

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

FRIDAY, 15th FEBRUARY, 1929

Vol. I—No. 12

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Unstarred Questions and Answers.

Statement of Business.

Resolution *re* Compulsory Physical Training, etc., for Indian
Boys—Adopted, as amended.

Resolution *re* Circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death—
Adopted, as amended.

DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1929

Price Five Annas.

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Monday, 11th February, 1929—*contd.*

The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed	...	665-70
The Indian Patents and Designs (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	...	671
The Trade Disputes Bill—Referred to Select Committee	...	671-702
Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands and the Standing Finance Committee	...	702
Amendment of Standing Orders	...	703

Tuesday, 12th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	...	705-06
The Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to...	...	708-88
The Inland Steam Vessels (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	...	738-52

Wednesday, 13th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	...	753-56
Short Notice Question and Answer	...	756-60
Amendments of Standing Orders	...	760-806

Friday, 15th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	...	807-12
Unstarred Questions and Answers	...	813-14
Statement of Business	...	815
Resolution <i>re</i> Compulsory Physical Training, etc., for Indian Boys—Adopted, as amended	...	815-32
Resolution <i>re</i> Circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death—Adopted, as amended	...	832-74

Monday, 18th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	...	807-12
Unstarred Questions and Answers	...	888-96
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, and the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	...	896
Demands for Excess Grants for 1928-27	...	896-904
Demands for Supplementary Grants	...	905-15

Tuesday, 19th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	...	917-68
Statement laid on the Table	...	968-69
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	...	969
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1929-30	...	970-80

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 15th February, 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.

REPRESENTATION FROM THE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE CUSTOMS, SALT AND INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENTS FOR AN INCREASE OF PAY.

541. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mahta:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have very recently received a representation from the clerical staff of the Customs, Salt and Income-tax Departments of Bombay urging a revision of their existing time-scales of pay?
- (b) whether it is a fact that the rate of annual increment granted to the mofussil staff of Post Offices in the Bombay Presidency is Rs. 5 per year?
- (c) whether they are aware that the cost of living in Bombay is more than that in the mofussil?
- (d) whether this point will be considered in dealing with the representation from the clerical staff of the Bombay Customs, Salt and Income-tax Offices recently received by them?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) A representation urging an increase in the existing scales of pay of clerks has been received from the Central Board of Revenue Ministerial Officers' Union in Bombay. Under Standing Orders, such representations have to be submitted to Government through the local heads of Departments concerned, *viz.*, the Collector of Salt Revenue, the Collector of Customs and the Commissioner of Income-tax. The recommendations of the Commissioner of Income-tax and the Collector of Customs have been received, but not those of the Collector of Salt Revenue, who has been reminded.

(b) Yes.

(c) The fact that the cost of living in Bombay is more than that in the mofussil has already been recognised by the grant of higher rates of pay to clerks in Bombay City than to clerks in the mofussil.

(d) Certainly.

APPOINTMENT OF APPRAISERS AND PREVENTIVE OFFICERS BY PROMOTION FROM THE CLERICAL CADRE OF THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT, BOMBAY.

542. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there are in the Customs Department of Bombay executive appointments of Appraisers and Preventive Officers?
- (b) whether these appointments were up to 1914 filled up from the Customs clerical cadre?
- (c) whether promotions described in (b) above were made even in the years 1920-22?
- (d) whether any such promotions have been made since the year 1922?
- (e) the reasons and grounds thereof if the reply to (d) above be in the negative?
- (f) whether such promotions will at least be made in future?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) Prior to 1914, Appraisers, but not Preventive Officers, were to some extent recruited from the ministerial service.

(c) No clerks were promoted to be Appraisers or Preventive Officers in the period 1920 to 1922, but five were in that period appointed to be Examining Officers.

(d) One such appointment was made in 1926, the Superintendent of the Cotton Excise Department being provided for in the Appraiser's grade on the abolition of the cotton excise duty.

(e) The increasing complexity of appraising work makes it necessary that the appraising department, in so far as it is not staffed by men directly recruited on account of special technical qualifications, should be manned by promotion from the grade of Examining Officers, since the latter acquire a thorough grounding in the work in the course of their own duties. Similarly, it has been held to be desirable that Examining Officers should be recruited direct so that they may be trained from the beginning of their service in their own particular duties, which have little in common with the duties of clerks. The duties of Preventive Officers are also quite different in character from those of clerks, and it has been held that it would not be advantageous to efficiency to make a practice of promoting clerks to this rank.

(f) The Government do not propose to interfere with the discretion of the Collector of Customs in this matter.

APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTORS OF INCOME-TAX BY PROMOTION FROM THE CLERICAL CADRE OF THE INCOME-TAX OFFICE, BOMBAY.

543. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there are in the Income-tax Office of Bombay executive posts of Inspectors?
- (b) whether these posts were filled up from out of the clerical cadre?
- (c) whether they are aware that this consideration was not attended to very recently in filling these posts?

(d) reasons for such decision if the reply to (c) above be in the negative?

(e) whether these posts will in future be filled up from out of the clerical cadre?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) The posts of Inspectors in Bombay City are filled up usually either by the direct appointment of qualified persons not in the service of the Government or by the promotion of members of the outdoor staff which consists of the bailiffs appointed for Bombay City and the Inspectors working in the mofussil. In exceptional cases members of the clerical staff have been appointed, but the normal line of promotion from the clerical staff is to posts of Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents. Actually out of 26 posts of Inspectors in Bombay City, 5 have been filled by promotion from the clerical staff.

(c) and (d). Do not arise.

(e) The practice described in answering part (b) of the question has been in force for some time and has proved to be suitable. There is no intention of changing it.

GRANT OF ALLOWANCES TO SUBORDINATE GOVERNMENT SERVANTS IN BOMBAY TO MEET ENHANCED RENTS.

544. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they are aware of the recent increases in the house-rent of Bombay City owing to the termination of the Rent Act?

(b) whether they intend to grant any sort of allowance to their subordinate Bombay servants to enable them to meet the enhancement in rent?

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

METHOD OF DETERMINING STAFF OF POSTMEN REQUIRED FOR A PARTICULAR POST OFFICE.

545. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state whether any time-test is applied for determining the staff of postmen or village postmen for a particular post office as in the case of clerks? If not, what things are usually taken into consideration for this purpose and how are they calculated for cities like Bombay, Calcutta, etc., on the one hand and for small towns and villages on the other?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The reply to the first part is in the negative. As regards the second part, the Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given by the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra to the first part of Mr. N. M. Joshi's starred question No. 498 on the 18th February, 1927.

GRANT TO POSTMEN AT LONAVLA AND KHANDALA OF THE POONA SCALE OF PAY.

546. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that postmen at Lonavla and Khandala were getting

the same scale of pay as the postmen at Poona and Kirkee before the Postal Enquiry Committee made its recommendations in the year 1920, which classed Lonavla and Khandala as 2nd Class areas? If so, will Government be pleased to state whether they have made any enquiries to ascertain that living at Lonavla and Khandala is cheaper than at Poona and Kirkee? Is it a fact that they have refused to grant the Poona scale to the postmen at Lonavla and Khandala? Will Government be also pleased to state the reasons for refusing the Poona scale for the postmen at Lonavla and Khandala?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Part I. No.

Part II. Does not arise.

Part III. A representation was submitted by the Bombay Presidency Postmen's Union to the Director-General and it was rejected.

Part IV. The rate of pay fixed with effect from the 1st May, 1928, was considered adequate.

GRANT OF INCREASED PAY TO OVERSEER POSTMEN.

547. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that, before the recent revision equalising the pay of reader and overseer postmen, the latter were getting a higher scale of pay than the former, for the reason that the duties of overseer postmen are more onerous and important than the duties of reader postmen?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state whether they intend to sanction more pay to overseer postmen, or to give them some duty allowance? If not, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the same?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) The scales were the same except for a small difference of Rs. 2-8-0 per month higher duty pay granted to overseer postmen.

(b) No. In the revision of pay it was decided that these classes should be grouped together with an improved rate of pay common to both, the small difference formerly existing being ignored.

EMPLOYMENT OF POSTMEN AND BRANCH POSTMASTERS AS CLERKS.

548. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that postmen and branch postmasters are made to work as clerks for a number of years on their original pay, and then reverted to their substantive appointments if they fail to pass the departmental prescribed test? Is it also a fact that this prescribed test is in English dictation and arithmetic and that these subjects have nothing to do with the practical and technical work which these employees are called upon to perform and that these employees more often than not fail to pass the test? Are Government prepared to issue instructions to the effect that postmen and branch postmasters may be made to work as clerks only in emergent cases and if they are made to work as such beyond a certain period they will be confirmed as clerks without the departmental prescribed test?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Government understand that the practice is not what is suggested in the first part of the question. The prescribed test is in English dictation and arithmetic. A knowledge of both English and arithmetic is necessary for clerical employees in the post office, and those who aspire to promotion to the clerical cadre must show their competency in these subjects. I am not in a position to say what proportion of candidates pass the test. In reply to the last part of the question, Government are not prepared to issue instructions as suggested.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I know, Sir, whether the recommendation for the promotion of these postmen as clerks in the lower scale was specifically made by the Ryan Committee as a means of economy and efficiency, and that no such tests as are now sought to be imposed were recommended by the Committee, as it would result in the exclusion of these people?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: If I may say so, Sir, that does not arise out of this particular question. My friend, Mr. Jamnadas' question referred to promotion to the ordinary grade of clerks. The question of promotion to the new grade of clerks recommended by the Ryan Committee is engaging the consideration of Government; but there too it would not be possible to make any promotions unless the people are in a position to satisfy certain tests.

