation. We do not go into the Government Lobby when a motion is before the House, but we are voting for or against the motion. If Government go into a particular Lobby, it is not our fault.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I accept your statement, it is a good trick for denying what you really admit.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Another point which Mr. Jamnadas Mehta made, and which I think should be rebutted on the floor of this House, was that he took the Oriental Translator to Government to task, but subsequently from what he read, it meant it was not the Oriental Translator, but Mr. Sanjana, a member of his Department.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: An Assistant.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Not the Oriental Translator.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I said an officer of the Department.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Coming to the subject, what does the Oriental Translator's assistant write? He writes translations of the various editorials that appear in the vernacular papers. My friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta accuses him of communalism. I say he is doing a great service to the country, because he is opening the eyes of those communalist papers to the fact that, if they want Swaraj, this is not the method of getting it, and if he is doing this, and if my friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, finds it unpleasant and inconvenient, I say he should ask the editors of those very respectable papers to cease writing articles that excite communal hatred.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is a matter which is not under my control.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Now I will say a word or two about the Government. The question for the House is that, whilst we support this motion for the Bill to be taken into consideration, I have said this is an occasion to criticise the policy of the Government.

Government, Sir, with all due respect, have not behaved in any manner to inspire confidence (*Cries of "Hear, hear", and "Vote against them."*) Not in this House. If you want to vote against, go elsewhere. (*Laughter.*) The Finance Bill is not to be voted against. If you are fighting for constitutional agitation, you must give them money.

Diwan Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Why not vote against them if you think you must criticise their policy.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: You cannot vote against them. We have already shown our indignation by throwing out Demands.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Throw out supplies also!

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: How will you get your fees here?

Diwan Chaman Lall: I am willing to forego my fees!

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Let your Party say so.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I say it on behalf of my Party.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Diwan Chaman Lall made many amazing statements against Bombay, and at least one to which I take great exception. He said that the conditions of industrial houses in Bombay are no better than they were years ago.

Diwan Chaman Lall: On a point of information, Sir. I said they were not much better.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Yes, that "much" does not sound good at all. If the Honourable Member had been straight and frank, he should have said they were very much better than they were years ago. I wish my Honourable friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, had not touched Bombay at all. If he had confined his activities to Rawalpindi, it would have been much better. We know Bombay conditions much better than my Honourable friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, who is sitting in Rawalpindi and trying to carry on propaganda on behalf of labour in Bombay.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I deny that.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: I congratulate my Honourable friend in anticipation of his appointment as a member of the Labour Inquiry Commission.

The other point which I wish to make clear is this. If the Government want to carry on the administration in this country, they should do so with the good will of this House and the country outside. Their action up to now has been—and I say so with all the emphasis at my command—leading to alienation of their friends, admirers and sympathisers. If one inquires from the people who have been loyal servants of Government for 20 or 25 years and who retired after their loyal service, what does one find? They are much dissatisfied with the state of affairs, and there is discontent throughout the country. Therefore unless the Government change their policy and try to create confidence in themselves they will find that, before they can consider the question of granting Dominion status, India will get independence by itself. (Hear, hear.) I have taken this trouble to sound a note of warning, because the methods of Government must be radically changed, if they want to live with the goodwill of the people of this country. I hope, Sir, in the year to come—when this House, as I take it will give them supplies—if they want to serve India in the best interests of India, as pointed out by the Honourable the Finance Member, they will find that their policy must be guided by the best brains in this country. Sir, let the Government say that their name is a misnomer. Let them make it clear before this House, and I for my part would be perfectly satisfied, let them say that they are not the Government of India but that they are the Government of England in India. If they were to put their name in that way, I am sure every one in this House would at least give them credit for honesty, because this is the only name of that Government with the present policy that they are pursuing. Whenever the question of 1s. 4d. or 1s. 6d. comes in, they have got to look as to how it will affect England. The Honourable the Finance Member says, rightly or wrongly, we must stick to 1s. 6d. Why should he have made

[Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla.]

that statement as such an early stage? Why should he not have gone into the whole question and have taken credit for at least considering the whole question in all its aspects? Instead of adopting that policy, he says 1s. 6d. will remain, so long as I remain the Finance Member of the Government of India.

Take the Commerce Department, the Department of the Honourable Sir George Rainy. When the question about the mill industry came up in the Simla session before last, the Honourable Sir George Rainy was not even considering England. He was considering the interests of Japan, with the result that the mill industry in India was suffering and was going from bad to worse. I hope, Sir, if they only change their policy, if they realise that they are doing something good for India, then they must behave in a manner which will inspire confidence in the minds of the people. Otherwise you can only carry on the Government, as pointed out by Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, by martial law and by certification. ("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches.) It will ultimately come to that.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It has already come to that.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas rightly pointed out on a similar occasion last year, I think, that it was the Government policy that was driving the independent thinkers to the Swarajist point of view, simply because the policy of the Government of India is not in the best interests of this country. (Hear, hear.) I hope, Sir, that the Government will revise their policy and see that, if they want to serve the best interests of India, then their policy for the next year must radically change, and it must be radically different. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, in his very able speech has again made a reference to the Mussalmans or the majority of Mussalmans who, it is said, are selling the country by getting some jobs of a ministerial character. I take strong exception again to that statement.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The Honourable gentleman does not seem to have been present or he does not seem to have been listening to me when I was speaking. He should not impute a statement to me which I never made.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: I am sorry if I have imputed any motive. But he did say the Sind block was selling the country by voting with the Government. He did say that. What is the use of making a statement and then saying that he never did so.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The Honourable gentleman does not seem to be aware that there are nearly four Hindu Members from Sindh. Why does he take upon himself the task of defending them?

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: I say the majority of them are Mussalmans.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I did not refer to them alone.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: What is the use of saying one thing and then explaining that he did not mean it or that he meant something else? He did say that the majority of the Mussalmans were blindly voting with the Government in the Government Lobby and they were selling the

country. He said that the Mussalmans suffer to the extent of 12 crores, and yet the Honourable Member says he did not abuse them. What is the use of disguising the fact?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I say so emphatically. I was referring to the Sind block and the non-Brahmin group and not to the Sindh Mussalmans alone.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: The majority of the Sindh block is comprised of Mussalmans. What is the use of saying one thing and then turning round and explaining that he did not mean it? This point has been debated elsewhere, apart from this House, and the Honourable Member cannot interrupt me like that.

Sir Hugh Cocks (Bombay: European): Is the Honourable Member then prepared to withdraw his remark that the Honourable Member, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, made an able speech.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: No, I am not. Most of his speech was quite right except this which I am criticising. (Laughter and Applause from the Swarajist Benches.) I said the speech was able, though some of the facts were wrong. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, I wish particularly to draw the attention of the Government to this point. Why are the Mussalmans voting with you, as pointed out by Mr. Mehta? Now, Sir, what the Mussalmans are asking is opportunity for service according to the population in the country. Whenever a Mussalman asks for service in the various departments, he is immediately dubbed a communalist. What is the question? What is it exactly that the Mussalmans are asking from the various Governments, Provincial and Central? At present what are the facts? The facts are that all the services under the garb of Indianisation are in the hands of the caste Hindus.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Hear, hear!

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: This is what the Mussalmans strongly object to. (Hear, hear.) They say that they want to drive away communalism that exists in the various departments of Government.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Quite right.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Is it for this that they should be dubbed communalists? On the other hand, those responsible for the appointments should be dubbed communalists because, their subordinate officers being caste Hindus

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: They only entertain the claims of caste Hindu candidates. I say, Sir, this is the reason why the Mussalmans are asking for representation in the services. If there was independence for India, as Diwan Chaman Lall would like to have, then Mussalmans would have no need for asking for separate representation. They could then settle their differences with their Hindu brethren ("Hear, hear" from the Swarajist Benches.) It is because they are going to be used both by Hindus and the Government, it is because they have been caught between two rival candidates for trusteeship and for the future governance, it is because of this, that the Mussalmans want separate representation. Sir,

[Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla.]

what is the response which the Mussalmans have received from the Government of India in the various departments? Nothing. Absolutely no response. Now, if this year the Government do not change their policy, we will have to adopt only one course. (*Several Honourable Members from the Swarajist Benches*: "Come and join us.") Only one course is open to us, and that is to leave the Government, whatever their merits may be, and to stand on our own legs, and we shall fight every one, unless our demands or safeguards as formulated in the Delhi Conference are accepted by either of them or both. This is the position of the Mussalmans today, and they will stand on their own legs, they will formulate their own demands, and say exactly what they want in any future constitution of this country. I therefore say that, in spite of the promise of Lord Reading that 33 per cent. would be given as representation to the Mussalmans in various services, the figures which were supplied to me by my friend Maulvi Abdul Matin Chowdhury the other day reveal quite a contrary aspect. It is not communalism that they want, but they want to drive away the communalism which at present exists in the various Departments of the Government.

Sir, I shall now mention one point which has been agitating the minds of some of us. A practice has grown, Sir, amongst the Government Members to consult Party Leaders and decide what action they should take or what persons should be nominated to the various Committees which Government are appointing. I say, Sir, that that method is radically wrong and should be done away with. (Hear, hear.) The Government Members are under the impression that they are consulting the Party, whereas, in reality, they are consulting only the Leaders in their individual capacity, and not the Parties concerned. (Hear, hear.) I mention it particularly because my attention was pointedly drawn to it by Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji with reference to the banking inquiry. If they want to consult the party

Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhamadan Rural): As a matter of personal explanation, Sir. I may say that I did not draw the attention of my friend Mr. Rahimtulla to the fact that the Honourable the Finance Member was consulting the Party Leaders personally or individually. All that I discussed with him was the question whether he was consulted by the Leader of his Party with reference to this Committee; and he told me that he knew nothing about it. That is all the conversation we had.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: Sir, this is exactly what I am saying. My attention was drawn to it, and I was asked whether my Party was consulted, as such, on a particular question; and I told him that, so far as I was aware, no Party meeting was called for and I knew nothing about it. That is exactly my grievance.

An Honourable Member: Why did you not consult your Leader?

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: I have consulted my own Leader and Deputy Leader. When they give their opinion, they don't give it on

behalf of the Party, nor do they consult the Party at a meeting. This is exactly my point. If the Members of the Government want to consult our Leaders, let them consult them—we have not the least objection to that. But if they say anything on behalf of the Party, I say that is not a correct statement. I do not find fault with the Government Members for consulting the Leaders; let them consult them by all means, but let them not be under the wrong impression that the Parties have been officially consulted. If they want the opinions of the Parties as such, they should write letters to the Secretaries of the Parties and then decide for themselves as to what is the best course. Sir, apart from the Party Leaders, the Government are deliberately ignoring people who do not belong to any Party in this House. I say, Sir, this is not also the right policy. The policy for the Government is to decide for themselves what the best thing is, and arrive at such decision after due consultation.

Now, Sir, let me go to the last but not the least question—the question of the North-West Frontier. I am glad, Sir, that, although my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta had the misfortune, I have the good fortune of finding Sir Denys Bray in his seat now. Sir, he in his speech . . .

Diwan Chaman Lall: We know it. Leave it to Sir Denys Bray himself.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: I am referring to the speech of Sir Denys Bray

Diwan Chaman Lall: I say leave it alone in your speech.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: If you have patience, kindly listen. My friend Sir Denys Bray took a great delight in communalism. Yes, I say he took delight, because he quoted a speech by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, which he ought to have quoted a year before. He omitted what Lala Rajpat Rai said last year as the Leader of the Nationalist Party on the floor of the House. My friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was prevented from making his speech in this House, as he was in the Chair at the time; but he proved that he was with us by voting with us in the same lobby. If proof were needed, there it was; but the Government of India do not require any proof. They take delight in communalism. (Hear, hear.) They take pleasure in the divide and rule policy, and they find out speeches, paragraphs and quotations which will suit their own purposes for the time being, without judging the whole question as such. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will pause before adopting this attitude in future. It is all very well to indulge in a flowery style, to delight in the use of rhetorical oration—as I will put it—and to see that the substance is not what it ought to be. (Hear, hear.) They must have read the *Hindustan Times*, one of the well-known papers of this place. Am I or am I not to understand that in the despatch which was published, there was the correct view of the Government of India on the North-West Frontier policy? What is the good of saying that the Government is still considering the question? What is the good of saying that the Simon Commission is considering the question, when the Government of India have already made up their minds that the North-West Frontier Province should not have the same kind of Reforms as are existing or as will come into force in the other provinces of India? May I tell the Government, Sir, that it is this policy that is bringing restlessness between the Hindus and Muhammadans? If they would settle amicably

[Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla.]

the question of their policy in regard to the North-West Frontier Province, if they would convince this House that the Government have changed their policy so far as that province is concerned, then I might say that there would be little difficulty in adjusting the differences between the two great communities of India. Therefore, if anybody is standing in the way of good understanding between the two great communities of India, I say it is the Government (Hear, hear), especially the Political Department of the Government of India, of which Sir Denys Bray is the Secretary.

Sir, I think I have taken up a good deal of the time of the House (*Honourable Members*: "No, no"), but I thought it was necessary to place the facts before the Government. When we are voting supplies, we are not voting without making suggestions regarding the policy of the Government, we are voting for the Finance Bill, because we want not only to give them supplies but also to direct their policy. It must be definitely understood that we are not voting for the continuance of the present policy of Government. I therefore support the motion before the House, Sir.

Mr. Abdul Haya (East Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir,

*"Nah samjhoge to mit jaoge ai Hindustan walo.
Tumhari dastan tak bhi neh hogi dastanon men."*

"Ye Indians, if you shall not realise responsibility to unite you shall be obliterated from this world and after you no chronicler shall even relate your story."

It is after a long time, Sir, that I have decided to open my lips in this House, and the first thing that I have to say today is that, after hearing the speeches yesterday and today, and after reading the description of those ugly scenes which were enacted last week, when the Leader of the Opposition and my chief, Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, were altercationing with each other, after reading a description of what happened in this Assembly, I consider it is no honour to be a Member of this unfortunate House. Where do we stand today?

A Swarajist Member: Where we did a long time ago!

Mr. Abdul Haya: Where were we in 1924? I am not enamoured of this Assembly. I am not very keen upon delivering speeches, because it pains me to find that here, in this House, where we have been sent by our constituencies to fight the cause of the country and to win freedom for our people, we are content to indulge in internecine quarrels. We are reduced to this now, that, instead of standing together, we are almost every day attacking one another. And what is the programme before my friends, the Mussalman Members? What do they now propose to do? My friend Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla says that he is willing to support this Finance Bill. The other Mussalman Members perhaps are willing to go to the same lobby with the Government. (*Swarajist Members*: "Not all.") I know that there are others who will follow Pandit Motilal Nehru, even if he takes them to the wilderness. And what does my friend Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla want? He says more services for the Mussalmans. I know, and when I say this I speak with authority,

that in the matter of services, the rights of Mussalmans are being trampled underfoot and the responsibility lies equally upon the Government as well as upon the majority community who for all intents and purposes hold the monopoly of these services. But before I criticise them, before I urge the claims of my community on them, the first thing that I have to say to my community is this. You are weak. You are unprepared. Perhaps some of the things you want you do not deserve. Remember the weaker must go to the wall. It is true that your legitimate rights are being ignored and denied. But is it not your own fault? You are not strong enough to protect yourselves. The rights of a strong person, the rights of a strong community cannot be denied. So what is happening in India today is this, that an alien bureaucracy with the help of an army, guns and aeroplanes, is keeping down a whole country, is keeping down a whole nation, whose rights are being denied to them because that nation is divided. They cannot present a united front to the bureaucracy. But so far as the Muhammadans are concerned, they are between the devil and the deep sea. Just as an alien Government is keeping down a nation, so here we have the case of an *imperium in imperio*. The majority community, which has got a monopoly, is keeping down a minority community, and neither the Government, nor the Hindu majority community, will help the helpless Mussalmans. If my Honourable friends, Sir, today, are going into the same lobby with the Government, I ask, have they considered what the Government have done for them during the last ten years? What have the Government done for them? It is painful to speak of the North-West Frontier Province. Reforms to that Province were not denied by Lala Lajpat Rai or by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya alone. The bureaucracy and Sir Denys Bray are equally to blame. So under the circumstances what are we to do? Shall we support you?

Swarajist Members: Why should you?

Mr. Abdul Haya: Have we received a gesture from you or shall we sell our freedom and our liberty for the sake of a few jobs? ("Hear, hear" from the Swarajist Benches.) It is all very well to say "Hear, hear!", but what have you done either? (*Swarajist Members:* "What can we do?") You talk of the Nehru Report, and you are proud that you have one dozen Mussalmans at the back of that Report. The number of the supporters of the Nehru Report can be counted on the tips of one's fingers; and still that poisonous pill is being forced down our throats against our will. I know the names of the Moslem supporters of the Nehru Report that were mentioned the other day in this House by Pandit Motilal Nehru. Some of them are very eminent persons, who have rendered service to the country. There are others who have rendered service in the past to the Government and to themselves; but there are others whom I, for one, cannot trust even with a single copper coin. My Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta yesterday said that 99 per cent. of the people of India want the British to leave India immediately, without bag and baggage.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: With bag and baggage.

Mr. Abdul Haya: No, he said without bag and baggage.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Without.

Mr. Abdul Haya: He wants to retain the bag and baggage.

Mr. K. Ahmed: For himself!

Mr. Abdul Haya: He wants to retain the baggage of the bureaucracy so that, after their departure, the Hindus and Muhammadans may fight over it. I say, is this a correct statement of fact? Have you got the country behind you?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Yes.

Mr. Abdul Haya: Is Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya prepared to support you in this statement?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is not necessary. I speak from my own knowledge.

Mr. Abdul Haya: Is your own chief, Pandit Motilal Nehru, prepared to subscribe to this statement after having subscribed to the Nehru Report? Is he not now for Dominion status? You come forward with these statements and you say the whole country is behind you. I am prepared to say that none of those gentlemen who sit on the Benches on my right is prepared to support you. (*An Honourable Member:* "Every one.") Are the Muslims today with you?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is my view.

Mr. Abdul Haya: That is your view. If you want to deceive yourself you are at liberty to do so.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: So are you.

Mr. Abdul Haya: It is no use calling upon the Muslims to support you in a game where you think they are to be used as mere pawns. For my part I am certainly not prepared to say anything on the floor of this House that may retard the progress of this country; but the first and the foremost thing that you have got to do, the most important thing that you have so far failed to do is to make up the differences that exist between the Hindus and the Muslims. Was it not I who spoke a note of warning, as far back as 1925, that the bureaucracy is counting upon our differences, and that a time will come when the Hindus and Muslims of India, instead of attacking the bureaucracy, will prefer to kick one another? Has not that come true? Was it not I who gave notice of a Resolution that no Royal Commission should be appointed until the Hindus and Muslims had made up their differences and prepared a constitution for themselves? With the Simon Commission at your door, you have been misbehaving. With the Simon Commission amongst you, you have been fighting. You have been trying to throw dust into the eyes of the Government and of the Commission and of the people of India. It is a patent fact—nobody can deny it—that we are disunited. We cannot carry our will, we cannot secure a victory. Are you prepared today to make amends for the past? Are you prepared today to sit this evening and settle this matter once for all? It is no use saying that the Nehru Report is the final say in the matter. The Muslims may be mistaken, but the fact is that an overwhelming majority of the Muslims do not subscribe to that Report. You have got to take it to heart; that you have got to bury it before you can rally round the Muslims under your standard, and you have got to unearth that precious document which you have so far ignored, that Bengal Pact of Mr. C. R. Das. It is only on those conditions that

we can come round. If that cannot be done, then we must all be content to meet the fate which is destined for a country which is disunited.

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

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

Mr. Anwar-ul-Asim (Chittagong Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I personally had no desire to take part in a debate where my intentions are likely to be misunderstood. I have watched, with a very great amount of interest, what has been going on here during the last two or three days on the motion before the House, and that is in connection with the consideration of the Finance Bill. I am on my feet, Sir, only to point out one or two facts which have appealed to me most and they have also pained me much. I am one of those, who, by tradition, culture and family connections, believe in the British connection. Anyhow Sir, I hope my friends both on the right and the left, will not misjudge me if I happen to use any immoderate words out of sheer anxiety and despair.

I have listened with a great amount of interest to the observations made by the various speakers who have preceded me, but one thing that singularly struck me most the other day in connection with the debate on the North West Frontier Province, was the observations made by my friend Mr. B. Das, whom I like and love. Mr. B. Das, Sir, not knowing perhaps by going to raise a worm he was digging up a scorpion. He mentioned incidentally while narrating the tale of his own province about the willingness of the people of Eastern Bengal to be joined with the people of Western Bengal. Sir, the truth lies the other way. The fact of the matter is that it is now common knowledge, it is a matter of history.—we were school children then perhaps belonging to some small classes.—that the annulment of the partition of Bengal has hit hard particularly the people of my community. That was, Sir, in 1912, and that of course is a very old story. But later on, Sir, you know, as a Member of the old Imperial Legislative Council, as a valiant defender of the rights of Indians, the bellicose Government of Lord Hardinge in their wisdom annulled the partition, to stop the Swadeshi agitation of the late Sir Surendranath Banerjee, and Mr. B. Das had the hardihood to say that it was the strongly expressed desire of the people of Eastern Bengal to be joined with the people of Western Bengal, that brought about the annulment. The mischief that has been done to my people by the annulment was not realised by the authors who did the mischief in the first instance. If you had a well organised province in the Eastern part of this country, there would have been no necessity to keep a standing army on your south-eastern frontier. If you had a strong Government with headquarters either at Dacca or at Chittagong, I can assure the Government of India there need not have been any fear in their minds on this score of safety.

[Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim.]

Now, Sir, there is another matter about which I should like to say a word, and that is with regard to the castigations made by my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta against my people. He said that the Muslim people have boycotted the Simon Commission. Sir, as the Leader of my Party is not here, I want to repudiate this suggestion, and say that the Muslims have not boycotted the Simon Commission. As a matter of fact, we would very much like to give another chance to Government to show their honesty of purpose. That is not all, Sir. We in our heart of hearts on this side believe that there is justice in this world; there is fairplay in this world. We also believe, Sir, that there are people still living in this world,—they might be living at distances 6,000 miles away,—who believe in the honesty of purpose of the Muslim community, and we on our side are anxious to give another chance to the Simon Commission. One of the most brilliant Governors of my Province, Sir, has said this—perhaps Honourable Members on all sides will take note of this because it concerns them most. This is what he says:

"It was from a Muhammadan sovereign that the East India Company acquired their rights in three of the richest provinces of India, and it was a Muhammadan sovereign whose paramount position was recognised by them when they inscribed his name and insignia upon their coins. The Muhammadans, in other words, were the ruling race from whom Mahratta and other Hindu chiefs were proud to accept their titles. Their historical importance cannot, indeed, be gainsaid, and their political importance is equally well founded. No more loyal community is to be found in the Empire today; no community in India has provided more or better fighting material for the forces of the Crown. But beyond all this, it must be borne in mind that the followers of Islam extend far beyond the confines of the Indian Continent. The Muhammadans of India are connected by ties of religion, tradition and race with the whole of Western Asia, right away to the Atlantic—countries where the prestige of England stands high now, and where England is recognised as the champion of justice and fairplay."