PAY OF SENIOR OVERSEERS, ETC., IN THE POST OFFICE.

549. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the recent revision for overseers, reader-postmen and men in inferior service in the Post Office has not appreciably benefited the senior men in service and that the benefit is not in proportion to the length of their service in the Department, their pay having been fixed under certain Fundamental Rules? Is it also a fact that those who have put in more than 25 years' service in the Department cannot hope to reach even the maximum of the new time scale before they retire? If so, will Government be pleased to state whether they intend to consider the case of such senior men in service and to grant to them some larger number of increments at once?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Part I. Yes.

Part II. This is substantially correct.

Part III. Government do not consider that there is justification for the grant of any special concession. I would in this connection invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given by Sir Basil Blackett to a somewhat similar question asked by Kumer Ganganand Sinha on the 31st August, 1927.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I know, Sir, whether it is possible, as a special case, in the case of these postmen who have been given increments, not to apply the Fundamental Rules? I understand that, by the application of the Fundamental Rules, people who are to get promotion should begin from the scale at which it starts, but that people who

are newly appointed are given better pay to start with than the men who are promoted and are getting extra allowances. But, perhaps, Sir, I may put down a separate question.

PAY OF CLERICAL AND OTHER CLASSES IN THE POST OFFICE.

550. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** Is it a fact that the pay of the clerical and other classes in the Post Office was fixed on the point to point system in the year 1919 when the Postal Enquiry Committee's recommendations were accepted by Government? Is it also a fact that Government have discontinued fixing the pay on this system, while giving effect to the recent revisions granted to these employees, and that it was fixed under Fundamental Rule 22? Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for this departure and whether the Government of India have no longer the authority of giving effect to revisions sanctioned by them on the point to point system?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Part I. No. In 1919 the pay was fixed according to the length of service.

Part II. Yes.

Part III. It was considered necessary to follow the ordinary rules which have statutory force and which the Government of India are not in a position to set aside.

†551.

REPRESENTATION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BIHAR, ON THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR RAILWAYS.

552. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the names of the Chambers of Commerce that are represented on the Central Advisory Board for Railways?

(b) Are Government aware that there is a Chamber of Commerce in Bihar also and that it has no representation on the Central Advisory Board for Railways?

(c) If so, will Government be pleased to state reasons why the Bihar Chamber of Commerce has not been represented on the aforesaid Board so far?

(d) Do Government propose to take a representative of the Bihar Chamber of Commerce on the Central Advisory Board for Railways at the time of its next reconstitution?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) to (d). There is no specific provision in the constitution of the Central Advisory Council for Railways for the representation of Chambers of Commerce. The election of members is made by the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State from among the Members of these Houses, and this is the only avenue through which members of Chambers of Commerce can be elected.

† Withdrawn by the Honourable Member.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PUBLICATION BY THE *CIVIL AND MILITARY GAZETTE* OF A FALSE RUMOUR IN CONNECTION WITH THE BOMBING ACCIDENT AT JAMRUD.

222. **Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the following passage in an editorial published in the *Civil and Military Gazette* of February 2nd, 1929?

"We have already seen how the rumour was bruited abroad that the aeroplanes which dropped a bomb on the Jat Squadron of Poona Horse was in reality on its way to bomb the Shinwais."

(b) Is not the statement contained in the above observation incorrect?

(c) Have the Government made any enquiries about the bruiting of such a rumour?

(d) Was the rumour bruited about by any newspapers or groups or individuals?

(e) Have they been warned to desist from the circulation of such rumours?

(f) Are any other steps contemplated to prevent the circulation of such rumours? If "yes", what are those steps?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the list of those who were killed or wounded in the Jamrud bomb disaster has not been published?

(h) Will Government be pleased to state why the said list has not been published?

(i) Are Government aware that the withholding of the list has caused much apprehension among their friends and great anxiety among their relations?

(j) Will Government be pleased to state the names of persons killed or wounded in the said disaster?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) Yes.

(b) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the statement made on the 11th February in answer to starred questions Nos. 470 and 498. The rumour is entirely incorrect.

(c), (d), (e) and (f). Government have made no inquiries about this rumour nor taken any steps in connection with it. They have no reason to suppose that it has found credence anywhere. In view, however, of the publication of numerous other misleading and alarmist reports, it has been found necessary to impose a measure of censorship of Press messages. Efforts are also being made to ensure the prompt supply of authentic information to the public.

(g) and (j). A complete list of casualties up to date, showing also the progress of the injured, was communicated to the Press on the 11th February.

(h) Does not arise.

(i) The answer is in the negative. The next of kin were informed immediately by telegram and by letter at their homes.

TENDERS FOR ROLLED STEEL JOISTS FOR THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

223. **Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Are Government aware that tenders were invited by the North Western Railway for rolled steel joists, mild steel sections, etc., required for consumption during 1929-30, to reach the Agent, North Western Railway on 3rd December, 1928?

(b) Are Government aware that prices c. i. f. Karachi were called for?

(c) Are Government aware that subsequently a special letter No. 601-C., dated 20th November, 1928, was issued before the due date, asking that the words "c. i. f. Karachi" be deleted and prices f. o. r. Karachi or any other station quoted?

(d) Are Government aware that, in spite of the above alteration, c. i. f. Karachi quotations were accepted?

(e) Are Government aware that, by thus accepting c. i. f. Karachi prices, the firms at Karachi, who quoted in the correct manner, have lost a large contract, although their prices were comparatively lower?

(f) If the replies to (a) to (e) are in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the names of the firms whose offers were accepted and the reason for the action taken by the Railway in accepting c. i. f. prices in spite of the letter cancelling this condition?

(g) If the replies to (a) to (e) above are in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to re-invite the tenders?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I am making enquiries from the North-Western Railway Administration and will communicate with the Honourable Member on receipt of their reply.

PURCHASE OF STORES FOR THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BY THE CONTROLLER OF STORES, KARACHI, FROM EUROPEAN FIRMS.

224. **Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Are Government aware that the purchase of stores for the North Western Railway is done by one officer, viz., the Controller of Stores?

(b) Are Government aware that, since the appointment of the present incumbent, the invitation of daily tenders for casual requirements from Indian firms in Karachi has been stopped, the only recipient of these being European firms in Karachi and firms at Bombay and Calcutta?

(c) If the reply to (b) is in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reason for stopping the issue of tenders to Indian firms and will any steps be taken to remedy the injustice to Indian firms in Karachi?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I am making enquiries from the North-Western Railway Administration and will communicate with the Honourable Member on receipt of their reply.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar (Leader of the House): Sir, with your permission I desire to make a statement as to the probable course of Government business in the week beginning Monday, the 18th February.

On Monday, the 18th, motions will be moved in connection with the elections to the Railway Central Advisory Council and the Railway Standing Finance Committee. Thereafter, the election to the panel in connection with the Advisory Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands will take place. Thereafter, motions will be made, first in respect of excess demands and next in respect of supplementary demands.

On Tuesday, the 19th, the first business will be the election of the Standing Finance Committee. This will be followed by the presentation of the Railway Budget.

Wednesday, the 20th, has been allotted for non-official Bills.

Thursday, the 21st, has been appointed by the Governor General for the General Discussion on the Railway Budget.

On Friday, the 22nd, there will be no sitting of this House.

Saturday, the 23rd, is the first of the days appointed by the Governor General for the voting of Demands for Grants in connection with the Railway Budget. I may take this opportunity of informing Honourable Members that the remaining days appointed by His Excellency the Governor General for the voting of these Demands are Monday, the 25th February, Tuesday, the 26th February and Wednesday the 27th February.

RESOLUTION *RE* COMPULSORY PHYSICAL TRAINING, ETC., FOR INDIAN BOYS—*contd.*

Mr. President: The House will now resume further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Dr. B. S. Moonje on the 30th January, 1929:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps should be taken as early as possible to provide for compulsory physical training, military drill and rifle practice for Indian boys attending schools and colleges between the ages of 16 and 20 years."

Kumar Rananjaya Singh (Fyzabad Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to give my full support to the Resolution of my Honourable friend Dr. Moonje. The purpose of the Resolution has been well explained by the Mover and the Honourable Mr. Aney, and Mr. Jayakar. My Honourable friends have also replied to the objections raised by the Honourable the Education Secretary. I here want to refer to only two points raised by the Honourable the Army Secretary. The first point is as regards the compulsion of the physical training and military drill. He said,—I am quoting his own words:

"It is possible that if a measure of this kind were introduced there might be a wave of enthusiasm at the start which would carry a certain way, but sooner or later I think you would find a spirit of grave discontent fostered among students; and the measure of compulsion would either peter out, or else it would culminate in something in the form of a strike. I may note, a strike of students armed with rifles, bayonets and ammunition."

[Kumar Rananjaya Singh.]