Sir, this is the sentiment of an English Earl, and on these we have based our hopes for getting recognition of our statutory rights in the next constitution. This is the idea that still reigns in the minds of Englishmen at home. With this view, we have thought it wise to give an opportunity to the Simon Commission. (*An Honourable Member*: "Louder please.") It is not my purpose, I repeat, to embarrass the Government of India, but if the few words that I say are unpalatable I cannot help it. The other day, Mr. Ranga Iyer criticising the speech of my esteemed friend, Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, was rather passing some sarcastic remarks at our expense. He said that perhaps, if the people whom the Maulvi Saheb represents, are gate-keepers, they are not fit to find a place in the palace. Well, Sir, without shocking what is called the sentiments of my Honourable friends in this House, I may say that the forefathers of Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur received homage from the Hindus as "the great Moghul of Delhi is the God himself". Mr. Ranga Iyer conveniently forgets that I do not think that I should be supposed to be emulating the example of my Swarajist friends in taking up time of the House and thus giving an advantage to delay the consideration of this Bill. As these few points were very much agitating my mind I have stood up to unburden them.

There is one very significant appeal made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Haye, in his speech, and it is this. If anybody is to be

guided in his worldly policy as a worldly man, not being a saint, of course, he will say, give some credit for the past. Mr. Abdul Haye was addressing his friends on the right side, and said very rightly that they were standing between us and those who had got the power to give anything they liked. I think there is a great truth in that as far as it goes, because really there was a time when Mr. Abdul Haye's people were great Emperors, and the Hindus served them. These Hindu friends on the right whom he was addressing would not rest content until the time when they got absolute power, and it is absolutely human to feed fat on ancient grudge from Hindu standard. But I thought that after so many hundreds of years, we should be in a position to forget the past and follow the policy of live and let live. The Mussalmans treated the Hindus well, but it seems that we are not coming to that. Mr. Abdul Haye also referred to a very great Indian, who is the glory of my province. He invoked the name of the late Mr. C. R. Das. We all mourn his loss. My point is this. Knowing as I do a little of this world, it would have served the purpose of my Honourable friends on the right, if they had followed the policy of the late Mr. C. R. Das, and not beat about the bush and played all sorts of camouflages and make-believe stunts. Mr. C. R. Das, statesman as he was, great man as he was, philosopher and poet as he was,—could easily diagnose what was the real trouble, and as a result of that foresight he agreed to an understanding or a convention, or whatever you may call it, with the Moslems—and it was the Bengal Pact, and my only advice to my friends on the right is, "Follow Mr. C. R. Das. Try to emulate his example and act up to it. You are likely to get what you want".

Mr. K. O. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I want to bring the House back to the Finance Bill, if I may.
 3 P.M. (Honourable Members: "Hear, hear.") I have heard the exclamations and expressions of surprise from the non-official European Benches at the turn that the debate has taken, and in an interesting speech, my Honourable friend Mr. Fazal Rahimtulla also gave us his views regarding the propriety of raising all the various points that have been raised in the debate on this occasion.

I have been long enough in this House to remember the day when we first made a beginning in the establishment of the convention under which we are discussing the Indian Finance Bill today. In the year 1921 it was not the intention of the Government that the Finance Bill should be an annual event. It was in response to a non-official amendment that it was agreed that, although there might not be any change in the taxation, the Finance Bill should be an annual event, in order that this House might have the opportunity of asking Government to render an account of their stewardship in all the various departments of the Government, and in order to enable the House, if necessary, to pass a vote of no-confidence by even rejecting the Finance Bill. When we established that convention, in the simplicity of our heart—we in those days were simple-minded people, Mr. Jammadas Mehta had not yet strayed into this House—in our simplicity of heart we imagined that we had established a convention of very great constitutional importance. We thought that, whereas in the field of expenditure the control exercised by this House was restricted to a very small proportion of the money

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

that the Government needed for carrying on its operations, here under this convention, the House would have the fullest control of the purse strings of Government; and we imagined that, although the distinction between voted and non-voted items might continue in the demands for grants, so long as we could control the purse strings of Government, we had nothing to complain about. Nine years have rolled by since and what do we find today? The control exercised by this House is, if anything, becoming more and more illusory. Even though the Finance Member made a declaration, I believe, in the year 1922, that taxation would never be undertaken, except with the consent of this House, what has happened? Whenever we have attempted to reduce taxation under any head, all our attempts have been baffled by the extraordinary powers possessed by the head of the administration. Thus the whole procedure has been reduced almost to a mockery. There is the annual nine days' wonder when we walk and talk and achieve nothing.

Now, Sir, I will not, for the present, examine the result of the constitutional control that this House may have exercised over all the various departments of Government. I will confine myself to one or two revenue-earning departments of Government. So far as the spending departments are concerned, the control that may be exercised through the agency of the Finance Bill is bound to be remote; but what about the control over the revenue earning departments like the Salt or the Customs Departments? Well, the Assembly has been asking for a revision of the entire revenue policy of the Government, particularly urging that the customs tariff should be based on a scientific and rational footing. What has been the result? All these years we have been pressing this demand, and yet we are now in the very same position in which we were when we started. Sir, I will refer to a few instances just to illustrate how futile have been our efforts in the direction of reforming the policy of Government with regard to revenue matters. I will first of all take a very recent instance, an instance which must be fresh in the minds of Honourable Members. It is only the other day that we had to deal with a Bill to amend the Tariff Act as a result of a report of the Indian Tariff Board regarding the question of giving protection to the manufacture of electric wires and cables. In their Report on this subject the Tariff Board make this significant observation:

"The revenue policy of the Government of India, by which customs duties, imposed primarily for revenue purposes, have been altered without due consideration of the effects of such changes on the industries concerned, is partly responsible for the company's difficulties."

The reference here is to the request made by a particular company for the protection of that industry, and when we turn to the representation itself, we find that, in this particular instance, import duties that used to be imposed on this particular article were suddenly lowered as the result of a suggestion made by a British manufacturer who was interested in the import trade of this country. This is what we find:

"We, however, find that the Indian Government, at the request of the British Electric and Allied Manufacturers Association, have reduced the import duties on all wires and cables having a copper sectional area above, etc., etc. . . . and thus, unless some change is made very quickly, given the death blow to any Indian industry in this line of business."

Sir, this shows that in regard to the tariff policy of the Government, if it is a question of choosing between the interests of a British concern and the interests of an Indian concern, the interests of the Indian concern must give way.

Now, Sir, I will give another illustration with regard to the practical working of the tariff policy of Government. Reference has already been made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, to the action taken by Government on the Report of the Tariff Board, which dealt with the question of giving protection to the textile industry of this country. The Tariff Board, after making an elaborate investigation, made a report recommending that certain steps be taken. When the matter came up before this House, the Government had turned down all those proposals. They had their own scheme which they placed before the House for acceptance. That scheme was not made public before the actual measure was introduced in this House, with the result that the textile industry is not satisfied, and incidentally a struggling cottage industry is being hit hard. The Honourable the Commerce Member went down to Bombay to discuss the question after the publication of the Tariff Board Report. He consulted the Bombay Chamber of Commerce. He consulted the Bombay Millowners' Association, and one of the conclusions at which he arrived was that, in order to give some relief to the textile industry, it was necessary to lower the import duties, which the artificial silk yarn used to pay. This was altogether a new proposal. It was never broached before the Textile Tariff Board. It was never before the public. But fortified with the support that he got in Bombay, he comes to Simla and springs a surprise on the country, by proposing to reduce the duty on artificial silk yarn by half. Well, I raised my feeble voice against it, in the interests of the silk industry of this country, and my voice was drowned by the opposition not only of Government, but also of a section of the non-official Members of this House. Later on, the Agricultural Commission came out. They had to go into this very question, and they pointed out that these artificial silk imports are a real menace to the silk industry of this country. I drew the attention of the Honourable the Commerce Member to the observations of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. He said, "Oh, these people did not know what they were talking about". This is the kind of opinion that my Honourable friend has of a Royal Commission. He thought that the Commission had no evidence to support their conclusion. What is the evidence that the Honourable Member himself has got? He has not obliged us with that yet. He says, "Oh, the difference in price between artificial silk and real silk is so very great that it cannot be imagined how there can be any kind of competition between them!" Theories and abstract considerations like these are the only justification for Government for lowering this duty. The result of this action has been that the importation of this article has gone up by leaps and bounds, and our inquiries that I could make in my province, and also from my friends who ought to know, and in the neighbouring province of Bihar and Orissa, as also from people who know anything about the Benares silk industry, I find that this artificial silk yarn is really competing with the natural silk product. It is being used largely for purposes of adulteration, and I will say that it has even invaded Kashmir. The Honourable the Commerce Member said, if the situation is so very serious, why do not the

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

Provincial Governments complain? Now, when we put forward any suggestion for any concrete action being taken in any matter, we are very often put off by the statement, "Oh, we must consult Provincial Governments. How do you expect us to make any statement or take any action before we can find out what the provinces have to say about it?" What about this instance? The Honourable Member says, "I am going to do whatever I like. I will be guided entirely by my instincts and whatever advice I get from the Bombay Chamber of Commerce, I don't care tuppence for the Provincial Governments. If they find that these duties are unjust, why don't they come up before us with some evidence." That is the tariff policy of the Government of India.

Now this is an instance which shows that, if there is a conflict of interest between a very powerfully organised industry and a cottage industry, the interests of the cottage industry must give way.

Now, Sir, the third instance which I will give, will be in regard to the export duty on jute. Here is an instance which will show that, if the interests of the Central Government and a Provincial Government conflict, the interests of the Provincial Government must give way. Sir, the export duty on jute was imposed as a sort of war measure, an emergency measure, which was needed to provide Government with additional funds that were required at that time. Within a year of its first imposition, the rates were absolutely doubled. No inquiries were made at the time as to the incidence of this taxation, as to who actually was paying it, but elaborate defence has been attempted since, with the object of proving that it is the foreign consumer that is paying this tax, and that it does not fall on the agriculturists in this country. It is stated that as jute is a monopoly of this country, the duty is obviously passed on to the consumer.

Now, Sir, if the Government actually care to find out the true position in this matter, if they only care to go through the evidence that has been recorded before the Agricultural Commission, they will find that the position is so complicated that it is absolutely impossible for anybody to say, with confidence, that the agriculturist, the producer of this so-called monopoly commodity, actually derives all the profits to which he is entitled. As a matter of fact it is common knowledge that, although jute is not grown anywhere else, the producer is at the mercy of the consumer. It is as easy as anything for Government to find out the truth in this matter, if only they care to.

Now, Sir, what has been the justification for denying to Bengal its share of the taxation which actually comes out of the pockets of the producer? The Government say, "It does not matter whether we derive this income from a commodity which is grown exclusively in Bengal, so long as the duty does not come out of your pocket. It may be passed on to the consumer, so that there can be no legitimate complaint on your part that you do not get this revenue." But we challenge the Government to undertake a careful and exclusive inquiry into this matter, and then tell me whether this tax is really paid by the consumer. If it is not, then surely the Central Government has absolutely no right to appropriate this large income from this particular source.

Sir, I will next come to the question of Salt. I will not for the present moment deal with the inglorious history of the salt duty. I think we had enough of it on the last occasion, when we had a full debate on this question on Mr. Kelkar's motion for a reduction, and we will have another opportunity of discussing the matter when we go into the amendments of this Bill. I will, for my present purpose, confine myself to the question of the administration of the Salt Department. And I deliberately level a charge against Government of having obtained money for so-called schemes of improvement in connection with the Northern India Salt Revenue Department, on representations which have, in the end, turned out to be false. If the Honourable the Finance Member will care to look into earlier debates, he will find that when this Department was in the administrative control of Sir Charles Innes, and before him, Sir Thomas Holland, the Assembly was called upon to vote large sums of money for undertaking certain schemes of improvement, on the supposition that those schemes would enable Government to "flood the country with cheap salt". I am quoting the exact words of those Honourable gentlemen, "flood the country with cheap salt". The country has yet to be flooded with salt, and far from salt being cheapened, the price of salt has been enhanced by Government during the last 2 or 3 years. And the Honourable Member will find, if he turns to the accounts of the Northern India Salt Revenue Department, that as a direct result of the introduction of these schemes of improvement, the cost of operation has gone up tremendously and that the Department is working at a loss, in spite of the fact that the price of salt has been increased by Government.

Now when this question came up before the Public Accounts Committee, this increase in the cost of operation was sought to be explained away by the departmental authorities on the plea that it was merely the result of the introduction of commercial accountancy, but the Auditor General promptly pointed out then and there that the deficit was exactly equivalent to the additional interest charges on the additional capital that was required for the financing of these so-called improvement schemes. So, there is no getting away from the fact that these improvement schemes, far from producing the results expected from them, have actually made salt dearer and the output has not been increased to any appreciable extent. Various defences are now tried to be put in on behalf of the Salt Department, but you cannot get away from the fact that these large amounts were obtained from this House practically on false representations. Now, Sir, I do hope that the Honourable the Finance Member, who is directly responsible for the administration of this Department, will very carefully look into what has been going on. He will find enough material to engage him if he were to look up the Public Accounts Committee's reports and the debate that we had last year about this time on the Sambhar salt accounts as also the Audit and Appropriation Accounts of the Government of India.

Sir, I do not want to take up the time of the House any more than I can absolutely help. I will now refer to the proposed banking inquiry. I do not know whether the Honourable the Finance Member has received a telegram from an organisation, known as the Bengal Bankers' Federation, which represents nearly 600 small banking institutions, all public limited concerns. It has been ascertained that the total working fund of these 600 banks, or loan offices as they are sometimes called, can be estimated at about 24 crores of rupees. These are not, after all, institutions which can be absolutely neglected by the Honourable Member and in a manifesto

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

which this body, that is, the Bankers' Federation, published sometime back they gave expression to their fear as to what the ultimate upshot of this inquiry might be like. They apprehended that the main intention with which the Bengal Chamber of Commerce initiated the idea at a conference held for the purpose of considering this question, was to restrict the present facilities which are enjoyed by these small banking institutions. They are very much afraid that the counsels of these bigger capitalist interests might, in the end, prevail with the Government, with the result that the activities of these very useful institutions might be crippled. Sir, in a telegram which they sent to the Honourable the Finance Member, of which I have got a copy, they specifically made the suggestion that representatives of this institution should be allowed to be present at any informal conference which the Government might have for the purpose of settling the terms of reference and the constitution of the inquiry committee. It does not seem that the Honourable Member has seen his way to accede to this request. May I point out to him that the banking interests of Bengal are, in so far as the indigenous system is concerned, represented largely by this particular body, and in all fairness they should be heard before anything definite is done in regard to settling the terms of reference and the constitution of the proposed inquiry committee.

Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Tarit Bhusan Roy, speaking yesterday on this motion, made reference to the unsatisfactory condition of the present financial arrangements, known as the Meston settlement. Any one seeking truly to represent the interest of Bengal, cannot let slip this opportunity of referring to this question. I have spoken so often on this subject, that I do not think I will be justified in repeating all that I said in the past, but I will just make a few submissions under this head. The position has been very well summed up by His Excellency the Governor of Bengal in a speech which he very recently delivered in Calcutta, where he said that:

"Something like 45 per cent. of the total revenues of the Central Government comes from Bengal, and, at the same time, she finds herself with scarcely any money to run her own administration."

That, in short, is the position to which we find ourselves reduced under the present financial arrangements. It really surprises me how the Central Government can be so callous of the interests of the two provinces, which are industrially and commercially advanced, namely Bengal and Bombay, through whose agency they derive a very large proportion of their income. The policy of the Central Government can be described as that of starving the goose that lays the golden eggs for them. Sir, any one seeking truly to represent the interests of Bengal will not be true to himself, unless he emphasizes the very great injustice which the present financial settlement works against Bengal; and any one who seeks to represent the interests of Bengal cannot justly support the Central Government in raising revenues for their purposes, when he finds that the province which contributes a very large proportion, in fact the largest proportion, of the Central Government's income, is asked to go about in rags and tatters.

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I oppose this Finance Bill. I really feel, Sir, with one or two of the previous speakers that this Finance Bill is almost an apology for the Appropriation Bill, a real Appropriation Bill which

is discussed elsewhere in a real Parliament. I advisedly say real Parliament, in spite of the fact that the Honourable author of that book, which has become famous in this session—whom I do not find in his place just now—in spite of his calling this House the Parliament of India, and in spite also of the fact that you have actually a street, leading from this ill-shaped house, called the "Parliament Street", I really find that this is after all not a real Parliament, because, if it were one, then certainly this kind of Finance Bill would not be presented to the House.

Sir, there are two or three main features of the financial position, as we see it, which I propose to take up for discussion just now. The foremost and the main feature of the financial position is the scheme of taxation that we have at present. Sir, the scheme of taxation,—there is really no rational policy lying underneath it—is so badly devised that unfortunately it weighs more heavily on the poor, which is no doubt in consonance with the Biblical statement, "To him that hath more shall be given, and from him that hath not, even the little that he hath shall be taken away from him". That is exactly the position of the scheme of taxation in this country.

In this connection, I would quote a statement from the *Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India* by Professors K. T. Shah and Khambata. They find, after a thorough investigation of the entire scheme of taxation obtaining in this country, that the poorer classes, numbering more than two-thirds of the total section of the population, are shown to bear nearly 60 per cent. of the total revenue burden, while the richer, numbering less than one-third of the total population, and having more than two-thirds of the total wealth produced in India, bear only about 40 per cent. of the revenue burden. That is the anomaly, Sir, which the present scheme of taxation of this country leads to. I submit, Sir, that it is more or less taken to be admitted that the masses of the country are suffering under chronic poverty. Abject poverty and helplessness is the real situation, and yesterday my Honourable friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, when placing before the House the state of coolies in some of the plantations, made prominent this fact, that the lower classes were really on the brink of starvation, and also that they were suffering from chronic mal-nutrition.

Now, I seriously ask the Government, what is it that the Honourable the Finance Member has done, or what is it, that the Treasury Benches have really done, to alleviate the sufferings of these classes? What is it that they have really done under the budget presented to the House year after year, not only to relieve that burden, but also to raise the standard of comfort and the standard of living? Absolutely nothing. In fact, Sir, this year's was the longest of the budget speeches that I have heard. It took nearly two hours for the Honourable the Finance Member to read his speech. Throughout the whole of that speech, which I have been reading with great care, I have not been able to find one single proposal towards raising the standard of living of the poorer classes of this country. If that is the situation, it is nothing strange that there is distress in the rural parts. You have got the agrarian unrest and you have got the industrial unrest. I almost envy, Sir, the pleasant siesta which the Honourable the Home Member is enjoying at present. The Honourable the Home Member said, on another occasion, that the present unrest, agrarian and industrial, is due, not to the present scheme of taxation, for which the Government are responsible, but to the promulgation of communistic ideas in this country. That is but another handle for the Honourable the Home Member.

[Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar.]

Sir, speaking very recently in Calcutta on the 30th of January last, under the auspices of the Bengal Economic Society, Sir Daniel Hamilton said:

"I have no hesitation in saying that 75 per cent. of the present unrest has its root in the villages of India."

Let the Honourable the Home Member controvert these words and find out whether the statement he made the other day in another connection is really borne out by another critic, who has been staying here long, and who has really studied the conditions obtaining in this country and made these statements based on such study. He continues, Sir, and says that:

"The Indian ryot would like to fly from the village of destruction in which he now lives and reach the village celestial."

Sir, why is this village rendered a village of destruction now? Who is responsible for it? Only one answer is possible, and that is the Government of India. Sir Daniel Hamilton finds that the Indian ryot is really for flying from his village of destruction at present and reaching the village celestial. He goes on:

"Financial stringency, lack of funds, is the plaintive song—the funeral march, the dismal beat of the tom-tom—which he hears resounding from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin."

Further on he says:

"Political economy as now practised in India is a dismal science, and it is not surprising that the body politique is sick."

I would say, not that the science itself is dismal, but unfortunately, you have got one kind of political economy actually operating in other countries, while a totally different set of uneconomic heresies is operating in this country. Then he continues:

"Hundreds of crores of India's working capital is running to waste and little is done to stem the flow,"

and, after canvassing the present position, he wisely asks the question:

"Who can stem this outflow of India's life-blood?"

He himself answers it:

"The Government cannot do it. Congress cannot do it. The Simon Commission cannot do it. The only people who can do this is the labour of India, if Government will give them a chance."

Sir, we have been crying ourselves hoarse about the labour conditions obtaining in this country, and about the possible measures that may be adopted by the Government of India to enhance their prosperity and alleviate their suffering by giving them better wages and all that—but with what result? Absolutely nothing has been done. Even now, there is a Bill coming probably next week, for the purpose of alleviating their sufferings—no doubt they may be somewhat alleviated—but then simultaneously in the same Bill an attempt is being made to throttle them out of existence. Sir Daniel Hamilton charges the Government squarely and tells them that the only people who can stem the flow of working capital into waste are the labourers of India, if Government will give them a chance. He goes on:

"Unorganized and disunited as they now are, the great masses of people are like sheep without a shepherd and they fall, an easy prey to wolves. . . ."

If Government cannot help this vast store of labour that we have and save them from the distress in which they are placed, what else do they exist for, I really cannot see. Then again:

"Financial stringency or lack of funds, as the financial authorities suggest, was no excuse for inaction on the part of Government; for the people's labour was the people's capital, and India had larger supplies of that capital than any other part of the Empire."

And then he would particularly remind the Honourable the Finance Member that,

"If Sir George Schuster would read the first 25 words of the *Wealth of Nations*" of that famous book by Adam Smith,

"he would learn labour was the fund which supplied all necessities and conveniences of life."

And then he charges the Government with having entertained a bankrupt policy, so far as the financial condition of this country is concerned and he maintains that:

"The Government of India rested upon a bankrupt foundation, and the only possible remedy for turning that bankruptcy into solvency, was an organised co-operative labour of the people, which could be monetised so easily by Government, yielding a hundred per cent. of the crops to the people and a clear 5 per cent. of profit to Government."

Those are words of wisdom, spoken very recently by Sir Daniel Hamilton, and I make a present of this speech to the Treasury Benches.

Then, Sir, I would touch upon another phrase of the scheme of taxation. That was touched upon by a few of my Honourable colleagues who spoke previously on this matter, that is the Customs tariff. Now, Sir, I would really ask the Government whether there is really any rational or national policy so far as the customs tariff in this country is concerned. We know from the history of the customs tariff in this country, that it was not thought of at all as a serious contribution or as a very great contribution to the general revenues of this country, because, even so late as 1882, the entire revenue yielding from the customs was only a crore of rupees. Only after the war, the idea dawned upon our financial experts that customs, after all, might be a ground upon which they might look for an increase in revenue. Since the war, measures have been adopted which have augmented the revenue from customs. Today it stands in the neighbourhood of 50 crores. It is well and good, Sir, that the revenue is increased; but my complaint is this, that it has not been so adjusted as really to enhance the development of the indigenous industries of this country. As I said on another occasion, that the railway freights and fares mar or make the industries of this country, now I would say that of the customs tariff also. It is the customs tariff that really makes or mars the industries of this country. If only a careful attempt had been made to define and well lay out the policy of the customs tariff, with the Indian interests only as the basis, and no other interests coming into operation! We are all aware, Sir, that there are many things in which the interests of this country come into conflict with the interests of Great Britain—and in such cases the Finance Member of the Government of India should take particular care that only the Indian interests are taken into consideration, though they may tend to operate quite in an opposite direction to the interests of Great Britain. If only this vast revenue of Rs. 50 crores from the customs tariff rates are

[Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar.]

managed in such a way really as to develop the indigenous industries of this country, in fact more capital can be created in this country. But one has only to look at the general policy of the Tariff Act to find that there is absolutely no principle underlying the various provisions of that Act. We have got there several provisions and several duties, beginning from duty free, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and going up to 5, 10, 15 and even 30 per cent. No doubt classifications of commodities and goods are made under the several tables included in the Tariff Act, but one really fails to find any principle involved in the classification of such goods. So much so. Sir, that I find that the Federated Chambers of Commerce held a meeting at Calcutta last December and actually passed a Resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to go into this question minutely, and very closely, and to evolve some principle which must be the basis of the future customs tariff of this country. I would particularly request the Honourable the Finance Member to take that Resolution of the Federated Chambers of Commerce into serious consideration. I also remember, Sir, that the Honourable Sir George Rainy was present on that occasion, and he was asked to reply to this Resolution passed by the Federated Chambers of Commerce. The reply that he gave I really find, was quite halting and absolutely unavailing. In fact he made no serious reply at all. He would neither say "yes" nor say "no". In fact, he made no suitable reply at all. He would neither say Yes or No. He just said that considerations might arise which would make it difficult for us to adopt the suggestion made by the Federated Chambers of Commerce. That was the *summum bonum* of Sir George Rainy's reply. That is not the reply we look for from the Treasury Benches. What we ask is the definite policy as to what should be done in a matter like this? Even on the point of customs tariff, if really early steps are taken either to form a committee to go into matters of detail, or at least to ask the Tariff Board to examine the matter more closely and give us the benefit of their labours, and if a real scheme framed on a rational basis, is made available for the House to act upon and the Government to legislate on those lines, I think that would be the most profitable and appropriate way of enhancing the capital of this country.