A wonderful deduction, Sir, I, at least, don't find any logic in it. But before going into the argument, may I ask Honourable Members opposite, since when the Government have begun to direct their activities out of the fear of strikes. Government, especially the educational authorities, have very seldom shown any solicitude for the difficulties of the students. How is it that the time, when a wholesome and a highly beneficial proposal for the student community is moved here, the Government have begun to shed crocodile tears over the difficulties and the burdens under which the student community already labours. I want to express before the House, Sir, my firm conviction that the opposition from the Government Benches to this Resolution is not due to any sympathy with the hard burdened student community, nor is it due to any educational considerations. I in fact have a very poor opinion about the present day educationists in India. I don't mean to say all of them, but most of them, fed up by the most poisonous system of education that is prevalent in this country, have got their hearts and minds poisoned towards all high aspirations of the nation. This education, instead of broadening, has narrowed down their outlook to a few books and sermons read to them by their white masters and professors. I cannot but feel pity for my Honourable friend with *ahimsa* serving and helping the Government through thick and thin, the Government that is established only by dint of guns, bombs and bayonets. I utterly fail to understand in what way the ideas of *ahimsa* of my Honourable friend the Education Secretary can be reconciled with the ruthless oppression of the Government under which he has the honour to serve. It is very fine to speak of *ahimsa* when a poor Indian young man wants to learn how to handle a rifle or fire a shot from it. I and most of us on this side of the House also believe in *ahimsa* but I submit, Sir, that *ahimsa* does not mean to be not able to defend one's self. We don't want *himsa*, i.e., blood-shed but if *himsa* is necessary to prevent blood shed, I consider it another form of *ahimsa*.

It has been said, Sir, that in a country like India, or a country of the size of India, when you have not adopted or introduced the principle of compulsion for education itself, you cannot proceed to make military training obligatory. I am quoting, Sir, the Honourable the Education Secretary. To me this argument appears to be quite illogical. Does he mean to say by this, Sir, that as education is not compulsory for all in India there cannot be any compulsory subject which all the students going to schools and colleges must read? This is contrary to facts. Everybody here knows that, in spite of the fact that education is not compulsory, there are some subjects that all the students going for education have to study. For instance, for every school-going student, mathematics up to a certain standard is unavoidable. English is a compulsory language to be learnt by all scholars. If they don't study them they have to leave the school or college. Some may say that "Oh! the study of these subjects is essential for the mental development of the scholar". The knowledge of English is a necessity in the modern age. But, Sir, so is the physical training and military drill for building the physique and the character of the student. Is there any educationist who is so wise as to have the obstinacy to say that military drill and physical training will do any harm to the students? I wonder if there is any. On the other hand there is a considerable number of Honourable Members, who considers that this training will be of immense good to the scholars. It will make them

physically fit for the struggle of life and will make them an asset to the nation. After this training, they will be better able to fulfil the obligations of a citizen.

A very funny remark has been made by the Honourable the Army Secretary. He has said that "It came as a shock and a surprise to hear my Honourable friend Mr. Aney say, that the words in the Resolution are not military training but military drill". He has further said that, if the Resolution means only this much, then it is a most unexpectedly innocuous Resolution.

Exactly so, Sir, but what is there to be shocked at in it? Moreover the Honourable Secretary appears to have forgotten his above remarks when he proceeded with his speech. He has stated at a further stage that:

"If we carried out that plan and introduced compulsion in the University of Delhi, the only result would be that we would deplete the University, and the neighbouring University would profit by the measure."

I submit, Sir, how can a harmless thing, as the Army Secretary has stated this to be, so provoke the students as to leave the University at all? What the Members of this side of the House think is that this physical training, instead of proving repulsive to the students, will be an object of attraction. Certainly the members on this side of the House can claim to understand the mentality of the Indian students and parents better than the Honourable gentlemen on the other side. The case of the University Corps does not apply here. There is no wonder if the Corps have not risen to the desired quota. Those who are in touch with the University Corps know perfectly well that the officers and instructors of the Corps do not form a part of the college staff. They are not under the college authorities. The necessary result is that the officers and instructors do often arrange programmes which clash with the regular studies of the students. How can anybody expect a student to keep absent from the college lectures for the sake of the military training which is not going to be his regular profession?

On the other hand, this Resolution requires that arrangements for physical training and military drill, etc., be made through instructors who should form part of the college staff, under the Principal of the college, or the head of the educational institution concerned. In this arrangement there can never be any clash in the times for different subjects. When it will be guaranteed that no other part of the education will suffer by this, students can possibly have no objection to undergo the training.

At this place, Sir, I would like to refer to a remark of my Honourable friend Revd. Chatterjee. His objection to compulsion, in his own words, is in this way. He has said:

"We have already so much compulsion that is imposed on students to do one thing or another. They have to learn a multitude of subjects."

I ask the Honourable Member, how the students that have joined the University Training Corps can find time to undergo the full military training, while the other students cannot find time for this simple training. Does the Honourable Member mean that the students going to the University Corps are not required to learn a multitude of subjects? If they can do so why can't the others?

[Kumar Rananjaya Singh.]