I also remember that during the budget speech, the Honourable the Finance Member when discussing the borrowing policy of the Government, said he was trying to explore every possible avenue open to him to borrow in the country, but he would not go into this question of developing the indigenous industries of this country and so augmenting its capital resources. I may remind the Finance Member that there are two or three things of importance in considering the borrowing policy of the Government. The first question is when to borrow, the second is what to borrow for, and the third whom to borrow from. If these three standpoints are clearly borne in mind, it won't be difficult for the Finance Member to arrive at conclusions which will certainly appeal to this section of the House. We are not against the borrowing policy at all as such provided the borrowing is for purposes which really enhance the benefit of this country for the generation to come. We are certainly not against borrowing at all. The only question is borrowing would certainly be inexpedient in a case where, owing to a temporary fluctuation in revenue, there was a temporary deficit; in which case borrowing certainly is not expedient. In cases where it would augment and promote the productive industries of this country, if borrowing was necessary, then certainly this section of the House would

respond to the wishes of the Honourable the Finance Member in agreeing that borrowing was necessary. Then the third question would come in, where to borrow from. Primarily the borrowing must be in this country before he thinks of borrowing abroad. He must so adjust his customs tariff, he must so manage things financially that, for the development of the indigenous industries of this country, more capital may be thrown in and more resources be ready at his disposal whenever he thinks of borrowing. He should always, as far as possible, borrow from the country's own resources. But if all these things fail and his purpose is beneficial to the country, then it is open to him to borrow from abroad. As my Honourable friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar said the other day, if, even after offering a higher rate of interest, funds are not available in this country, he can then have recourse to borrowing from abroad. We should have absolutely no objection and we do not care where the money comes from in that case. The only primary consideration is that he must try to do his best not only to augment the capital resources of this country but explore all avenues for the successful borrowing of money in this country. When all this fails, he can go and seek money from abroad.

The next prominent feature about the financial position is military expenditure. No doubt that has been discussed *ad nauseam*. I do not want to say anything further on that point. I will only say one or two words. I spoke in the general discussion of the budget, and I asked the Honourable the Finance Member that this House might be enlightened on one particular point, but unfortunately he forgot all about that. He probably considered it unnecessary to answer that objection of mine. My point was that these items of expenditure, which are mainly made in England, ought to be expressed in terms of gold. That would give a clear indication to us of what the position really was. I pointed out in this connection that the ₹5 crores at the 16 pence ratio, which was the military expenditure for 1922, was 40 odd million pounds, whereas the 55 crores he has budgeted for the year to come at the 18 pence ratio operating, really is 41.20 million pounds. Sir, if I am correct in that, it only discloses that, instead of the 10 crores of rupees which we find to be less from the figure we found in 1922, we really have an excess of over a million pounds in 1929-30. If my position is correct, and I am subject to correction by the Honourable the Finance Member, I would really ask him to enlighten the House what it really means. Does it mean an increase in expenditure, or does it mean a mere trifling change in the method of accounting? I really am at a loss to know whether it represents an increase of expenditure, and I shall be very much obliged to the Honourable the Finance Member if he enlightens me and the House on this point.

Then, again, Sir, I take objection to what are called net grants of 55 crores of rupees for another 5 years to come. The Honourable the Finance Member also in the very next paragraph, if I remember rightly, has disclosed the possibility of the Army saving about a crore and a half in the course of the coming year out of its net grant of 55 crores, and he postulates a similar saving for the next 5 years to come. If within the next 5 years to come, he postulates an aggregate saving of 10 crores out of a military budget of 55 crores, he no doubt puts that apart as a reserve to be spent by them as they please by way of improving their present condition during the next 5 years to come. I would seriously ask the Honourable the Finance Member if he really has a hand in framing the budget on this head, whether

[Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar.]

this is not to countenance the idea of practically placing a premium on expenditure for the next 5 years to come?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): I don't know why the Honourable Member goes on talking of the next 5 years to come when he means the next 3 years. The scheme is to operate for 4 years, of which one has already been concluded.

Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar: I thank the Honourable the Finance Member for the correction. I ought to have said 8 years or between 8 and 4 years. Very well, Sir; but even then, I ask him, where was the need, if the Army Department had not the upper hand over him—and I have a shrewd suspicion that that is the case—where was the need of assigning these 55 crores of rupees to the military authorities to do with as they please? This saving on the allotment of a net grant is a rare phenomenon in the finance of any country. You say to them "You need not spend this amount in any particular year. You can have it in the suspense account, and do with this amount just as you please in the next 4 years." Especially when he also told us, in another place, of the possibility of fresh taxation, which he might probably have to think of in the next year, if circumstances demanded it—also in the same breath to assign away this large amount of 55 crores to a department which is not noted for its economy in expenditure, I think that is a very serious state of things, which we, on this side of the House, could legitimately object to.

Then, Sir, the third prominent feature of the financial position is the top-heavy administration as it is called. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jumnadas Mehta, says that this Government of India is suffering from top-heavy administration. I really do not grudge the fat salaries which the Treasury Benches opposite are enjoying and the fat salaries enjoyed by their Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, and a regular army of other officers; but my real grievance is this: if they give us real worth for the money that they get, I shall be quite content. I know they are all competent people; I do not say they are not; I know they are all eminently fitted to occupy the offices that they hold now; but my serious complaint is this; being in those offices, they do not really give us the whole money's worth which they can possibly give if only they try to. What I mean is this. If there is a small motion suggested from this side of the House that a certain matter has to be looked into, or that there are certain matters which have to be inquired into, at once they think of appointing a committee or commission. Where is the need for these needless and endless committees? Sir, during the last seven years, the expenditure on committees and commissions alone has reached the figure of one crore of rupees. Sir, one crore of rupees to be spent out of this poor country's resources on committees and commissions alone, and all within the short space of seven years, is rather a serious affair. And, Sir, what, after all, is the net result of the appointment of these committees and commissions? I am reminded of what Dadabhoj Naoroji said more than sixty years ago, almost with a prophetic vision. The more I myself look into the recommendations of these committees and commissions, the more I look into the adoption—the wholly halting adoption—by the Government of India of the recommendations of these committees and commissions, the more I am tempted also to think

likewise, and therefore it is, Sir, that I propose to read to the House what Dadabhoy Naoroji said very long ago. This is what he said :

"As regards the appointment of commissions, the usual process in such cases is to appoint a commission or a committee, put in members, and have witnesses of their own choice, leaving, if possible, just a small margin for appearance of independence. Generally they get their own foregone conclusions."

That exactly applies to almost every commission or committee that we have witnessed operating in this country. If unfortunately any commission or committee have gone out of their way and not adopted the foregone conclusions of the powers that be, who appointed them, then what happens? They are shelved completely, like the Skeen Committee Report. What has become of it? It is shelved. And if it is shelved for some four or five years and then if somebody in this House gets up and wants to know what has become of certain recommendations of a committee's report, then he is at once reminded that those are back numbers. Only the other day my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, quoted from the Acworth Report and the Incheape Report; and he was immediately reminded by Sir George Rainy that those reports could not be looked into now, and that they were back numbers. Sir, those recommendations were made by committees which the Treasury Benches themselves appointed. Where the recommendations do not suit them, they become back numbers all at once. They say that things are beginning to move in a different fashion altogether and those recommendations are found to be inconvenient and they are brushed aside as back numbers. I therefore say, Sir, that if unfortunately any committee or commission does make recommendations which do not find favour with the Government, what is it that the Government do? They shelve these recommendations in the first place; or if they are so minded, they sit in judgment upon those recommendations, and commend just a few halting modifications. Take the case of the Special Tariff Board Report. My Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, mentioned that fact, and I can only add that when that report of the Special Tariff Board, which sat to inquire about the industrial unrest of the textile industry in Bombay, made certain recommendations, those recommendations were set at naught, and instead, a mere halting measure of relief was adopted by the Government of India. With what result? The textile industry of Bombay was not protected against either Lancashire or Manchester. Is that what they wanted? Certainly not. They wanted something more; they wanted protection against Japan also which the Government would not give them. They wanted protection against Lancashire and Manchester which the Government were not disposed to give them. So that these halting measures by way of acceptance of the recommendations was really sitting in judgment upon the Tariff Board Report by the Government of India, with the result that we had the Tariff Acts of 1927 which did not please anybody in this country.

Sir, in addition to the fact that the Tariff Act of 1927 did not meet with the wishes of either the textile industry or anybody else, it also did harm in two directions. As was mentioned by my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, it hit the handloom industry in this country very hard. In fact I was one of those who raised our humble protests against lessening of the duty on artificial silk yarn, and the natural result that we see is—I speak subject to correction—that we have had very large imports recently from Britain of artificial silk yarn. I do not know if it was, with this view, that the duty was lessened in 1927, or that, as a result of that,

[Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar.]

that this thing has come to pass. Anyway we see the actual fact now today—the imports of artificial silk yarn from Britain have enormously increased since the passing of this Act.

Now, Sir, one word as regards the banking inquiry committee which has been almost started. No doubt, Sir, there have been unwanted commissions before, but this is an inquiry which this House wanted. I was one of those who spoke on the Resolution in 1927, asking for the immediate appointment of a banking inquiry committee. So far it is well and good. But I was not prepared and I do not know if my Honourable friend, Mr. Haji, was prepared, for this triple variety of a committee that we have got now. We were only thinking, to be frank, of one committee which would operate on this inquiry, and which would give us a report upon which action could be taken by the Government. But now, the announcement makes mention of three bodies: one is the central committee; and the other are the provincial committees. I can certainly appreciate that position also, if division of labour was the basic principle of the constitution of these two bodies. I am also relieved to find that the provincial committees will have perhaps to go more minutely and in detail into agricultural conditions, rural credit and the need for agricultural banks, etc., in rural areas. If that is so, the pursuit of that policy is certainly a very desirable direction in which the committee will operate. But what I really cannot understand is the third body. Why do you bring into existence this third body of experts—three or four—from England and also from other countries? Sir, I am reminded of a similar instance, which occurred in the case of the Royal Currency Commission. Not only was that Commission mixed, but experts from almost all imaginable countries of this world were also asked to give evidence. There was more or less a round table conference of economic experts, financial experts, exchange and ratio experts, operating upon the exchanges of this country. I ask the Honourable Finance Member if he can suggest to us any parallel anywhere else in the civilised world, where there is a round table conference of experts from other countries deciding and operating upon the finances of a particular country. It has occurred only in India and in connection with India alone. I really ask what have these financial experts done in India. The only result of their inquiry was this: our ideas of having a gold currency, of having a gold standard, pure and simple, have already been shattered to pieces. We had built great hopes on the promises of the Government of India from time to time and we were nursing hopes in ourselves that, after all, we were getting very near the time when we could have a gold currency, a gold standard pure and simple, backed by a gold currency. But that Commission, Sir, really enabled this Committee of experts to sit in judgment on the exchange and currency of this country, and our hopes were shattered to pieces when they said, in one pithy sentence, that "gold must not circulate in the beginning and gold need not circulate for ever". Sir, those are the sentiments which really underlie the mentality of these experts. That really shattered to pieces all hopes of having a gold currency here. I am reminded of that incident, Sir, and I really ask the Honourable the Finance Member, if he can, if it is not too late, and if the parties agree, finally abandon this portion of his proposal for the getting in of experts to sit in judgment upon the recommendations that might be made by these two Committees, I mean the Provincial Committee and the Central Committee, so that we can be saved from the advice of these

experts and their final recommendations upon this matter. After all, Sir, what can these experts do? Do they know the Indian conditions? Are they the people of this soil? Are they the people of this country? Are they moving among the people of this country? We do here represent the people of this country; we come from the people; we are of the people, and we are ourselves the representatives of the people, chosen by the people. If, in spite of all that, you elect to choose certain people who know little or nothing about this country

Mr. K. Ahmed: I thought you came in by signing the creed only.

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar: Sir, I was mentioning to the House that we do represent here the people of this country, and it is really preposterous that people without any knowledge of this country should be called in from outside this country to sit in judgment over the recommendations that may be made by these two Committees. Why do we want experts? Why should we seek the advice of experts? The Finance Member is our expert. If he is an expert in these financial matters, we can certainly take his advice upon the recommendations that will be made by these two Committees. I personally think, Sir, that we are not really in need of these so-called experts from England or elsewhere to operate upon the banking inquiry of this country, to sit in judgment on the recommendations that will be made by these two Committees. Sir, upon a consideration of all these facts I am driven to the necessity of opposing this Financial Bill, which is before the House.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I had a shrewd suspicion that some of my friends knew that I was under the advice of my medical adviser, and that I should jump five or six times in order to catch your eye, and probably that prescription was also conveyed to the Chair. I do not know whether it is so. Be that as it may, I am glad, Sir, that I have been allowed to speak on such an important subject as this. I do not know if there is any subject which has been overlooked, or which has not been discussed by the various speakers who have preceded me,—subjects which come under the name of the consideration of this Finance Bill. Sir, strict constitutional lawyers, like my friends Mr. Neogy and Mr. Sessa Ayyangar, confined their remarks to very relevant facts, according to their judgment. Gentlemen with more political vision about India's destiny and India's future had something to say about the system of Government that obtains in this country, Gentlemen who have the interest of their own community at heart have also said what they thought was in the interest of their own community. So, Sir, a variety of subjects has been traversed, and in fact I was attempting to take some notes so that I might reply to some of the speakers from whom I differed, because, instead of attempting to be original, I thought that would be an easy way to speak on the Finance Bill and have my name trumpeted through the news agencies about which my friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, had some unkind words to say this morning. I think Mr. Jamnadas's right to speak on this vast subject will be appreciated by the country at large save and except about certain references to news agencies, communal questions, etc., to which exception was taken by my friends Mr. Fazal and Mr. Abdul Haya. Really, Sir, I was very sorry and pained to see that nationalists like my friends Mr. Abdul Haya or Mr. Fazal Ibrahim should think that anything that fell from Mr. Jamnadas Mehta

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

was ever intended to mean a hit against their community. So far as we know him, Sir, we can assure our Muslim friends that Mr. Jamnadas Mehta never intended to make a reflection on their community. I also think that he did not mean any hit to that splendid news agency to whose services, I think, we owe so much. As I said before, I do not wish to say anything original, but I want to cover the general ground, rather than go over these minor details which I leave to lesser people to deal with.

Sir, we have been asked to consider the Finance Bill. I shall look to its nomenclature—I have got that here—and that says: "A Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in or imported by land into certain parts of British India". We understand all these words, "certain parts of British India". Now, Sir, there are two kinds of India, British India and Indian India. Such cowardly insults as are hurled at Indians can only be made by rulers of the type that sit on the opposite benches, aided by some of our own countrymen. What is meant by "British India", Sir? Did they conquer India? Did they conquer India by the sword? Did they not conquer the country by resorting to despicable methods, like perjuries and forgeries? Do they not still owe to the descendants of Jagat Seth 81 lakhs? Don't they remember that they still owe 81 lakhs of rupees to the descendants of Jagat Seth, for services rendered for betraying the people of this country? We have many Mir Jafars and Umi Chands in these days, and they may profit from the plight of the descendants of Jagat Seth, who was going from place to place for the price of his ancestor's disservices to the country, and an interpellation was made some years ago, when the Finance Member avoided it by saying, if there was such a debt it had been repaid. He would not care to look into the old records. There are numerous records in the Imperial Library here, and the descendants of Jagat Seth, have got copies of such records, and these records show that this British Government, the owners of British India, still owe Rs. 10 lakhs, if not more, to the descendants of Jagat Seth. They do not hesitate to style this sacred land of Aryan culture and civilisation as British India! As if it was their property, as if it was their ancestral property! India is ours and it is we who have inherited the ancient culture, and civilisation of Aryavarta, not the imported civilisation of an alien race, not the imported literature or the philosophy of the West. Inroads have unfortunately been made from before the era of Christ, beginning from Alexander, and even prior to that. If those passes, 19 or 20 in number, had been guarded by the race which produced a Sankaracharya and a Chaitanya, I think India would not be witnessing the sorry spectacle of our own children being treated in the way in which they are being treated, or seduced in the way in which some of them have been seduced for mere filthy lucre. The religion of Islam and the Aryan religion and Aryan culture were living side by side. But when these people came in 1757, with the help of Umi Chands, and Mir Jafars, they perpetuated a rule which will bring down their own downfall also. I am reminded by my Honourable friend, Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar, that there is a book which was written so long ago as 1876, in which it was said that England will lose India in 1933. It is the Rosy Crucian Society which has published that book. If this is correct, and I hope this is correct, what will be the fate of those people who now want to support the alien bureaucracy, which sits like a vampire over our breasts and sucks our life-blood, after 1933? You cannot delay the hands of the clock and carry on your misrule in the way in which it is being done now.

Now, Sir, coming to the Finance Bill—it is only with reference to British India that I had to digress, and I hope you will excuse my having had to say hard things which are true and correct—it says, “the fixing of minimum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act.” Who wanted this Post Office? What is the necessity of these post offices?

Mr. K. Ahmed: You are Aryans and not Dravidians.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: There is no necessity of this Post Office. When Sankaracharya propounded his philosophy, when the Vedas were written, there was no necessity for this Post Office.

An Honourable Member: Vedas were not written; they were *Srutis*.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: What is the necessity for this Post Office? You want to have some people in your service to support your rule, by paying them salaries of Rs. 20, 30, 40, 100 and so forth. You know these are the people by having whom you want to perpetuate a slave dynasty in this country.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What about your Rs. 20 a day?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I do not care a straw for this Rs. 20. My Honourable friend must know from where I come, and he also knows the antecedents of my family, which should have made him pause before he uttered things like that. (Hear, hear.) As I was submitting to you, and through you, to those deaf ears on the Treasury Benches, what is the necessity of this Post Office? Abolish the post offices. Don't carry on your nefarious trade in the way in which you want to carry it on. The Bill says, further, “to amend the Indian Paper Currency Act.” Let me leave that aside, because you want to take away all the gold and silver and everything else and give us only paper. (Laughter.) Then it says, “to fix the rates of income-tax.” As if this income is given by them to us! Tax your own people. Tax your people, whom you pay Rs. 3,000 a month. I have no objection to that. But you tax people whose great grandfathers had zemindaris worth several lakhs of rupees and which, by division according to the law of inheritance, has been reduced to a few thousands per year. You want to tax them if they earn a few hundred rupees by practising in the mofussil bar or the High Court. (Laughter.) Why do you tax them? Not only that. You have body of men whom you call judicial officers. High Court Judges, whose pay my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, would like to increase. If they are as poor as that, why should they accept High Court Judgeships? There are gentlemen who have larger incomes and still accept office. We have examples of that in this very House of men, who do not care for Rs. 30,000, or 40,000 a month, or Rs. 3 or 4 lakhs a year, but are satisfied with Rs. 80,000 a year. We have an example of that before our very eyes. Why don't you get High Court Judges from men of that type? Unfortunately, we have in this country judges and judges. Not only that, but if you go down, you have subordinate judicial officers, who used to get Rs. 400 a month. I remember a story which was given out to me by a former Member of this House, Maulvi Abul Kasem. He was a Member of the Bengal Legislative Council. He moved a Resolution for the increase of pay of sub-judges. Now, there are 63 or 64 sub-judges in Bengal. One of them, who happened to be posted at that time to Burdwan, immediately on reading that . . .

An Honourable Member: Where is Burdwan?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: If you do not know Burdwan, you do not know India. Immediately he ran to Maulvi Abul Kasem to congratulate him, and told him, "You see this is the real work of the country. What you do in regard to local boards, municipalities, drinking water supply, and so forth, is nothing. This is the real work of the country." The man's idea was that, if the pay of these 63 or 64 sub-judges was raised from Rs. 1,000 to 1,600, the whole country would be benefited. Government know that, and so they have a large number of these men. They have a large number of munsifs, and deputy magistrates, and their pay was increased, at one stretch, from Rs. 400 to 750,—people whose educational expenses probably did not go beyond Rs. 15 a month and who got these jobs after dancing attendance at the High Court or the Secretariat. Government know that these are the people who support their rule and they are thus perpetuating a slave dynasty. A munsif's son will get a munsifship and in other services also there is the same complaint. Don't laugh, Mr. Rau. There is complaint with respect to your Department also. But I don't want to be hard on any of you. Tax all these people. Why do you tax people whose income has, within 3 or 4 generations, come down from Rs. 2 lakhs, to Rs. 15,000 or 20,000 a year? You tax them, especially if they happen to criticise the Government. There are amendments, of course, which will be dealt with later on, and I have my own amendments also.

An Honourable Member: If you go away?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Then I won't move them. Sir, I thought that I would be able to congratulate the new Finance Member when he came here. Sir, although I had not the good fortune of congratulating Sir Basil Blackett at any time, I thought that, as soon as he left India, I should have the pleasure of meeting an Indian in his place. But this is a thing which concerns the purse. Indians cannot be trusted with this. Some one from abroad must be brought in. One Lord Sinha may be made a Governor of a province for a few months. One Nawab of Chatari may be made a Governor for a few months. One Mitra may be made a Finance Member for a few days, but the foreigner must be brought in, because it is foreign exploitation. It is against this system that I raise my voice of a protest. It is useless to discuss this Finance Bill. Some of my friends have criticised the Bill. They are not in love with the provisions of the Bill but they say, "We do not wish to oppose this Bill". I really cannot understand this mentality. If they do not approve of the provisions of this Bill, how can they support the consideration of this Bill?

As I was submitting, these matters relate to money and other things. A friend from behind says, "High finance". I do not care whether it is high finance or low finance. Sir, you may remember the immortal lines of Shankaracharya:

Artha Manartham Bhabaya Nityam,

Nasti tata Sukhalesh Satyam.