The Army Secretary has asked, "Who is going to provide the money?" It is not difficult to answer. The Government should provide money. It can be asked from where? The plain reply to this, Sir, is, by cutting down the fat salaries and allowances of the military officers. The Government has not grown pauper, to put this silly consideration in the way of such an important motion. If the Government do not find its way to accept it on account of the financial aspect of the proposal, let this proposal be accepted and a committee, with the majority consisting of Elected Members of this House be framed to go through the financial aspect of the proposal and to propose methods to find money for the scheme. If the Government is sincere and the question of money is really an obstacle in the way of accepting this Resolution, here is a proposal that will solve the problem. But sincerity in matters of public utility is considered a weakness by the Bureaucracy.

I submit, Sir, that the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution has done a great service to the country by bringing the question of physical training, etc., before the public eye. If the Government is not going to accept even this simple thing, then it will have to thank itself for the discontent among the youth of the country that is spreading with very fast speed.

With these words, Sir, I support the Resolution.

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Sir I rise to move the amendment that stands in my name:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that with a view to remove the defects in the character training of Indian youths as emphasised by the Skeen Committee, steps should be taken as early as possible to provide compulsory physical training, games, and drill, for Indian boys attending schools and colleges between the ages of 12 and 20, and to provide and encourage the use of miniature rifle ranges."

When I first saw Dr. Moonje's Resolution on the Notice Paper, I was at some loss to understand what was the object he was aiming at. On the face of it that Resolution was a plea for a measure of compulsory military training. Now, Sir, I hold that compulsory military training is for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is for the defence of the country. That is the fundamental reason for which any country adopts compulsory military training. It is for the purpose of maintaining an army for defence. In India I think Dr. Moonje, who has made a very considerable study of military matters, will agree with me that no such heroic method is necessary for our defence, nor would it, I think, be particularly suitable. For instance, on the North West Frontier, we have not the terrain on which we could employ vast masses of troops. What we require for the defence of the North West Frontier is undoubtedly a small and highly expert army, and we would possibly be doing no good in having a large body of men partially trained, ill equipped and improperly led. Apart from that, there are in complying with his original Resolution the difficulties of finance. For instance, to find money to arm 350,000 boys and to provide for the custody of those arms would present really very serious financial difficulties. I came therefore to the conclusion that Dr. Moonje's object was not that of compulsory military training for the purpose of defence, and I assumed

that his real aim was manly citizenship. Since the debate on his Resolution, he himself, Mr. Jayukar and Mr. Aney, have made it perfectly clear that the aim and object of this Resolution is this one purpose of manly citizenship, of the building up of our boys into men. With that Resolution, with that object, I and my Group are in entire sympathy and we will join hands with Dr. Moonje in doing all that we can to force that objective on the Government.

It is perfectly true that our youths, as trained to-day and as turned out from our schools and colleges, are defective in character. The Skeen Committee was perfectly correct in emphasizing that point. And they are not the only critics of the Indian educational system in that manner. My own Association, in front of the Hartog Committee, emphasized exactly the same point as the Skeen Committee, and as Dr. Moonje has done in this House with good effect.

Now, Sir, what are the facts? I have discussed this question with many educational authorities in this country. I have here with me a letter which I have received from one. He says:

"The facts of the present position are these. In spite of the undoubted increase in athletic activities during the last 10 years, large numbers of students in schools and colleges still play no field games. In many schools 'drill' is compulsory, but it is often a formal old fashioned affair"

—I may add here that my Honourable friend, Mr. Chatterjee, in criticising the physical training which goes on in the schools in Delhi, exposed my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai's statement that he is doing a lot, by saying that it is all a farce—

"but it is often a formal old fashioned affair which has no connection with manly field games, which not only develop the body, but also train the boy and the young man in corporate effort, the spirit of give and take, friendly rivalry, self-reliance, leadership, etc., and other qualities which make 'men' and good citizens.

The newer Universities which conform to the unitary type, such as Dacca and Rangoon, naturally have organised 'university' games, but after nearly half a century of existence, the older universities do not appear to have any games and athletics—organised by the university as such, (although the individual colleges have their own organisations). For example, no one ever hears of 'University' teams from Madras, Bombay or Calcutta competing with each other. In my experience of the last 16 years, I know of only one such contest—that in which the Bombay University played against the Madras University at Cricket in 1913. Even in the case of a comparatively cheap game like tennis (cheap for purposes of travel) the universities of Madras, Bombay and Calcutta never have inter-university matches. The University authorities do not appear to think that the corporate life of the students is their concern. The Madras University, for example, although there are 10 colleges for men in the Presidency town, has not yet a University Games Association for any game; there is no University Boat Club and not even a University Union. Rangoon is the only University with a Boat Club and only two colleges in all India have rowing clubs.