I wish these two lines could be translated and that Sir George Schuster might be initiated into the truth of these. The one man who is capable of doing it with proper rites is our friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I hope he will try to spiritualise the Members sitting

on the opposite benches, dealing with money and trying to take away as much as they can. This is one of our precious heritages—our culture, our civilisation, our religion and philosophy. Today you talk of Japan and Japan's civilisation, but you won't care to remember Japan 50 years hence, if she is conquered today by a foreign power. After 800 years of foreign subjugation and treatment like the one which we are receiving at the present moment, our religion, our civilisation and our philosophy have still survived. To what do we owe this? We owe it to the great heritage of humanity, the *Sadhana* of India. That *Sadhana* is not confined to race or geographical limits. It extends over the whole astronomical universe and humanity at large.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Where is your English dress today?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: It will at least take some re-births for my friend to understand that dress has nothing to do with culture. At least we in India, who believe in Indian philosophy and culture, Indian religion and history, know that certain animals have to pass through several births in animal life before they can ever attain to proper human understanding (Loud laughter).

Mr. K. Ahmed: You are a second Darwin!

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Like Darwin, I have my friend before me in support of Darwin's theory (Laughter). Now, Sir, when I was perusing the provisions of this Bill, I thought of a beautiful poem of Rabindra Nath:

*Ar koto durey nia jabey morey Sundari,
Bolo kon par bhiribey tomar Sonar tari.*

"How far would you take me, oh beautiful young lady, where are you taking me and where are you taking all the gold?" This Finance Bill is only intended to take the gold of India to some foreign land, but I can tell the Government, as an Indian, as one who has inherited the culture and the civilisation of the Rishis of old, that this gold will not avail them. It may not be that they will have to leave the country in the year 1933. My friend Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar may be wrong. He, however, assures me that he is right. Let us hope that that day will come soon—sooner. Your imperialism will lead you to darkness and to death. When any civilisation is concerned with such things as money and stealing money from others' pockets

Mr. President: Order, order, I must now ask the Honourable Member to conclude his speech.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I have still several things to say and if you will kindly allow me

Mr. President: You are not well.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I thank you for your solicitude. I will now conclude. I have spent 54 years of my life . . .

Mr. K. Ahmed: So old as that?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Yes. I am as old as that. I have witnessed many things and many happenings. My young friend over there was a school boy when the partition agitation took place. I was not a school boy then. I was a grown up man, and before that I used to dabble in

[Mr. Atnar Nath Dutt.]

politics. Now, Sir, at this fairly old age, I think, in the words of another poet:

*Basi dhyannagna ai jibanprovas tirey
Ei tiraj sandhya usha anyatirey mugdhakari.*

"I see darkness and clouds all around me at the end of my life, but there is a brighter dawn before me." I wish it is so with respect to India.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers (Assam: European): I rise on a point of personal explanation. Owing to ill-health, I was not here yesterday when my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaman Lall, spoke on the tea industry in Assam. Among other things, he made very serious charges against tea planters. I do not know the exact words he used, but I read the *Hindustan Times*, a responsible paper, which is owned by a leader of one of the parties here. In today's issue that paper says that my Honourable friend characterised tea plantations as slave plantations and said that tea planters were the worst type of humanity. Sir, I am a humble planter . . .

Diwan Chaman Lall: Sir, I rise on a point . . .

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: I associate myself with my community and protest vigorously against abuse of this sort. As for tea plantations being slave plantations, I say it is a downright lie. No member of the Swaraj Party in Assam—and we have a big party there—has ever made any such suggestion. If the Honourable Member would come to Assam and see things for himself, instead of giving second-hand information to the House, I think he would change his opinion.

Diwan Chaman Lall: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. Owing unfortunately to his illness, the Honourable Member was not present here yesterday, but may I remind him that the expressions I used were used on the authority of Mr. Purcell, a Member of Parliament sent out by the Trade Union Congress. He actually went down to Assam, and it is on his authority, I made that statement. It is to be found recorded in a pamphlet that he has written and in the report that he has presented to the British Trade Union Congress.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Sir, I take this opportunity of repudiating both those gentlemen. They spent a few days in Assam, and are just out for their own political ends. Here we have people living there all these years, who ought to know something about this matter. Why should the Honourable Member repudiate his own countrymen, his own community, and draw upon the evidence of people who have no concern in the matter?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, today is the third day we have been listening to the debates on the Finance Bill. The Leader of the Swaraj Party, Pandit Motilal Nehru, justly pointed out yesterday that there have been two sets of speeches, one set in support of the Bill, and the other against its acceptance, but in both of them the arguments advanced were more or less the same. The Honourable Pandit was at a loss to find out why the conclusions differed when the criticisms justified but one conclusion, namely the throwing out of the Bill.

Sir, I agree with Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas who, while criticising the Government policy in general, did not see eye to eye with the Honourable Pandit of Prayag, that the Bill should be thrown out. He has pointed out what the Government should do, but he saw the futility of throwing out the Bill, knowing as he does, that Government must function, and the obstruction policy could not help us in achieving what we want.

Sir, I have listened to my gallant and Honourable friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, who narrated the labour troubles and labour tales of Assam and Jharia. It seems he advisedly—the Honourable Member is not here—did not give the dates of those incidents which are past history now. It would have certainly carried a greater weight if he had done so. My Honourable friend knows that the condition of labour in the tea estates, whether managed by white men or black men, is almost the same. He did not attack a single Tea Estate under the management of a man of his own country or community, where Indian labour wages are more or less on the same level. Then, Sir, he does not seem to know that the condition is now changed, so far as tea companies are concerned. The tea company shares are now more owned by Indians than by white men, although for efficient management the companies are left in the hands of European firms.

As to the coal companies, I say that almost three-fourths of the shares are owned by Indians, and my friend's attack should have been directed to the share-holders, who in fact enjoy the large dividends pointed out by my friend yesterday. He brought to our notice instances of a few companies which had earned fabulous dividends, but he seems to have conveniently forgotten that 75 per cent. of the coal companies are, not only not paying any dividends at all, but are on the verge of bankruptcy. I should like to know what my friend has to say to that. Of course, his object was to give us a picture of the abject condition of labour. There is no question that the labour conditions should be improved, but I should think that we should put our own house in order first. It behoves us Indians to set the example first.

Sir, speaker after speaker has debated on the Finance Bill in its wider scope. I will confine my criticism to only one Department, the Income Tax Department, and with regard to that also I shall confine myself to the way the administration is conducted in Bengal, and particularly in Calcutta.

Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I did not point out the grievances of the income-tax payers in Bengal, and Calcutta in particular, and the manner in which the Income-tax Act is being administered in Bengal, and, as I said, Calcutta in particular. Honourable Members may be aware that Bengal pays to the Central Exchequer the highest amount of revenue derived from the taxes on income, and of which Calcutta contributes the major portion. During the year 1927-28, out of 398.71 lakhs of revenue derived from super-tax in India, including Burma, Bengal contributed 189.14 lakhs, that is, almost half the amount of the total revenue derived from super-tax; and out of 1,292.83 lakhs of revenue derived from taxes on income, Bengal's quota was 325.50 lakhs, that is, over one-fourth of the total revenue derived from taxes on income.

Now, Sir, by the present Income-tax Act (XI of 1922), the revenue derived from taxes on income was transferred from the Provincial to the Central Exchequer, and its administration is under the supervision of the

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

Central Government. A sudden change has overtaken the administration of the Income-tax Act in Calcutta since about the end of 1926, with the advent of, I am sorry to say, the two Indian Assistant Income-tax Commissioners—one a Hindu and the other a Muslim. The effect of this change is visible in the novel and unwarranted methods of assessment adopted by them, the most glaring instances of which I shall place before this House.

Now, Sir, the functions of the Assistant Income-tax Commissioners, apart from the departmental supervision of work of income-tax officers, are mainly appellate, as will be seen on a reference to sections 28(1), 30(2), 31, 37, 38, 39, 42(2), and 53 of the Act, with this difference from other appellate authorities, that they can hear and take evidence in appeal. But in everything they do with regard to any assessment or any assessee, they are to proceed judicially, that is, above everything else, they are enjoined to keep an open mind with regard to the merits of the appeals before them. Now, Sir, let us see how these officers have discharged the duties imposed upon them. The City of Calcutta is divided into various districts, and an income-tax officer is in charge of each district. These districts have been divided into two groups, which are under the control of two Indian Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax. The novel method which this astute Muslim Commissioner has adopted would sound like a tale in the *Arabian Nights*, but nevertheless it is true. He pays visits to the income-tax officers who are under him and takes a note of wealthy Indian assesseees. Mind you, Sir, he dares not touch a white assessee, for that will put an end to his job. It is his own countrymen that are his victims. After taking a note of the assesseees, he does what Haroun-al-Rashid of the *Arabian Nights*' fame used to do. He visits the assessee's place of business or his residence *in cognito*, sometimes in the guise of a broker or a contractor, or a borrower or a share broker, or a speculator in stocks and shares, and thus he collects his so-called first-hand information of the particular party's or the particular assessee's income. He will then go and leave a mandate to the income-tax officer to assess that particular assessee on this particular sum. The poor income-tax officer has to carry out the orders, lest he should lose his job, and, with his hands thus fettered, he merely carries out the mandate of the Assistant Commissioner in making the assessment without having any opportunity of exercising his independent judgment. Sir, when I make this statement, serious as it is, I do so with the fullest responsibility, and I am prepared to prove what I say to the satisfaction of the authorities, provided the gods of Delhi and Simla will follow the same method as that followed by this worthy Assistant Commissioner, namely, come with me *in cognito* and investigate the truth of what I say.

Now, Sir, see the farce that is played in Calcutta. As the decision of the income-tax officer, in the first instance, is thus wholly or substantially inspired by the Assistant Commissioner, an appeal under section 30 to the same Assistant Commissioner is practically one against his own judgment, and therefore, in practice the provision for appeals in the Act is reduced to a mockery. Any further appeal to the Commissioner is generally rendered futile, by reason of the fact that all questions of evidence and fact are generally concluded *prima facie* by the concurrent findings of the Assistant Commissioner and the income-tax officer upon them, and the Commissioner invariably refuses to re-open them. There is another

thing to be said, that is, the Commissioner does not pass any orders, even in appeals, without consulting the Assistant Commissioner concerned. What a farce, and no wonder such discontent prevails! The net result of this farce is that the provisions safeguarding the rights of an assessee who had been given the privilege of having three independent decisions in his case under the Act, are reduced to mere empty formalities by the manner in which the Act is administered in Calcutta. Then, Sir, the Assistant Commissioner, not content with the part he plays *in cognito*, privately collects information from the trade rivals of the assessee or such interested sources, and uses all such information in coming to the conclusion. Thus it will be seen that it becomes difficult to touch such an assessment, so laboriously got up by the Department, by way of an application to the High Court under section 66(2) or (3) of the Act, which covers a very limited area, and which provision very few can afford to avail themselves of by reason of the expenses it involves and on account of a sense of helplessness which is bound to overtake any one who goes through the first three stages of a one-man show.

Assuming, for a moment, that a personal inspection of the place of business of an assessee is at all necessary, it should surely be held by the income-tax officer and not by the appellate authority. And then the inquiry officer should notify the assessee before visiting the place of business, and if he interrogates any person, the questions and answers should be recorded in the presence of the assessee, and thereafter the assessee should be given an opportunity to rebut the evidence and findings of the inquiry officer.

Then, Sir, both the Assistant Commissioners have issued confidential circulars to the income-tax officers under them not to entertain applications under section 27, that is, for cancellation of an assessment for sufficient cause shown, and such applications are now rejected without a moment's pause and without sufficient reason, and appeals against such decisions also meet with the same fate. Sir, in September last, I put a question, asking for the total number of applications and appeals under sections 27 and 30. This is the question:

"Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the total number of applications and appeals respectively under sections 27 and 30 of the Indian Income-tax Act of 1922 referred to the Assistant Commissioners, or to the Commissioners of Calcutta, as the case may be, during the period of six months from May 1926 to October 1926, and how many of these applications and appeals were either allowed (including modifications of assessments) or rejected?"

The answer is:

"Applications under section 27 between May 1926 to October 1926, allowed 107, and rejected 177.

"Applications under section 27 from November 1926 to April 1927, allowed 150 and rejected 295.

"Appeals under section 30 between the period May 1926 to October 1926, allowed 130 and rejected 84.

"Appeals under section 30 for the period of November 1926 to April 1927, allowed 247 and rejected 242."

It may be noted, Sir, that a large number of applications are dealt with between May and October and not between November and April. Therefore, had I asked for figures between May and October 1927, I could

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

have shown that much more than this has been rejected. Here, again, Sir, I want the Government to apply the same test, namely, come and inquire *in cognito* and find out the truth for yourself.

The grievances of the Indian assesseees have not come to an end yet. The two Assistant Commissioners were closeted together at the beginning of 1927 to devise means and ways of increasing the revenue, and they hit upon section 34. The abuse of section 34 is now a household word in Calcutta. It has become an instrument of oppression and robbery. Now, section 34 exists for the purpose of revision of an assessment wherein any income has escaped assessment during the previous year or wherein the assessment for that year has been made at too low a rate. In the year 1927, under the advice of these Assistant Commissioners, the Commissioner of Income-Tax, Mr. Strong—but who is better known as Mr. Weak, for he is supposed to be entirely in the clutches of his two lieutenants—appointed a special income-tax officer who was known as an Income-tax Officer of Intelligence, Special Branch, to issue notices under section 34 indiscriminately. This officer thereby sat in judgment over the assessments made by other income-tax officers of concurrent jurisdiction. He called for the production of books for the previous three years and the harassment knew no bounds. Now, this method, apart from the reflection it casts on the honesty and ability of the first income-tax officer, inflicted great hardships on the assesseees. The bulk of the assesseees, who received such notices, refused to respond to them, as they were issued by an officer other than the income-tax officer of his district, and as the matter was about to be taken to Court, it was dropped like a hot potato.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What is the objection to rectify it in the High Court?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: You would yourself not be there to do that. And then, Sir, the old method of issuing such notice by the income-tax officer who originally assessed the income was reverted to. In September last, I put a question on this matter, Sir, and the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra replied thus

Mr. K. Ahmed: You are not opposing the Bill, are you?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am not opposing it; but I have got every right to plead on this matter.

My question was:

“Will the Government be pleased to state whether there is a special Income-tax Officer in Calcutta charged with the duty of issuing notices under section 34 of the Act? If so, who is he?”

The answer given was as below:

“There is no such officer. An officer was appointed to deal with certain assessments under section 34 in the year 1926, but the Central Board of Revenue considered the arrangement unsatisfactory, and ordered its discontinuance in April 1927. The remainder of the question therefore does not arise.”

They said they found the arrangement unsatisfactory, and ordered its discontinuance, and that was how they avoided the dirty linen being washed in public.

An Honourable Member: Who was the officer?

Mr. A. H. Ghusnavi: They did not say who the officer was Sir, now, what is the poor assessee to do? If he complies with the notice, it will mean dancing attendance from month's end to month's end with all his books of accounts for the last three years, and of all places of his business, however remote they may be. To save his business from utter ruination, he falls at the feet of the income-tax officer and asks him to penalise him by arbitrary assessment. The income-tax officer helpless as he is, cannot raise his little finger even without consulting the Assistant Commissioner. He communicates with the Assistant Commissioner who instructs him to assess the particular assessee with particular sums, which he does. But there are others who stubbornly refuse to submit to this *zulum* and continue dancing attendance, month after month. And in these cases, the Assistant Commissioner's instructions appear to be "Harass them as much as you can; refuse all bad debts on frivolous grounds, and assess as high as you can by hook or crook". But no assessment can be made before consulting the Assistant Commissioner, as to what amount the assessment should be fixed at. What a mockery to have an appeal heard by the same person under whose direction the income-tax officer has made the assessment, and it is equally ridiculous to go up to the Commissioner of Income-tax, who would not pass any judgment without hearing the Assistant Commissioner behind the back of the assessee.

Now, Sir, section 34 is a dangerous section and its use should be made only in extreme cases of low assessment. In this connection, Sir, I asked a question in last September:

"Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the number of such notices under section 34, issued to assesseees in Calcutta during March 1925 to October 1926 and November 1926 to March 1928, and also state the respective dates on which the original assessment in each case had been made? And will the Government be further pleased to state the number of such notices issued during the next previous six months with the respective dates of original assessment in each case?"

Now, Sir, during September 1924 to February 1925—that is, six months— notices under section 34 were issued on 67 persons only. During March 1925 to October 1926, that is, 8 months, notices under section 34 were issued on 554 persons only. During the period of November 1926 to March 1928, notices under section 34 were issued on 1,214 assesseees. Sir, from 67 in 6 months it had gone up to 1,214 in 17 months—an increase of about 600 per cent. Now, Sir, as I said, section 34 should not be abused. You must not issue, indiscriminately, notices under section 34. You must specify the points or items of income upon which you require further evidence; or mention the heads of income which the officer has reason to believe have escaped assessment, so that the assessee may know upon what particulars he is required to satisfy the officer.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why don't you see the officers about these grievances?

Mr. A. H. Ghusnavi: I have seen them. They will do nothing.

In September last I put the following question:

"Will the Government be pleased to state why no information is given to an assessee in the notice, under section 34, issued by the Calcutta Income-tax Department as to what income had escaped assessment in the particular accounting year, or as to what further information is required upon either a source of income or rate of assessment of the assessee?"

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

The answer was this:

"The Indian Income-tax Act does not require that the notice issued under section 34 should contain the information mentioned."

If the Income-tax Act does not require it, then the sooner that section is modified the better it will be for all concerned.

Then the answer goes on:

"In October 1926, however, the Central Board of Revenue prescribed a form in which spaces are provided for entering this information, and the Commissioner of Income-tax, Bengal, reports that this form is in use in Calcutta and that these spaces are filled up before it is issued."

True, this form is used but the spaces are left blank.

Then, Sir, there is another grievance felt by all assesseees, and that is, in the matter of granting copies of decisions given by the income-tax officer in the first instance when making the assessment. Before the advent of these two Assistant Commissioners, the copies of orders communicating assessments contained the general reasons for arriving at the specified income, but nowadays no reason is given for rejection of evidence or of books, no indication given anywhere that the income-tax officer has exercised his judgment in arriving at his conclusions. The assessee is, therefore, left in the dark as to what was the basis on which the income-tax officer made the assessment, and thus the proper method of challenging the grounds of the assessment is rendered very difficult.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Will you take them to the High Court? Will you move the High Court?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: How can I move the High Court? I cannot move the High Court.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Oh yes, you can. There are recent cases.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I cannot. Well, I am not a lawyer.

On September 5th, 1928, I asked the following question:

"(a) Do Government propose to re-start the practice which had prevailed till recently in the Income-tax Department in Calcutta of giving reasons for a decision or for an assessment made by the income-tax officers in the copies of such orders or assessments supplied by that Department to the assesseees?"

(b) Are Government aware that copies of assessment orders as are at present given contain certain figures only and not the reasons for arriving at such figures of income? If not, do Government propose to inquire if it is a fact?"

Mr. K. Ahmed: Consult the lawyers for a remedy!

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: The answer to my question was:

"(a) and (b). The Honourable Member is presumably referring to assessments made under section 23(4) of the Indian Income-tax Act"

(No, I am not).

"against which no appeal lies on the merits. In such cases the law does not require the income-tax officer, as it does in cases falling under section 23 (3), to record a written assessment order, and the Government understand that for the last two

years—approximately—such orders have not been recorded in Calcutta. The Government are not prepared to impose on the income-tax officers an obligation that the Legislature have not thought it necessary to impose on them. In cases under section 23 (3) detailed assessment orders are recorded."

Mr. K. Ahmed: If you like, you can move an amendment of the Income-tax Act or give notice of a Bill.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Then, Sir, on top of this, the Assistant Commissioners have induced the Commissioner to issue a confidential circular to the income-tax officers, the ruling idea of which is a negation of all the present procedure mentioned in the Act for the benefit of the assessee. This again is a very serious charge, but I say that the Honourable Member can get hold of a copy of the circular if he so desires. The whole Department in Calcutta has gone so much out of gear has so much shaken the confidence of the general body of assesseees, that it is useless to try to effect the necessary reforms, and a change of outlook from an executive officer to a judicial one by means of general instructions or pious circulars only. Here again, as I asked:

"Do Government propose to appoint persons with sufficient judicial experience to the posts of Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax, as these officers are required to decide questions judicially?"

To which I received the following answer:

"The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the speech made by the Honourable Mr. A. C. McWatters on this subject in the Council of State on March 10th, 1926, which represents the view of the Government. He will there see that as a matter of fact, at that time, about three-fourths of the Assistant Commissioners were officers with judicial experience."

Sir, so far as Calcutta is concerned, the two Assistant Commissioners have, or had, no judicial experience, one started life as a *kanungo*, and the other as a steamer clerk in the steamer service between Barisal and Calcutta. It is not that these grievances were not brought to the notice of Government but with what result? The matter perhaps remains shelved in the steel-framed shelves of the Central Board of Revenue. I appeal to the Honourable Sir George Schuster, and I hope and trust that the grievances which I have brought to his notice will be carefully and sympathetically looked into by himself and that the assesseees will be afforded the relief that they seek.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (and other Members of the European Group): The question may now be put.

Mr. President: Pandit Nilakantha Das.

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to begin by saying

Mr. President: I hope the Honourable Member will not be too long. If Honourable Members think that the Chair will postpone the debate till tomorrow, they are entirely mistaken. I am going to sit till midnight if necessary in order to finish the debate. Pandit Nilakantha Das.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Then I hope the Chair won't mind.

Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi (Burma: Non-European): On a point of order, Sir, I heard you say that you propose to sit till midnight. May I suggest

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

taking the vote of the House as to whether the House will sit after 5-30 P.M. It is a tremendous strain on Honourable Members to sit here beyond that.

Mr. President: That is no point of order, Mr. Munshi.

Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi: It is a point of procedure, Sir.

Mr. President: The Chair is not prepared to give up its power in favour of the House.

Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi: I am not trying, Sir, to challenge your power. I am trying to make a submission in view of the convenience of the House.

Mr. President: I have decided, in view of the protracted debate on this Bill, to sit as long as it is necessary for the purpose of finishing this debate. Pandit Nilakantha Das.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, I shall try to be as short as I can be. The introduction of tea hus, I am afraid, made the atmosphere of the House a little warm—I may say, hot. I propose first, Sir, to deal with that first. My Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall, in his speech yesterday made some observations on the Tea Labour. Today two other speakers, Mr. Chalmers and Mr. Ghuznavi, have both raised the same point by way of reply to Mr. Chaman Lall. Mr. Chalmers simply repudiated the charge that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark, as I may put it. Interested as he is, he should have given some authority for his repudiation. There is a dark corner in Assam and North-East Bengal, where the eye of law or of any public man never penetrates; and it is also a fact that there is a soft corner in the hearts of those that are in charge of our destinies (Hear, hear), for the people who are engaged in profiteering there.

(At this stage Mr. President vacated the Chair which was taken by Sir Darcy Lindsay.)