University authorities have concentrated far too much on the production of graduates fitted mainly for clerical appointments"

—A point made by the last speaker—

"India wants manly, self-reliant citizens, with powers of discipline, initiative, sound judgment, tolerance, etc., and the best way to obtain them, is to pay more attention to the extra-class room activities of the students in schools and colleges."

That is the opinion of a man who has had considerable experience of educational matters in India. Now, Sir, what is the attitude of Government towards the Resolution as moved by Dr. Moonje. I think it is quite easy for them to arrive at the conclusion that the object of Dr. Moonje was so to

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

improve the training of our boys in India that they should be turned out as men. I admit that Mr. Mackworth Young, when speaking on the Resolution, showed real sympathy with the objects of Dr. Moonje's Resolution, though he found certain difficulties in the way of accepting that Resolution as worded. I know, as a matter of fact, that if Dr. Moonje would visit the colleges run by the Army authorities, he would be immensely pleased at the manly spirit that is maintained in those colleges. I only trust that they will not fall into the hands of the educational authorities. Now, what was the attitude of my friend Mr. Bajpai, who is responsible in this House for Education? He started off by saying that he was actuated by a spirit of *ahimsa* and that he was averse to preparations for slaying. I submit, if that is the attitude of the Government of India in the Department of Education, the quicker the Secretary of that Department is brought into contact with preparations for slaying the better. We can never build up men entirely on a spirit of *ahimsa*. Mr. Bajpai finds tremendous difficulties in the way of accepting Dr. Moonje's Resolution. He pointed out constitutional and other objections which he could not get over. I would suggest to him that his argument regarding the constitutional objections is not a very good one. I believe the Governor General in Council has powers of superintendence, direction and control. Even if he cannot compel Local Governments, he can bring pressure and influence to bear upon them, and I would be satisfied if my Honourable friend Mr. Bajpai would say "We will use the whole of our influence with Local Governments to get a change in our educational system". This is a matter of national importance and national interest and we cannot hope to advance unless we can turn out boys capable of shouldering the burdens of self-government and defence properly.

Now, Sir, what does my amendment suggest? I start off with the object which we have all in view—to remove the defects in the character-training of Indian youths, as emphasized by the Skeen Committee—and then I go on to suggest certain steps which I believe, and I hope Dr. Moonje agrees with me, are conducive to that result, that is compulsory physical training, games and drill. I may say, regarding the question of compulsion, I had some difficulty with my own Group. As a soldier, I naturally would prefer methods of compulsion like my fire-eating friend Dr. Moonje. My Group have a different point of view. They do not like compulsion. Their argument is, and it is undoubtedly a sound argument, that compulsion may spread a spirit of discontent with the very object which we are trying to attain. I agree with that but we have all gone through some measure of compulsion. I had to run myself till there was not a breath left in my body and I am quite certain that that is all to the good. But apart from that, there are definite methods whereby we in England consider that we have obtained certain qualities. It is the essence of compulsory games at public schools which has given the public school man anything of value which he has got. We are called flannel fools and, although educationally we may not be so high up as others, I think no Member here will contend that they are lacking in any way in the way of manly spirit. That is due to the great attention paid in English schools to compulsory games.

Diwan Chaman Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Compulsory?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Yes, unless you get a medical certificate that you are not allowed to play.

Diwan Chaman Lal: The Honourable Member has mentioned colleges in his amendment. I want to ask him whether it is a fact that there is compulsory training at Oxford or at Cambridge.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I was not at Oxford or Cambridge. I imagine there is no measure of compulsion there, as it is a later stage in life. I think most students in public schools have compulsion.

An Honourable Member: Compulsory games in public schools?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Practically compulsory games. Now, Sir, the original Resolution laid down the ages of 16 to 20. I myself do not consider that that is early enough to start. I believe one must start at the age of 12, when an English boy goes to the public school. There is another point. Even if we persuade Government to take some action, that is not in itself sufficient. The universities and schools which are outside Government control have got to be interested, and I may say, possibly, forced to some extent to look upon this extra-class room work as one of vital importance. I think that those schools and colleges to which Local Governments give grants-in-aid could undoubtedly have pressure brought to bear upon them. Also the parent has got to play his part. I might add that, in the battalion in which I served during the war, there was a very excellent Indian officer of the Indian Medical Service, one who was exceedingly popular with all his brother officers, who was extraordinarily efficient and also courageous and one who won the military cross. I discovered only four or five days ago that he is the son of a Member of this House who has recently rejoined us, my friend Lala Hans Raj. He told me "Well, I was surprised that my son got the military cross because he did not show much courage in his youth when I used to beat him". The process of beating applied by my friend Lala Hans Raj did have the very effect which I and Dr. Moonje want to get. If boys get a little more of that from parents, I think we would be able to build up our boys.