Mr. Chalmers said there are members of my Party who have knowledge of the facts—if I heard him aright—and that my friend Diwan Chaman Lall had not listened to them before he raised his voice against the oppression of the tea labourers

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: On a point of explanation, Sir; I said that no member of the Swarajist Party in Assam had ever said that tea plantations were slave plantations.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I am thankful; I stand corrected. But my friend, Mr. Chaman Lall, gave an analysis of the Members of the Assam Legislative Council, and perhaps he proved that there were no Swarajists or non-Swarajists there who would care to go to the help of those poor workers in the tea plantations. I need not expatiate upon the reasons; for they are uncanny and perhaps unpalatable especially under the rules of etiquette here. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, thinks that he has rightly hit the point, I am afraid. If I heard him aright, he said there are Indian as well as European planters. I know. But because there are Indian planters there, that is no guarantee that our workers will remain safe in their hands. They are planters for all that; and in the

agricultural arrangements of India these planting operations have been a curse—a fact well exposed since the days when the Rev. Mr. Long of Indigo fame was imprisoned.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Question.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Ours is an agricultural country; the population is mainly agricultural; our people have ancestral plots of land to depend upon, and perhaps it would take a long time if I tried to prove—but it is a self-evident truth and perhaps awaits no proof—that, in this land, we want neither big farming operations nor big plantations like those in Assam. We have got industrial centres which my friend, as well as I, know are considered by some as unavoidable—a necessary evil I call it. Though even Mahatma Gandhi, and men of his thinking may differ, I call it a necessary evil; but it is an evil for all that. But where is the necessity for plantations? Why should not Government offer this land under plantation, in small holdings to the people? Any national government in India ought to see that those lands are brought under cultivation by conveniently small holders. If you want to have tea in this land, better set up factories for curing tea or doing the necessary processes after it is brought from the field. Why do you have plantations? I will not go into the question of profits; they are there

Mr. K. Ahmed: Otherwise it would have remained jungle; India could not have been made so fertile and it is a great blessing to India that the tea plantations have taken place.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Small holdings cannot make it fertile? I do not understand my Honourable friend.

An Honourable Member: Can anyone ever understand him?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: My friend, Mr. Chalmers, perhaps charged Mr. Chaman Lall that he had no direct knowledge

Mr. K. Ahmed: Neither have you.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I have knowledge which is nothing if it is not direct.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Your people have got no plantations.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: My people the Oriya labourers, account for more than 25 per cent. of the tea labour in Assam and North-East Bengal—8 lakhs out of 12 lakhs.

Mr. K. Ahmed: How would you maintain them otherwise?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If I were to choose, I would not, of course, maintain them on the five rupees a month that is given to them in the tea gardens, though mine is a poor flooded and famished province.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Question.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: It is sometimes less than four annas a day, is it not? I ask my friend Mr. Chalmers.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Question.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Very well, I have not got the book with me now to quote it from, but I shall make a present of it to my Honourable friend, if he is so sticky in his interested opinion.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Sir, I pay them personally; never mind the book.

An Honourable Member: How much do you pay?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Personally my friend, Mr. Chalmers, is a very good man and a hospitable gentleman; I am coming to that. I shall have very good tea if I happen to go there. Never mind, I shall quote a single instance of my personal experience; I had a barber servant of mine

Mr. K. Ahmed: And still you have not got your hair cut?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: He was fond of tea labour. How could he shave me? He went to Puri, and there got into the trap of one of the recruiting *sardars* who have been called by some of our papers as "the very reptiles of humanity"; the *sardar* gave him opium to smoke and taught him for about two weeks how to smoke opium

Mr. K. Ahmed: No, no; it was *ganja* probably.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: In Assam they have very little of your *ganja* Mr. Kabeer. It is a place where the opium consumption is perhaps the highest in the world. He was going to be transported to that Assam, where he would have little or nothing to do with *ganja*; and under the influence of intoxication some hopes and prospects were held out to him, and he was spirited away. We could not find out where he was for a full year and more, after which he returned—ugly, emaciated, and perhaps suffering from dysentery if I remember aright, a mere skeleton; a complete wreck of himself; and in that condition he was found in our village. He gave a description of his life there in the gardens, and said he had to walk to some steamer station through a jungle for three days for fear of

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: How long ago was this?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Some four or five years ago; I do not exactly remember.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Things are better now. I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I speak from memory; my friend invites me or some of us so that he will be able to show us the real state of affairs there. I have already said that my friend is a very hospitable gentleman; but I know there are traps everywhere; otherwise a new comer would be tabooed as a trespasser—there are labyrinths of arrangements for that. Will you deny that?

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Certainly.

Mr. K. Ahmed: The question may be now put.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If my friend is so very confident of his position, I should ask him to invite the ex-President of the Trade Union Congress, my friend Mr. Chaman Lal to send out his men, and I shall be willing to be a worker there, to establish trade unions in the gardens. Is he willing?

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: We certainly have no objection.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Here is an invitation for you.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I am so glad.

Mr. K. Ahmed: It is not Rs. 20 a day.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I shall take advantage of such an invitation; I hope it is a genuine invitation, and that the Honourable Member speaks in his representative capacity.

Now, Sir, there are labour rules. They are secret rules. I put some questions the other day to my Honourable friend Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra over there. I was told, in reply, that those private rules were not published and the Government of India had no knowledge of them. Now, what are those rules, Sir? As far as I could find out from my neighbours and servants, some of whom have fortunately come back, they told me that, if a man is discharged after his contract terminates,—I do not know if it is called a civil contract, but it is criminal,—if a man can somehow manage to secure discharge after the termination of his contract, and if he wants to join another garden, there are difficulties in his way. It appears, Sir, there is some secret understanding among the planters themselves not to admit such a man for two years

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: Nonsense. He can go and work in any garden.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I hope that my Honourable friend will quote from the confidential rules. It may be his opinion that such a man can go and work in any garden; it may be his feeling, and I have all respect for his feeling. Then, Sir, if a male coolie happens to marry a female coolie in another garden, then the female will only be allowed to live with her husband on condition that either the mother, sister or some other female relative would be brought from somewhere to take the place of this woman to work in her place in the garden. . . .

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: That is not true, Sir.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I should like to have a copy of these rules from my Honourable friend as a present.

Mr. T. A. Chalmers: That is not true.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: It may be your personal opinion, and I have nothing to do with such opinions here.

Then, Sir, there are the *Sardars* who are sent out on a recruiting campaign. They generally find the inhabitants of our small native states very convenient victims. I know, as well as many of my friends here know, what these native states are. There are no councils or constitutions. Doubly enslaved as the tiny chiefs of these states are, they are tyrants in their states. Nobody can raise a voice against oppression, for the rulers are all in all. It is these rulers, who are paid Rs. 15 for supplying each single coolie, and that payment is made through our Provincial Governments. For each man recruited, the Raja of the State is paid Rs. 15. Can you imagine, Sir, what is happening there under circumstances like these? I said that things are not all right in the State of Denmark. Was I not right, Sir?

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

And there is what is called the Labour Board to look after all this. My Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall, I think, has sufficiently dwelt on this aspect of the matter. Now, what is this Labour Board? It is a Board which consists of members of the Planters' Associations in Calcutta and in Assam. Is it not so? There is no Indian on that Board who can be trusted to represent the interests of labour. I hope, Sir, that the new Bill, which is going to be framed on the subject, will perhaps introduce provisions for proper supervision. Now, Sir, these poor coolies should not be left entirely in the hands of people who have vested interests

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why don't they trust you and remain loyal to their masters?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I find, Sir, that the Honourable Member in charge of Industries and Labour is not here. He refused the other day to publish the correspondence or to publish any information about the new Bill which is being hatched, and which will perhaps come into this House in Simla, the next session of the Assembly, as an amendment to the so-called existing Assam labour laws. I submit, Sir, that all matters relevant to that correspondence should be published from time to time, and particularly before the Bill is circulated for eliciting public opinion in India, so that we may be in possession of certain facts, figures and informations to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the exact state of affairs.

Then, Sir, my friend Mr. Ghuznavi said that there are Indians who will protect the interests of the labourers

Mr. K. Ahmed: He did not say that.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Here is a bigger and a far more comprehensive question that arises. The name "Indian" perhaps looks like a panacea to most of my Indian friends. For the last three or four years that I have been in this House, I have been fighting, almost single-handed, perhaps with the help of my friend Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar alone, for Indianisation in spirit. I said so in connection with my speech last year on the Railway Board, and my Honourable friend Sir George Rainy made a fun of my remarks and told me that he would think of such an Indianisation when there was a one-rupee Railway Board. Yes, I wanted to have a one-rupee Railway Board in my motion. That does not matter; that does not take away anything from the spirit of Indianisation, for which I was fighting, and for which I shall continue to fight as long as there is life in me. (Loud Applause from the Swarajist Benches.)

Mr. K. Ahmed: The question may be now put, Sir.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: My friend has already put so many questions during the last three days that it will be awful if he puts any more. Whether a Member or a servant of the Government be Indian or European I do not mind. Even if all those benches be manned by Indians in person I do not call it Indianisation. When I was listening to the speech of my Honourable friend Mr. Abdul Aziz the other day on the Army cut, I was painfully reminded of those eternal lines of Sir Walter Scott, "Breathes there the man with soul so dead?" And is this then the Indianisation in which you rob the soul, the spirit out of the Indian? What is the meaning of the Indianisation with Indians like this on your benches—with a foreign soul in an Indian body? With white face, with white skin,

there may still be Indianisation in India if the standard of pay and conditions of service be adapted to the living of Indians, to the Indian ways of living. What are you doing here?

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why have you got such a prejudiced mind? Don't be afraid of them.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: From the very beginning, what did the East India Company do? There was practically no remuneration paid to the servants of the Company. What did the Company do? They would give them a share of the profit, they would allow them to be engaged in some business. We shall perhaps come to salt in the course of the debate on this Bill, and we shall then see how the salt business was in the hands of the servants of the Company for their remuneration and profits. Time after time, there were Resolutions not to give them any hand in the business, and objection was taken that they ought to be properly remunerated. That was the beginning of service in this country. The Cheshire people actually made a representation to Parliament, to the effect that people of the East India Company should not have all the benefits of the Indian market. The Cheshire people must have a share, as a matter of right,—“natural and paramount”. That was their plea, and that was the plea for raising or abolishing the salt tax. This happened about a hundred years ago.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Let the question be now put.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Darcy Lindsay): Will the Honourable Member proceed?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I bow to you, Sir. That was the beginning of British service in this land. It was created long ago during the time of Lord William Bentinck I think

Mr. K. Ahmed: In which year?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Let my Honourable friend go to school. It was adapted to a standard which would attract people from England under conditions which were very different from those obtaining today. There were no steamships in those days. There were no aeroplanes; and the servants were to be practically segregated and banished, practically sent to the Andamans so to say. The pay of the servants of the Company was fixed to attract such people, as it were, into banishment. Has there been any move on the part of the Government of India to go into those circumstances, and is there any proposal to cut down the pay of the services to the Indian standard?

(At this stage Mr. President resumed the Chair.)

Has there been any attempt? On the other hand, only the other day the so-called Lee Loot came to crown the gradual allurements held out to the service during the ages. The Lee Commission came and put some more money into the pockets of the so-called public servants and it was put in such a way that there might not be even an apology of voting on those amounts. It is not Indianisation. I do not know what else you mean by Europeanisation or Anglicisation. It is an engine to undermine India's soul, its spirit, its life, its culture. It is the conquest of culture which is the worst conquest in the human world. (*Cries of 'Hear, hear, from the*

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

Congress Benches). This is a country which has lived through 6,000 years and more. It has a history, a continuous history, a tradition, a civilisation, a living civilisation, and even today, in our daily ablutions we say "*Somapa pitaras strpyantam*". That means that those who were offering *soma* on the banks of the Drasdvati—those forefathers are propitiated even now by us.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: On the banks of the Thames.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: That attempt is now being made, so that we may pour it into the Thames instead of pouring it into the Drasdvati for our forefathers. And where do you find in the world, except perhaps China, such a country where the civilisation lives through the ages? Egypt. I have every respect for the nationality of that country, but it is not the Egypt of the days of the Pyramids. But here is India, in spite of all the vicissitudes of our cultural life—it is the India of the *Vedas*. We still claim it to be so, and if your this *makee* Indianisation goes on in industry, in service, in trade, in everything else, where are we drifting? We do not know. This is no Indianisation. When we have our national government, as we will have very soon, our first duty will be to have a committee which will make a thorough inquiry in order to Indianise the services, industry, trade and everything. Now, I shall pass on to my friend Mr. Abdul Haye.

Mr. President: It is not wise to enter into it.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I shall then leave it. Then finally I do not understand what use there is in discussing finances in this House at all. That is a question which I ask myself very often. But still so long as we are in this House, we have got to look into the Bills of expenditure and this and that connected therewith. We cannot avoid that. We do that for getting what many of us call Dominion status. It has been discussed here already, and it is not for me to go much into that. I was not a student of constitutional history in my early life. But I was the other day simply astounded when my Honourable and gallant friend Colonel Crawford asked the question "Will you not carry on a fight for independence if you get Dominion status?" I asked myself, what is this? Is it that our leaders are going out with their hats in hand so that Dominion status will have to be put into those hats, with certain conditions and restrictions. As my Deputy Leader said, he questioned the Colonel's credentials. I don't do that. I take it that he was expressing his national sentiment in a representative character.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not a Leader?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I hope I am entitled to discuss the question in spite of it. When the talk of Dominion status came into the political atmosphere of India, I began to study it. I questioned myself whether I had studied it aright. I was put in mind of a line from the *Gita* :

"Yasyām jagrati bhūtāni
Sā nisha pasyato munes."

"Where devils revel, it is darkness for the Gods".

Canada, Australia and South Africa have each a Dominion status and they revel in it, and surely they have not got it on conditions. Why does the same thing portend darkness to the Indian? Where does the question of agreements and conditions come from? Therefore I say, a subject and a dependent people we are, and ours is to strive for independence pure and

simple at any cost and without considering consequences. If any party is interested in living with us amicably, it is their business to come forward with the offer of Dominion status, or whatever you call it. Then will be the time for us to see it and sit in judgment over it, and dictate our own terms and conditions, if need be. But my gallant friend, the Colonel, must understand that our leaders were never out with their hats for Dominion status. They made a generous gesture, for to be generous has been traditionally ingrained in our constitution. India has been generous to foreigners through the course of her history, and this has been the treatment ever accorded to India by the foreigner. It was to help England that Dominion status was agreed upon by so many parties in India. We have been over generous, and the Colonel has proved the type foreigner. Therefore now is the time either to do or to die. We cannot live under conditions like this. It is not only painful but humiliating. It is more. It is insulting, and it is injurious to the health of the nation.

Coming to the scheme of expenditure, an offering of it, so to say, was made the other day in the form of a big book containing items for so many crores of rupees. It was an offering on all fours, for not a pie could be touched. If the Gods swallowed or coveted a particle of the offering, who would give it? (Applause.) We are used to give offerings to the Gods. Our *vedic* forefathers gave them. Then they included a drop of *Soma* juice—a kind of wine; and now there is big dose of opium in this Budget offering. (Laughter.) It is very interesting. We all know how the Indian Government long and strenuously fought in the International Convention for opium to be permitted to help the people of the East with opium. That is a long and unpalatable history. But the agreement came in spite of our self-constituted representatives, and in consequence of that our Provision opium sale is being perhaps gradually reduced year by year. Whether and how far that is being carried out, is not my concern here. Provision opium is safe in the hands of the international arrangements. But I find here, as a matter of fact, that excise opium has been the stronghold of my friends over there.

In 1926 we were told that our excise opium was sold to the provinces, the price being calculated on the basis of the cost price of the production of opium. Then naturally the price is practically stationary. Nobody can deny it. But when do you look into the income from the sale proceeds of excise opium, it was 70·08 lakhs last year (revised estimate), and this year it is 71·28 lakhs. (*An Honourable Member*: Crores, you mean?) Lakhs or crores, may be crores, I think they are lakhs. But what I want to point out is that the proceeds from the sale of excise opium are gradually increasing. Was it not high time for the Finance Member to make a scheme for gradual reduction, just as the Convention adopted a scheme for gradual reduction of Provision opium? I ask you, Sir, whether it was not up to him to make a scheme to reduce it gradually in ten or fifteen or five years, or whatever it might be, and to abolish the sale of opium ultimately in the provinces.

I was given a copy of the Bihar Budget the other day. I looked into this excise opium in which I am interested (Laughter), yes, I take opium as a subject, I mean as far as this House is concerned. I don't go into the income, for there I cannot know whether there is a reduction or an increase. But the opium which was purchased from the Government of India, excise opium, in 1925-26 realised Rs. 7,46,620, and in the revised estimate it is Rs. 7,58,123. It is a distinct increase of a few thousands, and the

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

Finance Member of Bihar and Orissa seems aggrieved this year for he says, "It is anticipated that this year's poor monsoon will affect consumption (of excisable drugs and liquors) resulting in a decrease in revenue" (Bihar and Orissa Financial Statement page 3). But still my friend, Mr. Coatman, in his book 'India in 1927-28' tells me that, in 1910-11, the consumption for the whole of British India was 12,527 maunds. In 1926-27 it was 7,021 maunds. Yes, he is a very clever officer of Public Information (*An Honourable Member*: "Misinformation"). Misinformation, yes. He very slyly left out the year 1921. He should have compared the figures with 1921. There was a great fall, and three years ago it was proved by figures in this House that, all over India, there was a tremendous reduction in the sale of excise opium that year on account of Mahatmaji's efforts. But he cleverly compares the present with 1910-11. Then he says about Bihar and Orissa, that, "The Bihar and Orissa Opium Smoking Act prohibits opium smoking except by licensed vendors". I wish his information was correct. I belong to the Province of Bihar and Orissa, and I had the privilege to appear as a witness before the last Opium Committee, where I pressed for this particular measure, and yet it has not been given effect to. I give him this piece of information and I challenge him to deny it.

Then, Sir, I believe it has already been very taxing to you .

Mr. President: Not at all (Laughter). (*Cries of "Go on!"*).

Pandit Nilakantha Das: This opium offering is quite in fitting with our traditions. There was an offering of the whole budget. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, will be glad that he is Indianising the budget to this extent at least.

The scheme of expenditure is, as I have said, not on the basis of Indian life and Indian income or Indian expenditure. With
6 P.M. regard to the expenditure in our ordinary domestic affairs, we say "Cut your coat according to your cloth", but here the cloth is found out for the coat which is already there, and the cloth is found out for that coat and not for this *Khadar* coat; for that coat over there, the English coat. For the *khadar* coat we have cloth enough in this country, but we have not enough for the English coat, which must be made and maintained clean and fresh. (*An Honourable Member*: "And dry?") No, it is not dry. My Honourable friend, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, said, the dress has nothing to do with culture. He has his own ideas, but once, year after year, we are asked to appear in morning dress. Once our friend, *The Forward*, remarked that the Viceroy would be horrified to know what the morning dress of an Indian is. Let not our friends there be horrified. Our coat is like that and they must find cloth enough in this country for this Indian coat. Let him not first conceive the expenditure as he is doing. What is he doing? He is following the tradition created and fostered for him.

As soon as the Government of India Act of 1919 came into being, and this kind of budget offering came to be discussed in this House under what is euphemistically called the Reformed Constitution, there was anticipated a difficulty in finding money to meet the problem of unemployment in England. There was, of course, then the blush of virginity and newness and a device was planned to take money "Home" in a

way constitutional. At once the pompous Industrial Commission was announced under the pretence of developing Indian Industry. This mountain of a Commission produced the Indian Stores Purchase Department. That was the main recommendation of the Commission for the development of Indian Industry. The other day when I was appealing to my friend, the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, he said, "Industries is a Provincial subject and transferred. I am concerned with industries in centrally administered areas only." I have nothing to do with them, but I was supplied with a poor report of the Indian Stores Department. Very well, it was so small a book. I really thought that the Government of India had decided that all purchases, whether railway, military, civil engineering, and every thing should be purchased through the Indian Stores Department. But what do we find? The whole thing is a sham. It is a fresh luxury at the cost of the tax-payer. In the last year under report the tax-payer is laid under contribution to the extent of more than Rs. 50,000. Why all this paraphernalia? If you do not like to give an impetus to Indian industry, then what is the use of all this pompous Stores Department? How much do you buy here? The other day, in the course of my discussion on the railway budget, I proved home the whole case for the railways. There was no reply from the Government side. The difference between last year and this year in the railway stores purchase, so far as foreign purchases are concerned, is 7 crores more and the Indian purchases are 35 lakhs less. I was referring to the last year under report and the last year but one. And here, I also expect that the Army Department, which is getting 55 crores and 10 lakhs, should give its orders for its stores purchase. But I find that there is a Marshal, General, or some other big officer who will purchase things direct. (Shame.) We have no knowledge as to what he is actually doing. But a very poor sum comes, of course, to the Indian purchases. Perhaps our Honourable friend, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, thinks that he is helpless in the matter.

There are so many other departments for which purchases are made; why should they not all go through the Indian Stores Purchase department? Why is there no attempt at centralisation? Unfortunately I have lost the list. (Laughter.) There are so many departments which purchase stores for themselves. Even pencils are purchased elsewhere. The pencil industry was a growing industry during the war time and after, but it has now practically collapsed. When we first came to this Assembly, we used to be supplied with Madras pencils. Now we see none. These we use, seem to bear some Indian names. Some Indian firms, I am afraid, import these pencils from abroad and impress their names. Cedar wood is the best for pencils. There are various forests in Baluchistan and the North West Frontier Provinces which have plenty of this cedar wood. But no thought has perhaps yet been given to develop them by communication or anything like that. Timber for pencils has to be purchased from California. What is that timber? It is a kind of sugar pine, which is coloured artificially by chemicals injected into the living tree. Here in India you have plenty of sugar pine in the Himalayan forests. We do not investigate into the subject at all in our Dehra Dun Depot of experts, and the Indian Stores Department has nothing to do with pencils, has nothing to do with telescopes; it has nothing to do with microscopes and machines, and many other things, the purchase of which ought to be

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

centralised in the Indian Stores Department. The Indians by this means, should systematically be encouraged to produce and manufacture the required articles. This is a very grave situation. The Master General of Supply, Printing and Stationery Department, and all these departments purchase their own stores. Even the State railways purchase their own stores, they do not purchase through the Indian Stores Department. If they purchase the oils and paints, which they have been doing a little for two years, they seem to think that they are showing some favour to the Indian Stores Department. A sum of 13½ crores, as my Honourable friend tells me, is spent in England in purchases for the Army. All those purchases ought to have been made through this Indian Stores Department. But decentralisation is the principle followed by the Government of India.

I suggested the reason of this decentralisation in this House. Money is wanted in England to deal with the question of unemployment, and the reformed constitution is functioning as it does. It is more convenient if the discussion can be cleverly evaded. Then, the railway finance was separated and that was to create a psychological compartment in the scrutiny of the budget. This is railway, so this money set apart must go for upkeep and development. This is the decentralised concentration fostered in us. When you come to ways and means, 80 crores go every year for railways. This sum of 80 crores must go unscathed and uncriticised, for there is an arrangement for five years. So you create this psychological compartmentality. When we talk of railways, we say now to ourselves, yes, this is railway money and we should not touch it with our sacrilegious cuts or criticisms. Ways and means must, as a matter of course, find money here, in England, or anywhere for railways. What doubt or dissent can there be? There is no centralisation, everything is decentralised with a set purpose. If you have all the money for stores purchase in one lump, then you can view things in the proper light. I do not know whether this is not the thin end of the wedge. The military expenditure is separated this year, and that by an arrangement. It is another decentralisation. If we want to cut something out of 55 crores and 10 lakhs spent under military, the idea comes up that it is military, and under arrangement, we should not touch it. They include their estimates in a very big book all non-votable, yet there was an inclination to look into it. But after this separation even my Honourable friend Dr. Moonje will not perhaps look into it, for the very source of the desire is being psychologically killed. So my submission is that the inevitable mentality is there to work itself out in the military or the railway or whatever may be the department concerned in this clever policy of decentralisation. I shall narrate to the House one story, to illustrate this mentality fixed and set. A school master was once asked by a student: "Sir, *Prāna* and *Jibana* both mean one and the same thing (life). But how is it that the *na* in *Prāna* is *Mārdhanya* (palatal); and the *na* in *Jibana* is *Dantya* (dental)?" The teacher scratched his head for a time, and then said in disgust, as it were "Silly child, don't you realise that this is *Prāna*, and should therefore be *Mārdhanya*; and that that is *Jibana*, and therefore should be *Dantya*!" Similarly when we come to the Military Department, it is

military, and should not be touched, and so on. This is a kind of very dangerous mentality to which we are being introduced. All money should be put together in one lump to be examined, and there should be no separate reserves created. Here you have 23½ crores—Railway Reserve. The other day, I said that this money was being taken from salt. It is the tax-payers' money. By putting money in reserve, like this, they are not only keeping the money idle but also they are encouraging certain industries somewhere in England. Now I don't know if the military arrangement announced the other day with a military reserve is the thin end of the wedge for another decentralisation. By reserve I mean the surplus which will remain without lapsing, year after year to accumulate under the arrangement for a certain number of years, towards the expenses of reorganisation, about which we know nothing. We do not know any items or details about that. That is the idea, I say, of creating another reserve. We will see, by 1930, how many more reserves, how many more decentralisations are being created out of the tax-payers' money.

Then about debts. I put a short question to my Honourable friend Mr. Sessa Ayyangar, when he was speaking and he replied, "Yes". "First we shall", he said, "take Indian money if it is available; otherwise, we shall take a loan, we shall, if need be, borrow money from abroad." I put a question 'Even in England?' He said, "Yes! I have no objection". But I am sorry, Sir, I have to differ from him. I should, if I am put in charge of directing national finance, (Laughter.) borrow money from any other country in the world, but not from England. I tell you as my friend Mr. Birla over there,—I do not find him here now—pointed out, this is political debt, not economic debt only. I say I can stand economic debt, but vested interests and political interests have been created and are being created in this country, and it is this money which we borrow in England that is more than half responsible for our subjugation and subjection. Do not borrow from England, if we have to borrow anywhere at all. Yes; every nation sometimes does want money when it desires to grow; but I say, do not borrow a farthing from England. That should be our principle, even if we get it in England at a little less interest. Then, Sir, no money actually comes here; we get debts accumulated in papers, but get perhaps worked iron clay or stone, or something of the sort, for which labour and art is paid in England. You hear you have a national unproductive debt, a commercial productive debt, and so many names of various significance. What is the meaning of all these? Do the debts develop your own industry and do they increase the paying power of the tax-payer? No. I have no desire to go into further details. (*Honourable Members*: "Go on".) I have great suspicions that this money, which is borrowed, is not utilised for the purpose of giving an impetus to our indigenous industry, or for promoting our national wealth. National wealth does not consist of wagons and locomotives, these stones and those buildings of New Delhi; that is not national wealth. National wealth is the applied genius of the nation; that is, national labour having a money value. It is this applied genius which is national wealth. And what promotion is given to that applied genius of the nation—the genius which can be made into money and which can produce money?

I shall now turn a little to agriculture, if I am permitted. Reduction of rates is said to help agricultural wealth. I shall show you what all

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

these reductions in railway rates mean; they mean something else than what they appear to be. They are fresh agencies for draining. Over and above that, as I was saying, money is borrowed in England. What is the meaning of that money? It is only a paper business. The stores are purchased in England, our locomotives, our rails, our telescopes, our microscopes, and even men are purchased there. As a matter of reality, at the back of the paper business, their industry is supported and encouraged, and they have their own vested interests even propitiated. The starving Industry is paid, new Industry encouraged, unemployment dealt with; and for the produce of industries, the interest on the capital again is assured. Thus it is a double debt. It is a very subtle thing. I am not an economist myself; and my friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, will help me next year at least, if necessary

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: Don't bother him.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Then comes agriculture. My friend Mr. B. Das has in this connection referred to the floods and embankments. That is a big and pressing problem in India, and particularly in Orissa. On that I propose not to speak as he has spoken well. But, I shall here speak to you a word about agriculture proper which is the subject now before the country. There was a big Commission, a pompous one. When it came, we all expected that perhaps it was bringing some millennium into India. The terms of reference were published. My friend Mr. Goswami is here, and he was responsible for a Resolution in this House by which we demanded an economic inquiry into the conditions of the people. We expected something would turn up, but what did we get? A taxation inquiry we got, instead of an economic inquiry. Then when the Royal Commission was announced, generally we thought it would go deep into the matter and hold something like an economic inquiry, as all economic inquiry must be based on agricultural inquiry. But it was not the fault of Lord Linlithgow or his friends. They were prevented from entering into the economic position of the Indian peasant. Land tenure, irrigation of land, land tax—all these things which materially affect the agriculturist of India, were precluded from the terms of reference. They were shut out altogether. Then, after two or three years of inquiry, something like a voluminous report came out. On the recommendations of that report something was being hatched, and we were in the dark for a long time; as to what it was; and even now it is not published. Of course I am thankful to my friend Mr. Bajpai, who gave me some information privately (Laughter) as to what was being done about that. In spite of the anxious cares of my friend Mr. Bajpai and his Honourable Member to ensure Indian representation and Indian interest I am sure that in the name of experts—the very negation of Indianisation in spirit and matter—something will be newly introduced. I shudder, Sir, at the name of experts. We have been slaves not only of culture, of finances and arms, but also to a certain extent, of experts. And those experts will come, and perhaps some arrangement for big farms—I know and many of my friends know what those farms are—like the plantations of Assam will crop up along with them. There may also be some central office or Institute where will sit probably some entomologists with microscopes with two or three pinned insects under these microscopes. In three or four years

they will tell you: "Well, to kill or ward off such and such an insect, irrigate the fields with solutions of potassium permanganate". That is what we find in Pusa. Once there was an insect pest in my cocoon garden, and I was asked to inundate the plants with a solution of potassium permanganate. It was impossible. How could I do it? I do not know, if, in the end, the same thing will happen here, too.

I am not in this place going into the subject how all the labour is being depleted in our rural areas and being thus forced into plantations and to foreign countries in search for a living. I shall not go into all those questions. (*Honourable Members*: "Go on, go on"). It is too late now. But I shall now go to the communal question which I consider from quite a different view point. It is not the communal questions between the Hindus and the Muhammadans. There is some other communal question which has been brought up and fostered in this atmosphere of the Government of India, and that is in connection with provincial redistribution, distribution of provinces in India on the basis of language. Linguistic province is the only natural administration division. (*Some Honourable Members*: "Question!") There might be Honourable Members who question, but the answer is there in Linguistic Division of Provinces and nowhere else. That is the only natural solution where harmony out of and among all the sub-cultures is possible. They will all in that harmony grow into a healthy body politic. It will be a synthesis. India cannot expect to have one homogeneous shade of culture throughout. There must be sub-cultures as there are and will be, and those sub-cultures in synthesis will become one synthetic body politic of the Indian Nation, one comprehensive culture. When our fore-fathers, in the distant post-Vedic times, found the race divided and their language fallen into dialects, what did they do? Where did they find the principle of nationalism or culture? They formulated the Sanskrit language. They did not expect a homogeneous culture but one synthesis they created out of a heterogeneous mass.

But this Government came here not with any such idea in their head. The provinces were somehow or other thrown into their present forms, and some provinces were formed according to the circumstances of annexation. Now I belong to a province (*Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar*: "With no culture!") whose culture has been studiously killed for these 150 years or more under the British Government. Some portion with the conquest of the Northern Circars during the Carnatic War was thrown out into Madras. That is the main cultural portion. Bengal had absorbed a big slice under the Dewani of the Company. Then another portion was thrown into Bengal during the second Mahratta War, and a third portion was still, upto 1849, under the Bhonslas of Nagpur, under which it was allowed to remain. And what is happening? Culture with its vehicle, language is being killed not only in its struggle for existence in the outlying areas; but in one province where you have more than one sub-cultural entities, what is the effect? They always quarrel with one another, and as the outcome of the quarrel, one party always goes to the Government for what it calls its self-interest and the other party does not lag behind in securing its own benefit just in the same way. As rivals of one another they seek the help of a third party, and this, as we all know, is very advantageous to Government. These communal wrangles, these sub-communal wrangles, must be put an end to. I do not know what the Government are thinking about it, but I should like to tell them that, unless this natural

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

division of provinces comes to be a real arrangement, there is no hope for the growth, for the smooth growth of Indian nationality. I know this Government may have very little to do with our nationality, but if I seek to convince the House, I picture to myself what things ought to be under a national Government. If anyone is worth his salt in this land, then he should remember this aspect of the problem, this aspiration of the people, and direct his energies accordingly. Sir, I oppose the motion.

Many Honourable Members: The question may now be put!

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, the motion before the House has been supported on one side and strongly opposed on the other. I wish to speak only for a short time in order to lay emphasis on some points which have arisen in this long debate. The motion has been opposed on a variety of grounds. A number of acts of commission and omission have been brought under review, and there has been a comprehensive survey of everything connected with the administration. I wish to draw attention to one of the acts of commission which has been referred to in connection with the Bill which is now before the House. Before I go on to discuss the general aspects of the question, I wish to say a few words about the announcement regarding the appointment of a committee for a banking inquiry. I fear that there has been much misunderstanding on the part of some Members on this side of the House regarding this matter. Among others I was honoured by being invited to a discussion of this question, and I am glad to be able to say that the Honourable the Finance Member has shown the utmost consideration from the time that he took up this question, to the opinions of the Leaders of Parties and other Members, whom he invited to discuss this question. And I am also glad to be able to say that every point which was suggested by any Member at the discussion was accepted by the Honourable the Finance Member. We have long asked for such an inquiry. It has been a standing complaint that a banking inquiry was not taken up for so long and now that the Finance Member, at an early stage of his career as Finance Member, has found time to take an earnest interest in this matter, it is something for which we have to offer our thanks to him and to try not to misunderstand his action. Sir, a complaint has been made regarding the proposed nominations. I am certain, without of course presuming to be in the confidence of the Finance Member with regard to the personnel of the Commission, I am certain that if any suggestion were made, either by this Assembly or by any other section of public opinion regarding the personnel, judging from the manner in which the Finance Member has received our suggestions in connection with this inquiry up to this time, I am certain he would give that suggestion every consideration. Objection has also been taken on the ground that Leaders of Parties were invited and that other Members of Parties were not informed of what took place. Now I happen to be the Leader of a Party at this moment, and I confess that I regret that I did not, after the conference, call a meeting of the Party to inform the Members of the Party of what had happened. I think it was due to them. It was a mistake on my part. But I can assure the Members of my Party that we were invited, not in our individual capacities, but as persons representing a group of Members in this House.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, I can assure my Leader that no Member of our Party, as far as I know, has at any time complained because Members of the Party were not informed by him of what took place at the informal conference of the Leaders.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: It is very kind of Mr. Aney to tell me that. I know it. But my point was that if there is any complaint in this matter, the Finance Member is certainly not to blame.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla: May I draw the attention of the House to the fact that I wanted the Honourable the Finance Member to make it clear as to whether he required the individual opinion of the Leaders, or the opinion of the Parties which the Leaders represented; and if he wanted the opinion of the Parties, then I said the Secretary must write to the Secretaries of different Parties and get their opinions. I did not impute any motive to the Leaders, but I suggested the Leaders gave their own personal opinion and not the opinion of the Parties as such, which they represent in this House.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I should inform my Honourable friend, Sir, that this is a new departure on the part of a Member of Government in charge of a Department—this consultation of Leaders on important matters before a decision is arrived at regarding them, and I think we should not insist upon the formal procedure suggested by my friend Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla. It would hamper the growth of this convention and not help it. I think we should accept the action in the spirit in which it was taken. Personally speaking, and I hope I may now say speaking on behalf of all of us, I feel very grateful to the Honourable the Finance Member for the manner in which he took us into his confidence in this matter. One word, Sir, about the invitation of experts. That question was very carefully considered. The scheme of the inquiry is that there should be a very thorough and comprehensive inquiry into the needs of banking all over the country for all classes of people. The provincial committees have been appointed in order that they should collect material, facts and information which they alone will be in the best position to collect. The Central Committee will continue to guide the operations of the provincial committees, and when the necessary material has been collected and classified and has received preliminary consideration by the Central Committee, it is proposed to invite some experts not merely from England but from other countries also if necessary, who will give the Central Committee the benefit of their experience of banking in their own countries, which experience will be of help to the Central Committee in formulating its own proposals. The proposals which will be finally made will be made by the Central Committee. They will come before the Legislative Assembly formulated by the Central Committee, with the help of the experience which the experts will place at the disposal of the Central Committee. It is not the experts who will put forward the proposals. They will be invited merely to help the Committee with all the information and all the experience that they have of the working of banking institutions in their own countries. I look forward to this inquiry leading to big results, and I earnestly hope that it will be pushed forward as we have every reason to expect that it will be pushed forward, with all the expedition possible.

Now, Sir, I will make a few remarks on the general discussion of this budget. I ask Honourable Members on the other side of the House to

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

look at this debate in a large-hearted spirit. Many individual acts of Government have been criticised: the failure of the Government in different departments has come under review. Naturally there is a great deal to be said on the administration of individual departments; and the general complaint which has been voiced is undoubtedly a condemnation of the failure of the Government to have brought about that moral and material progress of the people, which we, and I am sure all well-wishers of the people, desire to see carried out. Now, Sir, in such a discussion, I beg the Members on the opposite side to overlook what has been said over-fervently, not to lay too much emphasis on criticisms of individual acts of Departments, but to try to form a complete picture of the whole situation. I submit that, if they will try to form such a picture, they will see that there is a very widespread and deep dissatisfaction with the general administration of the country under the present system. I do not wish to take up the time of the Assembly at this hour by repeating what has been said and said many times in this debate. But I do wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that, apart from criticisms of particular departments, there is this general feeling which emanates from the discussion that has taken place and, Sir, this general feeling is of a double character. Naturally every government must be judged by its success or failure in the various departments with which it is concerned, but it is the existing system that has been brought under review. It is the system which has been the subject of the attack, of the complaints and protests that have been recorded, and I wish the Government to consider the discussion mainly in this light. The Finance Bill has been brought forward to provide funds for the expenditure which has largely been passed by the Assembly. That expenditure has of course to be found. Everybody understands that. Those who intend to vote against the Bill also understand it even as those who propose to support the Bill understand it. But I wish the Honourable the Finance Member and his colleagues in the Government of India will realise what this protest means. The system is a most peculiar one. I do not know that in any part of the civilised world there has been such a constitution as the one under which we are working. We are here as the elected representatives of the people. The majority consists of such elected representatives. You are carrying on the administration by denying us a voice—a determining voice in that administration; our voice is limited—our voice and our votes are limited to a fraction of the expenditure that you incur. You ask us to support, by our vote, the legislation which you find it necessary—absolutely necessary—to pass year after year in order to raise taxes for expenditure on the administration in all its branches as it stands. For fifty years we have been protesting against the extravagance of that expenditure. It is not today; it is not during the last few years that we have begun to make our protest against the extravagance of the expenditure. Anybody who cares to do so may read the writings of Dadabhoj Naoroji, of Romesh Chunder Dutt, of William Digby and other Indian and European writers who have, during the last three-quarters of a century, written on the subject. We have complained that the expenditure on the civil side has been high and extravagantly high. We have complained that the expenditure on the Army has been extravagantly high. We have not been able, even by repeating our protest year after year, to make any impression upon the Government of India. When we had looked forward to a reduction of the Army expenditure under the conditions that have

prevailed, we are met with the fact that, though there is to be a reduction, the amount saved is to be set aside to provide the Army further with modern methods of defence, and the only hope that is held out to us is that, when the 10 crores thus saved has been spent on the mechanisation of the Army, there will be a possibility of a reduction. Now, I do not say that the Honourable the Finance Member can do anything more. I have knowledge enough of the administration of the Army in India to know that it is the War Office—not even the Cabinet—that must primarily determine what reduction will be permitted. But that does not take away from our mind the pain of the position in which we find ourselves. There is a conviction in the minds of many of us—I should say of nearly all Indians if not of all Indians—that the expenditure on the Army is extremely heavy, that while in England they are content to spend only about 14 per cent. of their total revenues on their Army, here you are spending about 43 per cent., that while at the conference at Belgium it was laid down that 20 per cent. should be the maximum limit of expenditure on the Army in any civilised country, you are spending 43 per cent. of it in a country which is unfortunately, sadly, very very poor. But, Sir, it is no consolation to us to know that the Honourable the Finance Member and his colleagues in the Government of India have not got the power to cut that expenditure down. It is no consolation to us to think so. We recognise the fact; but the painful thought comes again and again to our minds that, though we have been protesting, year after year, in congresses, in councils and in assemblies we have not been able to persuade those in power to reduce that expenditure. Even in the matter of the internal security British troops we have not been able to persuade the Government to reduce its number even to the figure at which it stood some years ago. Now, I ask my Honourable friends on the opposite side to place themselves in our position and to try to feel as we feel on these matters.

This is only one of the many questions. But in fact, on every important question relating to the administration, we find ourselves in the same position. Take the Railway Board, for instance. It deals with the huge budget, of over 100 crores, and yet not a single Indian out of the 820 millions has been found competent, during all the years of administration of the Railway Board, to be appointed a Member of that Board. Even in Departments where the Government have appointed Indians as Members, we find that they have not been provided with sufficient funds for expenditure because the essential reduction of general expenditure has not been effected, and that, for that reason, they are not in a position to push forward the work of the department entrusted to them to the extent it should be. In the matter of finance, we have the painful feeling that, for a hundred years and more, Indian finance has been administered mainly from the point of view of British interests. I am very sorry to say so but that, Sir, is our conviction. I do not complain of the speech made by the Honourable the Finance Member. As I said the other day, probably in the circumstances of the case it would have been unreasonable to have expected him to promise that the question of the 1s. 6d. ratio would be reconsidered. But I do submit, Sir, that the hard fact remains that we have no power to effect a change in the administration of our country. We are here in response to the call of the King-Emperor's representative. We have agreed to carry out this Act. We are here to co-operate with the Government, yet we find, sitting here year after year, that our position is a very humiliating one. We feel both the pain of it as well as the

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

inutility of our presence here. It is in this situation that we are called upon to support the Finance Bill. I ask my Honourable friends on the opposite Benches, as I said before, to place themselves in our position and to feel whether, if they were in our position, they would support the Finance Bill. The Finance Bill is meant to raise taxes to support the administration with the expenditure that has been sanctioned, and for nothing else. We are opposed to that expenditure being maintained at the level at which it is maintained. Can we conscientiously, can we with any sense of self-respect, can we with any sense of our duty to our country, support the Finance Bill? We know that the money is needed; that the demands made have been sanctioned, but we feel that, as the Government of India have under the constitution the power of, and the responsibility for, incurring the great bulk of the expenditure, either according to their own discretion or according to the direction of the War Office or the Secretary of State in London, as the Government of India have the power of spending the money raised from taxes, they should take the responsibility of passing the Bill, empowering the raising of those taxes. That briefly is the reason why several of us will not be able to support the Finance Bill.

Now, Sir, this is a situation which, I submit, calls for a very early remedy and modification, and it is here* that I wish to detain the Assembly for a very short time in asking my Honourable friends on the opposite Benches to do their duty by the people of this country, in whose service they have placed themselves for the time being. I submit, Sir, that, whatever has been said to-day, what was said yesterday and the day before, and what has been said in other debates in this House, is a very clear and sufficient index of the general feeling that exists in the country. I regret that the case should at times be overstated. I regret that, at times, there is exaggeration indulged in. I regret that, on some occasions, animus or feeling should be brought in where it could have been avoided. But I appeal to my friends on the opposite Benches to look at the picture in its true perspective, in its correct and complete form, and looking at it, in this manner I ask them to think whether it is desirable, in the interests of anybody, that this system should continue any longer. We have asked that it should be replaced by Dominion status, by full responsible Government being established in its stead. I ask my friends to support our demand. If my Honourable friends on the other side will not misunderstand me, and if I may venture to say so, I very deeply sympathise with the Members of the Government sitting opposite. I consider it is a very severe strain upon any educated man to listen to all the criticism which has been made in the course of this debate and also on other occasions. We know that they are not individually responsible for this system, and I feel that it is a very serious strain upon any educated man to have to answer for a system, for the continuance of which he is not individually responsible. Sir, it is high time that this system were ended. If it is continued, bitterness will grow, that will be the only result which I foresee. If, on the other hand, my Honourable friends opposite will look at the picture in its true light and not allow their minds to be wrongly influenced or affected by the exhibition of small differences amongst us, if they will try to look beneath the surface and see how much of unity of opinion there is among all Indians on the main question of

Dominion status, with due safeguards for the rights of minorities, the position, I submit, will be absolutely clear. I thought it was a little unkind of the Honourable Sir George Rainy, when he emphasised the differences which had unfortunately been expressed on a previous debate, and when he did not even, on my invitation, recognise the great solidarity of opinion among all Indians on the question of Dominion status, with due safeguards for the rights of minorities. Now, Sir, I wish to say this, that this proposal for Dominion status is not a new one. It has not come into existence during the last two or three years, or since we came into the Reformed Councils. The idea was first put forward by the late Mr. Dadabhoj Naoroji in 1906. Much earlier than that, the Indian National Congress had formulated a scheme of self-government, in which the elected representatives of the people of this country were to decide matters of financial administration, as well as all other matters. The idea was revived and given a new life by Dadabhoj Naoroji in 1906, when, after describing all the ills of the system of administration, which have been referred to in this debate and in many others, he said there was only one remedy, namely, Swaraj or self-government, of the type that obtains in the Dominions or in England. Those were the words used by Dadabhoj Naoroji. Two years later the Indian National Congress definitely adopted Dominion status as the object of its pursuit. When the Great War came some of our people pressed the Government to make a declaration in favour of Dominion status. And in this connection I wish to invite the attention of the House to a Resolution that was proposed at the War Conference. At a critical stage of the war, a War Conference was convened by the then Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, which met in Delhi from the 27th to 29th of April in 1918. A message had been received from the Prime Minister of England, calling on India to rise to the height of the occasion and not to fail England in its hour of trial. The Viceroy convened a Conference, to which many Ruling Princes and several representatives of British India, were invited. I had the honour of being among those who were so invited. Now, Sir, at that Conference we all gave our unanimous support to the demand for more men and more money to help England to terminate the War with triumph. At that Conference one of our colleagues, the Honourable Mr. Khaparde, gave notice of a Resolution, in order that the interests of the Indian people in the war and their willingness to make sacrifices in it might be stimulated. He gave notice of a Resolution to which His Excellency the Viceroy referred as follows:

"I wish to inform this Conference that I have received notice of a Resolution from the Honourable Mr. Khaparde. The Resolution is as follows:

"That this Conference recommends that, in order to invoke whole-hearted and real enthusiasm amongst the people of India, and successfully to mobilise the man-power and material and money, the Government in England should, without delay, introduce a Bill into Parliament meeting the demands of the people to establish responsible government in India within a reasonable period which would be specified in the Statute.

We feel confident that the inauguration of this measure will make our people feel that they are fighting for their Motherland and for freedom in the defence of their own rights, rights in an Empire in which they possess the same status as other members thereof; and we are further sure that if the imagination of our country is captured and its enthusiasm so encouraged, it can easily equip itself to be, in the language of the Premier, 'the bulwark which will save Asia from the tide of oppression and disorder'.

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

This Conference recommends that all racial distinctions should be removed forthwith and Indians and Europeans should be treated as the King's equal subjects in all departments of public affairs."

Some of us tried to dissuade the Honourable Mr. Khaparde from putting forward this Resolution, but he did put it forward and His Excellency the Viceroy laid it before the Conference, but ruled it out of order. In concluding the Conference, however, His Excellency Lord Chelmsford said that this would not in any way prejudice the cause of India, but would rather help it, that it would be remembered that Indians had, at that juncture, not pressed their national demand, but that they had put it aside and lent their whole-hearted support to the immediate duty which lay before them. Said His Excellency in concluding the Conference:

"I am perfectly conscious of the fact, I do not blink it for one moment, that there are representatives in this Conference, who lay great stress upon certain domestic matters. I do not underrate their zeal in these matters. Nor do I underestimate the importance of these questions which they would like to have brought up before this Conference. But let me assure them that no prejudice has been done to the cause they have at heart, that rather the attitude of those who have been present here today, the fact that men who feel strongly on these questions should have been ready when the Empire calls, to drop for the moment these matters and say 'No, this comes first.' I say that this attitude will raise sympathy which must bear its fruit in due time."

My Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, got up in the end to propose a vote of thanks to His Excellency for convening the Conference, and speaking on this part of His Excellency's speech, he said, referring to the Resolution which His Excellency had overruled as irrelevant:

"I can assure Your Excellency that we did it simply with the view of convincing the Government in this country that, in your entire aims, we respond whole-heartedly to the call that has been made; our desire is to respond to the call whole-heartedly, and if the proposals embodied in the resolution of my friend, Mr. Khaparde, were accepted and given due consideration, it would facilitate the attainment of the object you have at heart; you will enable us to co-operate with you in a far greater measure than at present."

I mention this to show that Mr. Jinnah agreed with Mr. Khaparde that it would have been an advantage if the Government had accepted the recommendation which was contained in the Resolution. But the Viceroy overruled it, and we accepted his ruling, and we did not raise the question any further in that Conference. But other gentlemen who were present at the Conference, in offering their support, in inviting the people of this country to lend their full support to the Government in that hour of trial, spoke also of the status of this country. Among them, I will quote only one whom I hold in great esteem and I believe many Members on the opposite side also hold him in great esteem for the independence of his views, for the sobriety of his judgment and for the high regard in which he is generally held. This was Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar. Speaking on this question, he said:

"I am sure that the measures of co-operation inaugurated today will lead, not merely to a temporary suspension of differences, but to the complete eradication of the seeds of mutual distrust between the Government and the people, which has given rise to misapprehension and misunderstanding in the past and will develop a sense of real brotherhood between all communities—a sense of full partnership in the Empire, consummated by a sense of self-respect, of equality and of the rights of full citizenship in India."

That was what Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar said in 1918. After the war, we had expected that Dominion status would come to us. When Mr. Montagu came out to this country to carry on an inquiry along with Lord Chelmsford as a preliminary to the reforms, we urged upon him that we should have full responsible government established. I had the honour of presiding over the Indian National Congress at Delhi in 1918 and that Congress, in very clear terms, urged that the country was prepared for full responsible government, and that it should be established. We reminded England, we reminded Englishmen and Britishers generally that they had said repeatedly that they had fought the Great War for the principles of justice and equality, of justice and freedom to all nations of the world, and we asked them to let us enjoy that freedom in our own country. But the constitution they framed did not give us that; it gave us the kind of powerless power, the kind of helpless representation which I have described in the earlier part of my speech. It gave us merely the opportunity to offer our opinions on certain questions, and brought us in into this machinery, in which, by being allowed to vote on certain motions, we come in to lend our support to the constitution, but are shut out from any voice in the most important portions of the administration, the finances of the country. We have not the power to hold the executive responsible to ourselves. With the very best of intentions, with the most conscientious of judgments, every Member of the Executive Government is free to disregard the views, which have been expressed, even by the largest majority of this House. That is the system under which we are working. We have tried it now for nearly ten years. We have had much experience of it year after year in these debates, and I will ask every Member of the Assembly, and those Members of the Government who have been for a long time here, to recall what a painful feeling has been left in the minds of most Members of this House when they have found themselves working under this system with little power to influence the judgments of the executive.

Now, Sir, I submit that the time has come when this demand for full responsible government should be supported by every Member of the Government, when this painful, I would not call it farcical, process of administration with the help of legislation, which is not supported by the bulk of the elected Members of the Assembly, should come to an end. We want that this Dominion status should be adopted as their definite demand of the whole country, a demand in favour of which, in spite of some differences which are yet to be settled, the whole country has pronounced itself in clear terms. I might mention that it is not only now that we are pressing for responsibility in the Central Government. When the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals were published, I published my criticism of it and in that criticism, dealing with the proposals relating to the Government of India, I said—and I hope the Assembly will excuse me for quoting it—I said in 1918:

“Owing to the war, the next ten to fifteen years will be most fateful years in the history of India. It oppresses my soul to think that, during this period, the Government of India, which, as I have shown above, have failed to build up the strength and prosperity of the people to the extent it should have done, should continue practically unchanged, and that the representatives of the people, anxious to promote the good of their fellowmen, should still have to bear the pain and humiliation of having no determining voice in the government of their country. In the highest interests of humanity as it is represented by the 320 millions of this land, and for the good name of England, I earnestly hope that this will not be so, and that the statesmen of England will see that the Government of India is brought to a reasonable extent under the control of the people whose affairs it administers, Mr. Montagu and

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

Lord Chelmsford have well-described the effects of the war on the Indian mind. Let the statesmen of England ponder whether it will be reasonable to expect the people of India to be satisfied with any scheme of reform which will still keep them out of all power in the Central Government of their country."

Nearly ten years have passed since this was written and they have produced nothing. My Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Haye, asked a question this morning in a pathetic way. He asked, "Where did we stand in 1924, and where do we stand now?" Now, I ask all friends in great humility to emphasize our differences less, and to think of the points of unity which we have established, not with a desire to underestimate the importance of any question which was yet to be settled, but merely with a desire to see what really is the picture presented after this efflux of ten years. I submit that we stand stronger today and more united. I have heard Members of all parties express their desire that Dominion status should be established without further unavoidable delay. I hope that my friends opposite will take note of this fact, and press it upon the Government in England and push it forward to the full extent of opportunities which are open to them. I have one more word to say. We have discussed the Bill threadbare. All the other criticisms might be put aside for the moment. I know that some of the subjects of criticism are transferred subjects which are to be dealt with by the provinces. We know that. I do hope that too much importance will not be attached to these considerations. The main point that has been urged during the last three days is the necessity for a change in the constitution, and I submit that the only change that will suit the circumstances of the country and enable us to promote goodwill between Indians and Englishmen is the change which we have indicated, namely, full responsible government of the Dominion type, and I appeal to every Member on the opposite side to lend his fullest support to this proposal.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President: If Honourable Members have no further contribution to make, I should like to call upon the Honourable the Finance Member to speak.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

(Mr. Mukhtar Singh got up in his place.)

Mr. President: Has the Honourable Member any new facts to bring forward?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Yes, Sir. I thank you very much, Sir, for giving me a chance to express my views on the subject we are discussing. It is my misfortune, Sir, that though the Royal Commission on Agriculture has given its report long long ago, the Government have not seen their way to give any day to this House to discuss those recommendations. While the Agricultural Commission recommended that an Agricultural Research Council should be formed in this country, they clearly stated that it should be done by an Act of the Legislature, but still the Government have not come forward with a Bill, so that there may be a chance for the Members of this House to express their opinion as to how far they agree with the recommendations of the Royal Agricultural Commission.

Mr. K. Ahmed: We have sanctioned an amount of 25 lakhs.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: This is why I am forced to stand up at this late hour, and I hope the House will give me the indulgence of hearing the story of those people who consist at least of 78·9 per cent. of the total population of this country. Sir, I am glad the Honourable the Finance Member has admitted in his speech the low standard of living among the rural population when he says:

"I fully accept the statement which I have heard in this House that the standard of living among the rural population of India is miserably low, and I yield to no Member on the other side in my keenness to take a hand in the joint effort to remedy it."

Further on he says, "But this is no sudden and new phenomenon." I want to point out that he is correct there. It is a phenomenon brought about by this Government by slow and continuous process in 150 years. I shall try to show how it has been brought about. I have tried to look into the census figures of this country. In 1881 we find that the percentage of population living on agriculture was 28 per cent. In 1891 it increased to 61·06 per cent. It is possible that the percentage taken in 1881 might not have included all those who might have been included in 1891. If we disregard the figures of 1881, even then what do we find? In 1901, the percentage was increased to 66·5, and in the next decade it increased further to 71·6 per cent. and in 1921 it increased to 73·9. That clearly shows that there has been an effort on the part of the Government to kill all industries, one after the other, and to force the people of this country to live upon agriculture and agriculture alone.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (United Provinces: Nominated Non-Official): Are these figures only of people who live on agriculture or agricultural labourers?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: My friend asks me for details. I am certainly willing to give them. They include people living on agriculture, on arboriculture, on horticulture and on animal husbandry. That shows that, within 30 years, there has been an increase of 21 per cent. more pressure on land, and still we are told that the Indian cultivator, if he does not live happy and prosperous, is extravagant and things like that. If you refer to the land that comes to the share of every cultivator in this country, you will be perforce convinced that the cultivator cannot live prosperously. I shall not take the time of the House by referring to other publications about which the Government might say "We do not believe them." but I refer to the authentic report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. We find on page 183 of the Report:

"The Punjab figures, which are the only ones available for a province, indicate that 22·5 per cent. of the cultivators cultivate one acre or less; a further 15·4 per cent. cultivate between one and two-and-a-half acres; 17·9 per cent. between two-and-a-half and five acres and 20·5 between five and ten acres. Except for Bombay, which would probably show a very similar result, and Burma* which would give higher averages, all other provinces have much smaller average areas per cultivator."

That gives you why the Indian cultivator is so poor. If you refer to areas held by cultivators in other countries you will find that the English cultivator or American cultivator is prosperous, not because he is a better cultivator than the Indian cultivator, but because he has got more land. You will find that in England and Wales the size of the holdings,

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

varying from one to 5 acres, comes to 1.1 per cent. only, from 2 to 20 acres the percentage is 5 and 20 to 50 acres 9.7 per cent., the total under 20 acres is 6.1 per cent. and the total under 50 acres is 15.8 per cent. Then if you take the case of Germany you find that under $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres the percentage is 1.1; under $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 acres 4.8 per cent.; and $12\frac{1}{2}$ to 50 acres 10.1 per cent. Total under 20 acres is 5.8 per cent., total under 50 acres 15.8 per cent.

That gives you an idea, Sir, as to how the cultivator in other countries is prospering, and the cultivator in India does not prosper. In the United States the average holding contains 148 acres. I am told, Sir, by the Honourable the Finance Member, and in very forcible words he says in his budget speech:

"I sympathise whole-heartedly with those who, like my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, have expressed, in terms of great eloquence, their burning desire to improve the economic condition of the people. But I would say to him that the only way in which that can be done is by the constant and combined effort of Government and all those who can influence public opinion, directed to the extension of education and credit facilities, to the encouragement of hard work and thrift, and to an increase in real wealth by the introduction of improved methods of cultivation and communications. Anything else is no more than a quack remedy."

I want to examine this statement in this House. I have analysed the statement that I have read from his speech. It says, Sir, that there are five things that he advises us to adopt. The first is the extension of education, the second credit facilities, third the encouragement of hard work, fourth thrift, and fifth improved methods of cultivation and communications. I would like to show him that the state of affairs in this country does not warrant this advice. I take first education. As it is very late, I will not enter into a detailed description of all these things, but would point out that, before the English people came into this country, we had a better system of education (Hear, hear) than we have today. Not only this, I go still further and say we educated more people than we are doing today. (Hear, hear.) There may be some people who may not agree with me, and for them I would quote a gentleman, Mr. Leitner, the first Principal of the Lahore College. He says in his Report:

"In backward districts like that of Hoshiarpur the Settlement Report of 1852 showed a school to every 19.65 of male inhabitants, adults and non-adults, which may be contrasted with the present proportion of one Government-aided school to every 21,818.7 inhabitants.

"That was the case in 1878."

And even today what do we find, Sir? There is only one elementary school for more than three villages in this country, and still we are told we must educate. The Government get every pie that they can get from the poor people of this country, and may I inquire how much do they spend on education? What steps have they taken to educate the people of this country? I say, Sir, with all responsibility, that Indians will be still willing to give a special education tax, provided the Government makes a provision that every adult and every child shall be educated.

Mr. President: Education is a transferred subject.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I know, Sir, but unfortunately there is a sufficient area under the direct administration of the Imperial Government.

What have they done for it? Are they willing to have compulsory education in the whole of the area administered by them? Are they willing to spread education amongst the adults of this country? What steps have they taken in order to make everybody literate in the area under their control?

Last time, I pointed out that, in the area administered directly by the Imperial Government, the education was much more backward than in other provinces. It may be that the area has come under direct control only recently, but what special steps have been taken by the Government of India about the area under their direct control? If they have not taken any, Sir, I say that the Honourable the Finance Member cannot say that it is our duty to educate the people of this country. Is it not a fact that a number of institutions, in every province, are opened every day by subscription raised from those who are already poor and over-taxed?

Then the other advice that he has given is credit facilities. I would ask, how a poor man, who has nothing to give in security, can command credit facilities? When you have reduced every man in this country to this condition, is it possible to have credit facilities? If you consider it is possible, I ask, are the Government of India ready to give all their reserves on loan to the peasantry without any interest?

If they are not, what right have they to say that there should be better credit facilities? The entire framework of the credit societies is, as I have stated in my evidence, a farce. You cannot improve the condition of the people of this country by introducing the co-operative credit societies alone. No country has done it, and no country will do it. It is simply wrong to say that people do not take sufficient interest in co-operative societies. As a Director of a co-operative district bank, I have an intimate knowledge of what happens. At least in my province I know that the number of societies under liquidation is practically the same as the new societies that are being formed. It shows clearly that the people cannot pay their debts, and if you do not take care to increase their income, how is it possible that only credit facilities will solve the problem?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Free them from money-lenders.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: My Honourable friend suggests that we should free them from money-lenders. It is all very well to say so. Why should not, in the days of famine, as it is raging today, the Government give us *takavi* loans at the rate that the Government get from the Imperial Bank? If they cannot have more than 3 or 4 per cent. for their reserves, what right have they to charge 7½ per cent. from the peasantry and then say, "We are making advances as *takavi* loans." The interest was 6 per cent. before, and it has been raised to 7½ per cent. This shows how far the Government are interested in the peasantry of this country. If we go still further, we find that a person who takes *takavi* has to pay much more than that which comes to his pocket. If a man borrows Rs. 100, he hardly gets Rs. 94, and the balance of Rs. 6 goes to other men's pockets. He has to return it by a certain time limited by the instalment bond he is asked to execute. The result is that the interest that the poor man has to pay is much higher than it is said the Government is charging. If this is a fact, as pointed out by my Honourable friend, I have seen it myself and I know it is a fact—then how do you boast that the Government advances loans at a very

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

low rate of interest? I say that, if there is a very large amount of reserve, if there is a large amount of surplus which the Government have, do not make it over to the Imperial Bank. Why not invest the whole amount with the co-operative societies without interest, and let these co-operative societies distribute that amount at a lower rate of interest? I know in my own Province, the rate of interest generally charged by the co-operative societies, is 15 per cent. This shows, Sir, that the Government want to throw all the blame on the people of this country without doing anything themselves.

Mr. K. Ahmed: That is much less than what a *baniya* charges.

An Honourable Member: What about village banks?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I am asked, what about village banks. I know what the position of a village bank is in a village. In a village where there is a co-operative society, that society has to go by a certain Act, and according to the Act and the rules made thereunder you cannot advance sufficient money to the cultivator, unless he has got a security to give. Perhaps Honourable Members here do not know that it is not the amount of money that matters to the cultivator, but it is the amount of money that he gets at the proper time that matters. Suppose there is a man whose bullock dies in the beginning of the monsoon, and suppose he wants Rs. 500. He has not got the security to offer. What would happen? The co-operative society will not advance sufficient money, so that he might be able to carry on with his profession, and the result will be that, where there is a co-operative society and the members of it have discredited the money-lender of the village, they have to go to the money-lender again, and they will have to pay a much higher rate of interest than they would have had to pay before the advent of the co-operative society. This is what happens. I say, if you are afraid of the money-lender, then show the agriculturist of one acre the way by which he can live and get his living. If you cannot show him the way, you have no right to say, have better credit facilities. A man cannot live on that amount of land which he possesses, and therefore he has to be in debt and debt always. As to the amount of interest, he must pay a higher rate when he wants money, and the Government or the co-operative societies cannot give it to him. That is the position, Sir.

The only thing that can remedy this evil is the development of industries. The old industries ought to have been allowed to prosper in this country or you at least ought to have given a chance for those industries to prosper which are purely agricultural industries. I have seen, with great disappointment, in the Royal Agricultural Commission's Report, which I have read not once, but thrice, that it does not touch this point at all. They could not touch it. Why? Because if you look at the personnel of the Royal Agricultural Commission, Sir, you will see that agriculture was not represented on it. There was only the late lamented Sir Ganga Ram on the Commission. Unfortunately he died, and if he had lived, he would have contributed his quota in this agricultural Report, and it would have been written otherwise. I am sure that, from the writings he published during his life time, you will find that his opinion was something different from that which is stated in the Royal Agricultural Commission's Report. You appoint a Commission to go into the details of

the condition of the Indian agriculturist, in order to make his condition better, but you do not appoint any agriculturist member on that Commission. You know where the whole fault lies. This is the way in which you have destroyed all the industries, and nobody on this earth will be able to ignore that point, and this is why you did not appoint the right sort of people on this Commission.

The third thing is the encouragement of hard work. It is a cruel joke that the Honourable the Finance Member has cut. Let him show me any English agriculturist, or English cultivator, or any cultivator for the matter of that, who will come to India. I shall give him a small plot of land, the same amount of land that an Indian cultivator possesses on the average. Let that English cultivator import all his scientific and agricultural knowledge, let him till the land, let him live on it only for one year, and if he does not die within that time, then I shall certainly say harder work is possible. That is the condition of this country. The Honourable Member speaks of hard work, and how to do hard work. These people who do not get even one full meal a day and you want hard work from these people. You want harder work from those people who irrigate their fields in the severest winter season, and who pass their nights in the severest cold, with only one *chaddar*. These people who hoe their sugarcane in the month of *Jyeshth* (June and July) in the severest heat, do you expect harder work from them? I say, this is the most cruel joke that the Honourable the Finance Member has cut. (Hear, hear.) He ought to have been a little more pathetic towards the people of this country.

Then, Sir, comes another thing, that is, thrift. I do not understand how a man can be thrifty who has nothing with him to lay by. Any Indian cultivator has nothing with him, and to say that he ought to be more thrifty, I consider, is another huge joke. There are people in this House and there are people outside, that is people who have no direct connection with the peasantry of this country, who say, in season and out of season, that the cultivator is very extravagant. It is a falsehood, it is an incorrect statement of fact.

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy (Bengal Mahajan Sabha: Indian Commerce): That was the statement of Diwan Chaman Lall.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: He quoted only from a book written by some theorist economist. If there is a marriage in a family, a man must have some moments at least for recreation. And if he spends Rs. 12 where he ought to spend only Rs. 11-12-0, you ask him not to be extravagant. You smoke cigarettes worth more every month than the amount spent by a village peasant on a marriage. Still, you ask him to be more thrifty. Sir, those gentlemen who have nothing to do with the peasantry directly, if they label this charge against the peasant, I can simply say, this is an assertion based on ignorance. A cultivator does not get sufficient to eat, and does not get sufficient clothing; and still, you ask him to be more thrifty.

Lastly he advises him to follow improved methods of agriculture. On what lines, I ask? Is it on the lines that the raw youths from foreign countries, who come over here, ask us to adopt—is it on those lines? I say, with all responsibility, that so long as this system continues in this country (Hear, hear), so long as people from foreign countries are brought over to this country to teach us agriculture, this state of distress and

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

poverty will continue. Why? Because in England and in other foreign countries the climate is different, the soil is different, and the conditions are different, and still, whoever comes from England, does not come as an agriculturist, but comes as an expert agriculturist. (Laughter.) And what does he do? Whatever he has seen, and whatever he has learnt in a few years at his college, he considers that all those things can be adopted in this country. I would say, Sir, with all humility, that although the Royal Agricultural Commission has not denounced, in so many words, the agricultural departments of this country, yet they have clearly found out that the agricultural departments of the entire country have miserably failed to achieve their object. I would quote only a few passages in this connection, because I do not want to tire the House.

An Honourable Member: We are very tired. Finish.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I am quoting, Sir, from page 107:

"Agricultural implements in India are, on the whole, well adapted to local conditions."

Then further on, the Report says:

"They are within the capacity of the draught oxen, comparatively inexpensive, light and portable, easily made and what is perhaps of even greater importance, easily repaired and they are constructed of materials which can be readily obtained."

This is the opinion of the Royal Agricultural Commission, and the experts could not find it out so far. They have been every day, in season and out of season, telling us the importance of improved ploughs. If a person consider it derogatory to sit at the feet of an old farmer and learn his difficulties, I say he has no right to teach others. He can never teach anything; because a person who does not know our language, who comes as a ruler, even in the Agricultural Department, cannot understand our difficulties, and therefore, although his technical knowledge, or his expert knowledge, might be of any magnitude, still he cannot advise anybody. I say, Sir, that, unless and until the Indians are put in charge of the entire Agricultural Departments of this country (Hear, hear), nothing is possible. Further on, we find in the Agricultural Commission's Report:

"The Agricultural Departments have, however, so far done disappointingly little in this direction."

Mr. K. Ahmed: You find everything in the book; it must be very useful.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: Of course it is useful to those who care to read it.

An Honourable Member: Who understand it.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh:

"As regards the qualifications required for the officer in charge of the work on agricultural machinery and implements, we are of opinion that the head of this branch should be a research engineer, who is primarily an engineer, and secondarily a farmer, a man familiar not only with the manufacture of machinery and implements, but also with their use on the land. In short, he should be thoroughly conversant with the various problems which confront the small cultivator."

Mr. K. Ahmed: How can you then discredit the Members of the Commission?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: Again further on they say:

"We believe that the importance of conserving moisture has been the principal reason for the Indian cultivator's preference for the type of plough used by him; and, as he is too poor to afford a variety of implements, the ordinary Indian plough is the best type of general purpose implement for his needs."

In spite of this finding, do you know, Sir, what happened at the appointment of this Commission? Since the Royal Agricultural Commission was appointed in this country, there were articles published in England, in a number of papers, saying, "Here is the chance for better implements of agriculture being sold in India". That shows, Sir, why the Royal Agricultural Commission was appointed, though they were disappointed at the recommendations made by the Commission. I can say, Sir, from my own experience, what happens in this country, which will give you an idea as to how far the Agricultural Departments in this country really wish to help the peasants. At Palwal there was, the year before last, an exhibition. The Secretary of that exhibition, who knew me very well, wrote to me asking me to send my implements there from my place. I sent these implements at a cost of more than Rs. 50. I sent my own man to make the demonstration. On the last day, I went to Palwal myself. But what did I find? I found that the implements could not be exhibited, could not be demonstrated. (*An Honourable Member:* "Why?") Yes, I asked "why"? I was told that the man in charge did not allow it. I said "All right, I shall pay from my own pocket all the expenses of demonstration of these agricultural implements." This also was not allowed. Why? I was told these agricultural implements were not on the agricultural list and therefore they could not be demonstrated. (*Cries of "Shame".*) A very fine thing! Why? I know why. They were German make, or American make, and they would have done better than the British implements that were being exhibited there. If that is the real position, if that is the real condition of this country, I say, Sir, the sooner you abolish this Agricultural Department of yours the better. At least we shall not be misled; at least we shall be able to learn things for ourselves, rather than be told by those who don't know what they are saying.

One more thing, Sir, in this connection. On page 81 there is another certificate given to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. President: Has the attention of the Honourable Member been drawn to the *chit* that has been passed on to him?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I shall be very brief, Sir, and I shall try to finish as soon as possible. The Report says:

"It cannot be said that the Agricultural experts are even yet in a position to give satisfactory advice to the cultivator in regard to the use of manures."

This is your advice about manure. I have not time enough, Sir, to give you more quotations from this Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture to show you that there is not even one single improvement that this Department can boast of having done for the agriculturists of this country, and this is why they find fault with the poor cultivator and say he is conservative. He is not conservative. Give him the right sort of things and he will adopt them. I take it upon myself to see that, if the things that you advocate are really useful, they will be taken hold of by the cultivator. It

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

is a surprise, Sir, that even Indians who are in Government employ say the Jat cultivator is superstitious. There are people who can stand here and say that the Jat cultivator is a superstitious one and he non-co-operates on *dal*! I do not understand. It may be so in the administration of his district, but in my own place we are not non-co-operators in that sense. On our side the Jat is the best cultivator.

Sir, I have only two or three points more, and I shall try to be very brief. I was stating, Sir, about the industries, and I said there are a number of agricultural industries which have been killed and have been allowed to be killed. The first industry I will point out is sugar.

Mr. K. Ahmed: It is very sweet.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: It is very sweet, but according to Government they do not want to have a sweeter sugar produced in this country, to be taken by the people of this country. They want foreign sugar. I was told, Sir, only the other day, that there is to be a Sugar Sub-Committee under the Agricultural Council that is going to be formed. I am sorry, Sir, that we are not going to have only the first distillation. It will be a triple distillation. That Sub-Committee will form their own opinions, which will then be sent to the Advisory Committee, and then go to the Governing Body, and then those recommendations will be communicated to the Governing Body, and then possibly something may be done. The Government is sure that, by that time, the sugar industry will be killed. Sir, this is the treatment we are having from Government in the matter of the sugar industry. The very fact that, in the course of their voluminous book, the Royal Agricultural Commission have not said a word about the sugar industry, although they have touched on the subject of jute,—because of course it concerns them—the fact that they have not touched upon sugar in this entire Report—clearly shows the mentality that is working there.

Mr. K. Ahmed: They left that for you!

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: Then, Sir, take the case of vegetable ghi. This Government allow margarine and hydrogenated oils to be imported into this country under the name of ghi and it is shown as ghi not only in the market but in the customs reports as ghi. That shows the regard of the Government for the dairy industry.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: They can be prosecuted!

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: If I give you the figures, you will find that, in 1923-24, we imported 1,540 cwts. of this ghi, and in 1926-27 we imported 3,875 cwts.—an increase of 251 per cent. We know, Sir, at least I am quite sure, that even when a Resolution has been passed in the other House about it, no action will be taken. Henceforth, after the formation of an Agricultural Council, every important subject in connection with agriculture will be shelved under the pretext that it will be referred to this Standing Council. I shall be excused if I say a few words about this Agricultural Council. I would submit, Sir, that, in the first place, the Commission clearly recommended that 50 lakhs ought to be spent over this, and what did they say? They said "This is in our view the minimum grant", and here the Government has decided 15 lakhs to be the maximum

grant. And then it is not a grant, it is an endowment, as if this Government were making a charitable endowment to this object. It shows, Sir, how far they are sympathetic towards the cultivator in the appointment of an Agricultural Council. I would submit here, Sir, that it was clearly stated in the Report that the Agricultural Council should be brought into being by an Imperial Act of the Legislature. May I ask why this recommendation was not taken care of? Why? Because the Government are afraid that, as soon as this Bill is brought before this House, there will be a number of safeguards by the Indian people and the Government will be forced to administer that fund in the way the country want it to be administered. But now, in order to avoid that inconvenient method, they are creating this Agricultural Council by putting an amount in the Budget. Is it, I ask, fair to the agricultural Commission? Is it fair to the people of this country that you have not the courage to bring in a Bill for the formation of this Agricultural Council, discussing it here, and then deciding what should be the function of that body and how that Fund should be administered? But you won't do it. I conceive the Government have avoided the bringing of the Bill before the Assembly, because if the Bill had been brought before the Assembly, this House would have clearly stated that, under the Agricultural Council, all the servants working the agricultural experts—should be Indians, and that is why the Government wanted to avoid that inconvenient thing. I am certain, Sir, on this point, that, unless and until these Agricultural Departments are manned by Indians, and Indians alone, it is impossible to understand the real difficulties of the country.

Mr. K. Ahmed: The Secretary is an Indian—look at the Honourable Mr. Bajpai sitting there in the Treasury Bench.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: He is not on the Council. I am afraid my friend does not understand what the Council will be like; my friend will not be there on the Agricultural Council; and even then, suppose he becomes the Chairman of that Council, is it not possible that, next day, some other gentleman might be the Chairman of that Council? This is why, Sir, it was anticipated by the Royal Commission itself, when they said that they did not want an agriculturist to be the Chairman of that Council but that he should be an administrator—an Indian Civil Servant—perhaps a retired Commissioner might have been very good as Chairman of that Committee

Mr. K. Ahmed: Supposing he is an Indian: what is the harm?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: That shows, Sir, that you do not want any improvement in agriculture; what you want is to shelve all these things under the pretext of something or other. I have only one more word to say (Hear, hear.)

Mr. K. Ahmed: The question may now be put.

Honourable Members (from Nationalist and Swarajist Benches): "Go on, go on".

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: As I am asked, Sir, to finish (Cries of "Go on"!) Only one word I want to say: there is famine in the whole of the United Provinces and the Punjab.

An Honourable Member: And the Central Provinces also.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: And the Central Provinces

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhammadan): And parts of Bihar and Orissa also. (Laughter.)

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I shall not take any subject which has any direct connection with the provinces. I shall only deal in this connection with the duty of the Imperial Government, so that it may not be said that I am irrelevant. I have seen, Sir, in Hissar and Rohtak with my own eyes, not a single tree is left whose branches have not been chopped off and eaten by the cattle there. Cattle are dying by hundreds and thousands; and what has this Government done? Possibly a question might be put "What could the Government do?" I say, Sir, the Government could freely import fodder from those places where it was available in abundance; they could very well import grass from all the forest areas to those places.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Has not that been done?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: It has not been done. Will the Government Member in charge of the Railways let me know as to what stations are declared to be under famine conditions, because, under the goods tariff, it is necessary that a station should be declared, before a special rate can be given. May I know the names of those stations which have been declared to be famine-stricken?

Mr. M. Keane: In the Meerut Division.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I shall be profoundly obliged if I am informed of the stations which have been declared

Mr. M. Keane: How many hundreds and thousands of maunds of hay have been imported by Government, into Bulandshahr?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: It is for the Honourable Member to say. I think it would have been much better if the Honourable Member had given me the information, rather than put the question to me. I do not know.

Mr. M. Keane: As I say, hundreds and thousands of maunds of grass or hay have been imported.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: I know, Sir, in Meerut that nothing has been imported.

Mr. M. Keane: In the South of Meerut Division very large supplies have been imported; not in the northern or central part.

Mr. N. C. Chunder (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Large is a relative word.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: May I know if it has been done in Meerut proper?

Mr. M. Keane: I do not think so.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: Has it been done in Saradhna? Has it been done in Mowana and Baghat, Meerut District? The question, however, Sir, is not this. The question is what stations have been declared to be under famine conditions? It is not a question that I am putting to my Honourable friend, Mr. Keane, over there.

I put this question to the railway authorities and I ask them to let me know the number of stations that have been declared to be under famine conditions; and if they have not done so, even if hay has been imported into Meerut, it is not an answer to my question. I would submit, Sir, in this connection a very instructive passage at page 262 of the Royal Agricultural Commission's Report. That will give an idea how the railways are helping the poor peasants of this country:

"The Chief Conservator in the United Provinces informed us that the freight charges made it unprofitable to send even baled fodder more than fifty miles by rail."

That shows, Sir, that hay and fodder cannot be taken to more than fifty miles from the place where it is grown, and this shows, Sir, why there is always a famine of fodder, while it is available in abundance in the forest areas

Mr. K. Ahmed: All your points are exhausted.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: If you see the goods tariff, Sir, you will find a very peculiar thing. Even where the special rates are given, who is to pay for these special rates? Not the railways, but the poor peasants themselves. How? You will see it, Sir, in the goods tariff of the North-Western Railway which I have in my hands

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Or the Bengal and North-Western Railway?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: At page 199 you find on the broad gauge the railway charge for a four-wheeler is 3a. 6p. per mile. Out of this concession rate, one anna is to be paid by the trader and 2a. 6p. by the Government. This shows, Sir, that the railways do not carry these things at a concession rate, but the taxpayer has to pay from his own pocket. It is the same case with all the other railways—metre gauge or other gauges. That shows, Sir, that even at a time when famine is there, the Government has not seen its way to make fodder available at cheap rate.

I am forced to refer only to one more paragraph of the Honourable the Finance Member's speech. He says:

"The success of a Finance Member in such a country as this lies not so much in himself as with the favour of Providence that determines the seasons. If my period of office is blessed with a series of good monsoons, my task may be comparatively easy."

May I put a question to him? Is this a statement prepared by him, from his own experience, or has he been advised by his Government to say so? I understand, Sir, it cannot be his own experience of this country, since he could not have that experience; and if he has been so advised, I am forced to say, he has been ill-advised. Is it this country alone where the monsoon is uncertain? Is it not so in England? Is it not so everywhere? (Laughter.) Is it not so in Germany? Everywhere in this world, agriculture must have to depend upon the seasons. (*An Honourable Member from the Swarajist Benches:* "Quite right".) What is the peculiarity in this country, that with every monsoon, the cultivator fails or prospers? This shows, Sir, that this Government has not been able to provide the facilities with which the cultivator can freely combat the freaks of weather.

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

My friend over there will bear me out when I say that, even today in Meerut district, which is mostly irrigated by canals, there is more than half the area which is unirrigated. Why? Because the canals will not give water at a time when the cultivator needs it, and the reason that is adduced, is that they are protective canals and therefore they must extend the area under command as much as possible. That is the reason why, Sir, in spite of all the huge sums of money that have been put into canals, they have been able to irrigate only 48 per cent. Can't the Government create a number of other facilities for irrigation? Can they not sink a few tube wells for providing water to the cultivators? If the Government have a mind to do so, they can certainly do it; but they want to spend money on railways, not because they want to open up the country, but because they want that articles manufactured in foreign countries should be brought to the very door of the person who wants to consume them. I am not a believer, Sir, in those advantages which are said to be the direct benefits accruing from railways. No doubt, as travellers, we also enjoy them. It is much better not to open up a country, rather than to open it and expose it to all the temptations and luxuries of the West, without providing sufficient means to the people to buy those things with. I submit, Sir, that the Report of the Agricultural Commission, itself, has said that it will always be the duty of the Government to look to the prosperity of the people. They have clearly stated here.

An Honourable Member: What page please?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: It is stated on page 672:

"The demand for better life can, in our opinion, be stimulated only by a deliberate and concerned effort to improve the general conditions of the country side and we have no hesitation in affirming that the responsibility of initiating the steps required to effect this improvement rests with the Government."

Will the Government do anything in this matter? That is the question. I submit, Sir, that we are convinced on this side, according to a Sanskrit saying "*Dhanasya moolam rajyam.*" That is, it is only the governing power that can make the people prosper. We were told, and rightly told, thousands of years ago by one of the greatest economists of India, Kautilya, if we want to be prosperous we must have the Government in our own hands, and unless the Government parts with that power, it is impossible for this country to prosper and to live in peace and prosperity. (Hear, hear and Applause from all sides.)

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

(Mr. Arthur Moore got up, and Mr. President called out his name.)

Mr. Arthur Moore (Bengal: European): I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

Mr. President: I take it that no Honourable Member now wants to address the House?

Some Honourable Members: Some of us want to address the House at the third reading, Sir.

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava then got up to address the House (it being then 8-5 P.M.) and there was a continuous banging of tables and cries of "Sit down, sit down" from the European Group.]

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, if you allow me five minutes, I will finish my speech.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must rise if he wants to speak.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, if I rise at this late hour to speak when I find that all the Honourable Members are quite impatient for their food (*Several Honourable Members:* "Not at all"), my apology is that I want to refer to a very important matter. I know that food is very dear to Honourable Members

Mr. President: It has nothing to do with the Finance Bill

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is hardly true, Sir, that food has nothing to do with the Finance Bill. I would submit that the Government of India want food themselves, to sustain themselves, by the help of the Finance Bill. (Thumping of Desks.) I submit, Sir, that my only apology for rising at this late hour to refer to a special matter is the importance of that matter. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the condition of six crores of people, who are known by the name of depressed classes. Now, Sir, those depressed classes do not get full meals for months and for years. (Thumping of Desks and loud cries of "Sit down", "Sit down" from the European Group and from the Muslim Party.)

Honourable Members (from Swarajist Benches): Go on, go on please.

Mr. President: Order, order. I think the Honourable Member ought to take a hint. The Honourable Member has got a right to speak, and the House has got a right not to hear him.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: When I have a right to speak, I am certainly not going to be cowed down by this kind of clapping and thumping. (Cries of "Sit down, sit down" from the European Group.) This clapping by Honourable Members will not help them in the least; it will not stop me in the least from speaking on a very important matter (Cheers and cries of "Hear, hear" from the Swarajist and Nationalist Benches.)

Mr. President: Order, order. (Addressing an Honourable Member on the Swarajist Benches): The Honourable Member ought to know that this is not a public platform.

(An Honourable Member said something about the same treatment for Government Members.)

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: What do you mean by it?

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Why are they making a noise?

Mr. President: Order, order.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, I crave the indulgence of this House, I humbly submit to Honourable Members of this House, that they will very kindly extend to me the indulgence which I humbly pray for. I merely want to show that six crores of people have a right to be heard in this House, and I am speaking on their behalf. My point is this, Sir,

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.]

that in India the condition of the depressed classes is such that we cannot give our support to the Government to pass the Finance Bill. Last year a debate was raised in this House at the instance of my Honourable friend, Mr. Jayakar, and a Resolution was passed that steps should be taken to ameliorate the condition of the depressed classes. I put a question to the Honourable Member in charge on the 17th September as to what action had been taken in regard to that Resolution, and whether Members of depressed classes were competent to buy lands from agricultural tribes and the reply was that inquiries were being made as to whether certain depressed classes had the right to purchase certain lands. Sir, here I want to draw the attention of the House to this most important question, because when we are dealing with six crores of people we must consider their civic rights. Is it, or is it not a fact, I want to ask Honourable Members who are in charge of the Government of this country, that these members of depressed classes are not allowed to purchase land in India

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Is it so?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Certainly, Sir. There is not the least doubt about it. I challenge every Member of the Government to tell me whether in the North-West Frontier Province and in the Punjab these members of the depressed classes have a right to purchase lands. (*An Honourable Member:* "In the United Provinces they have a right to purchase lands.")

An Honourable Member: They cannot enter your houses; they cannot enter the public temples.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, I do not wish to reply in detail to all the exclamations about the disabilities under which these depressed classes labour, but let me tell my Honourable friends that I think it is wrong to ordain that the depressed classes should have no right to purchase lands or that they should not enter our temples. Sir, who is responsible for this mentality? I say that it is the Government who are responsible for it (*Cries of "Sit down, sit down."*)

An Honourable Member: Who is responsible for not allowing the Hindus and Moslems to enter temples and mosques?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is again the policy of the Government. There is a proverb "*Yatha Raja tatha Praja*". (As the King is, so is the subject.) It is the Government which has persistently adopted the policy of racial discrimination and the policy of divide and rule. The higher services in the Army are reserved by Government for the white people and a monopoly has been created by the Government for the Anglo-Indians in the Railway Department. This mentality, Sir, of making monopolies or creating special privileges, is responsible for the mentality of those who regard discrimination against depressed classes as necessary. But let me tell the Honourable Member who put me the question, that in this matter the upper classes of Hindus have burnt their boats. If this principle is accepted, let Government come forward with all possible measures which will secure equality to the members of the depressed classes. I will refer to an article under the heading "*Agrarian Serfdom*" appearing in the issue of the 20th March of the *Pioneer* (*Honourable Members from the*

Congress Benches: "Read the article"), and they will realise how those depressed and oppressed people are sold as bond slaves. They receive only two annas as wages per day. They have got no proper houses to live in. (*Cries of "From whom" from the European Group.*) The question is put, "from whom?" Who pays them two annas? I submit that it is the Government who are responsible for this. (*Cries of "No, no" from the European Group.*) Why don't they bring in a measure for fixing the minimum wage, and secondly, when the Government themselves pay Rs. 5 or 6, or 8 or 9 to their own labourers, with what face can they come here and say that other people are not paying more? If you look at the social condition of these people, apart from their economic condition, you are bound to come to the conclusion that Government are criminally responsible for. . . . (*Cries of "Divide" and "go on."*) As there is a general desire. . . . (*Cries of "Go on" from the Congress and Nationalist Benches.*) (*Cries of "Divide" from the European Group and Government Benches.*) As there is a general desire not to continue, I would submit to the House. . . .

Mr. President: I have already told the Honourable Member that he ought to take the hint.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Whose hint are we to take? Is it that we should be cowed down by the noise that is made on the other side? That is what it means.

Mr. President: If the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition desires to continue the debate, the Chair has not the slightest objection. Let the House decide.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I desire to continue the debate till tomorrow morning. (Hear, hear.) Before the unseemly noise on the other side began, I had given instructions to my Party not to stand, but after that last scene which I saw, I have countermanded those instructions and have asked every one of those who have not spoken to stand up and speak. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. President: I think, this being the last year of the Assembly, I have given considerable latitude to Honourable Members to review the administration of this country, particularly in view of the fact that the general elections are coming very soon and every elected Member of this House has to give an account of his presence in this House during the last three years to his constituency. I myself think that the question has been sufficiently discussed, and I would ask the House now to divide on the question that the question be now put.

(While the division bell was ringing.)

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: May I request that I may be allowed to finish my speech?

Mr. President: Order, order.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: On a point of order, Sir. Can the question be put in the middle of an Honourable Member's speech?

Mr. President: The rules permit that.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: May I know, Sir, if it is your ruling that, when a Member is actually speaking, it can be urged that he should stop, and that the closure should be applied?

Mr. President: It is my ruling that the rules permit of a closure being accepted while a Member is speaking. I have invariably not exercised that right, and in this particular instance also I think I have not exercised that right. But if the Honourable Member maintained that the Chair was wrong in accepting closure when the Honourable Member, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, was speaking, the Chair is prepared to say that the rules give him the power to accept closure when a Member is speaking. I have previously ruled on one occasion, I suppose it was Sir Darcy Lindsay who moved a closure when Mr. Ranga Iyer was speaking, and I then pointed out that the Chair was altogether unwilling to accept closure when a Member was speaking, although the rules permitted that to be done. I thought, and still think, that the Honourable Member had sat down when the Chair accepted the closure.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have not finished, Sir.

Mr. President: But the Honourable Member did sit down. The question is that the question be put.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—67.

Abdoola Haroon, Haji.
 Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Abdul Haye, Mr.
 Abdullah Haji Kasim, Khan Bahadur Haji.
 Acharya, Mr. M. N.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Alexander, Mr. William.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.
 Ashrafuddin Ahmed, Khan Bahadur Nawabzada Sayid.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bower, Mr. E. H. M.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
 Chatterjee, The Revd. J. C.
 Coatman, Mr. J.
 Cocke, Sir Hugh.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Crerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
 Dalal, Sardar Sir Bomanji.
 French, Mr. J. C.
 Gavin-Jones, Mr. T.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Mr.
 Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
 Hussain Shah, Sayyed.
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.
 Ismail Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Jowahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar.
 Keane, Mr. M.
 Kikabhai Premchand, Mr.
 Lall, Mr. S.
 Lamb, Mr. W. S.

Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
 Mitter, The Honourable Sir Brojendra.
 Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Muhammad Nawaz Khan, Sardar
 Mukharji, Rai Bahadur A. K.
 Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Rafique, Mr. Muhammad.
 Rahimtulla, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Rao, Mr. V. Panduranga.
 Rau, Mr. H. Shankar.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Roy, Mr. K. C.
 Roy, Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan.
 Sams, Mr. H. A.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George
 Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
 Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
 Simpson, Sir James.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
 Stevenson, Mr. H. L.
 Svkes, Mr. E. F.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.
 Zulfikar Ali Khan, Nawab Sir.

NOBS—40.

Alyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sessa.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
 Chaman Lall, Diwan.
 Chunder, Mr. N. C.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Dutta, Mr. Srish Chandra.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
 Jogiab, Mr. V. V.
 Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jammadas M.
 Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
 Mitra, Mr. S. C.
 Moonje, Dr. B. S.
 Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
 Naidu, Mr. B. P.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Phookun, Srijut T. R.
 Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
 Roy, Mr. B. C.
 Shervani, Mr. T. A. K.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar Prasad.
 Tok Kyi, U.

The motion was adopted.

(As soon as the result of the Division was announced by Mr. President, the Opposition Benches started prolonged thumping on the tables.)

Mr. President: Order, order. Sir George Schuster.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I am

(The thumping continued again.)

Mr. President: Order, order. Sir George Schuster.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I am most grateful to the Members of the Opposition for this applause. I do not propose to deal with this question at great length, and, as the hour is late, I propose to reserve most of my arguments to the third reading of this Bill.

(Honourable Members on the Opposition Benches renewed vigorous thumping on the tables.)

Mr. President: Order, order. I would ask Honourable Members to be reasonable. Sir George Schuster.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I regret that it should fall to me to deal with this matter at this very late hour

(The thumping was renewed and the Honourable the Finance Member was obliged to stop.)

Mr. President: I once more ask Honourable Members to be reasonable. Sir George Schuster.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I do not propose to deal at very great length in reply. We have had the whole field of Government administration elaborately discussed in the course of the debate

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I move that the question be now put.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The subject has been very fully covered by Honourable Members on all sides of the House. We have heard a general indictment

(Thumping of tables was renewed by the Opposition Benches.)

Mr. President: I appeal to Honourable Members not to make a noise.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: When an Honourable Member on this side was speaking, you did not appeal to the other side not to make a noise.

Mr. President: Is it by way of revenge against the Chair? We have never had these scenes in this House during the last four years.

An Honourable Member (on the Opposition Benches): It is the fault of the other side. They started it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: You were pleased to observe that when it is clearly indicated to an Honourable Member who is speaking, that the House does not want to listen to him, he ought to take the hint and sit down. We are now giving the same hint to the Honourable the Finance Member—that we do not want to listen to him.

Mr. President: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would be on perfectly safe ground if he had the majority with him on that question. If the House is with him, I can quite understand his attitude but we have seen that the House is not with him, and still he has asked his followers to go on creating this noise. I would ask him to reconsider the position.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: We will take the consequences.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. (*Shouts of "Sit down", "Sit down"*.) When the Opposition have had their say for the last three days, is it not chivalrous and proper to give the Honourable the Finance Member who has given them a patient hearing, a chance? (*Shouts of "Sit down, sit down."*) I want the Chair's ruling in that matter. (*Further shouts of "Sit down"*.)

Mr. President: Under Rule 17 (3) of the Legislative Rules, I suspend the sitting and direct that the House do meet again tomorrow morning at Eleven O'Clock.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 21st March, 1929.