Now, Sir, Dr. Moonje planned a campaign to assault the Government position in this matter and he has delivered his first assault and met with a repulse, though I admit not very severe. His plan of campaign has however not actually gone through. Now, Government has exposed to some extent the weakness of its defences, and I think, with a certain amount of collaboration with Dr. Moonje, we might start a fresh plan of campaign which would be likely to pierce the defences of Government, and I would ask him and those who supported him whether they will not for once join forces with me and my Group in a final assault on the Government position. I believe Dr. Moonje has really done a valuable service in bringing forward this particular Resolution. If we are to go forward to self-government, it is entirely necessary that the foundation upon which we build should be good and sound, and it is by Resolutions of this nature that one can endeavour to build up a manly spirit amongst our youth. Sir, I move my amendment.

Sardar Gulab Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): In supporting the Resolution, Sir, I find that all the four principal objections raised so far by the Honourable Mr. Bajpai, Education Secretary, have been so satisfactorily

[Sardar Gulab Singh.]

dealt with by Mr. Aney and Mr. Jayakar that I need not touch any of them. As for Revd. Chatterjee's difficulties in the acceptance of the Resolution, I may submit that the details of the measure may easily be worked out and we hope to expect much sympathy from an eminent educationist like him, who is everyday conversant with the actual state of things. As for the persuasive speech of the Honourable Mr. Mackworth Young, who entirely agrees with the principle of the Resolution, I shall meet his apprehensions when discussing the subject matter of the Resolution generally.

Sir, it grieves me to the core and makes me feel all the more keenly the deplorable condition of the India of to-day when I find the necessity of associating myself with the Resolution so ably moved by my Honourable friend Dr. Moonje. Sir, there was a time when every son of India was a born soldier and, at times, when the foreign invasions threatened the country, even its women used to put on armour and lead the battles; but to-day we find ourselves so far degenerated that we cannot even defend our person and property when a thief or burglar breaks into the house. It will add to our humiliation, of course, but I cannot help saying that not even one among ten thousand has ever handled a sword and does know the difference between a gun and rifle, having never had the chance of seeing one. Riding may not be absolutely foreign to them, since, the only ride they have the privilege to enjoy is on the occasion of their marriage. It is not so much their fault as that of the Government if they are so weak and emaciated; and even when a proposition to restore the strength and virility of Indian students is before the House, Mr. Mackworth Young says about compulsion that the university students are generally the most independent and most intolerant class of such oppression. May I draw his attention to a Resolution passed at a meeting of the students of Delhi, held on the 30th January last, to the effect that:

"This meeting of the youths of Delhi Province wholeheartedly supports Dr. Moonje's Resolution moved in the Legislative Assembly to-day, asking the Government to make military drill and rifle practice compulsory in all schools and colleges in India for boys above sixteen years, and requests youth organisations throughout India to accord their support to the motion, and urges on the Government to accept it and give it immediate effect in all academic institutions in the country."

Sir, I cannot blame the Honourable Mr. Mackworth Young for opposing the Resolution when he very well knows what restrictions have been imposed by the Government upon arms and which nothing can explain better than the famous lines of the poet Akbar:

Hai hukum i shahinshah koyi hathyār na bandhe,

Palne sab aurhai koyi dastār na bandhe.

Dertī hai bahut lohe s' sarkār hamari,

Nāri men kunjī koyi zenhar na bandhe.

(Loud laughter.)

The King ordains that none should bear arms,
All should wear veils and not turbans.

Our State even fears iron much;
None should tie even a key with the waistband.

It is undoubtedly a fact, Sir, that the fault lies as much with the system of education which saps the growth and strength of our young men from a very early age, so that when a boy is out of the college he is a total wreck, fit only for the desk and plying a pen rather than a sword.

All I can say, Sir, is that, had compulsory physical training been adopted and formed part of the college curriculum, the exigency would never have arisen, nor would we have had the occasion to cry on our weakness and infirmity. It is never too late, as they say, and much of the lost strength can be recouped if students are given compulsory physical training along with the mental, for a number of years, say from 12 to 20, as suggested by Colonel Crawford in his amendment to the Resolution.

Sir, I support the Resolution.

***Mr. M. K. Acharya** (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps should be taken as early as possible to provide for compulsory physical training of Indian boys attending schools and colleges, and also with a view to inculcate among them group discipline, initiative and capacity for leadership to provide for Military Drill, Rifle Shooting, or other similar exercises for all boys between the ages of 16 and 20 years except those who may for good and sufficient reason be exempted from the same by the school or college authorities concerned."

Mr. President: How does this differ from the original Resolution?

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I shall explain it, Sir. I have made a few alterations the object of which is to make the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Dr. Moonje, clearer. I shall try to meet one or two of the objections raised the other day with regard to Dr. Moonje's Resolution. For instance, there may be other forms of physical drill than military drill and rifle practice, and therefore I have worded my amendment to read "or other similar exercises". Secondly, I want to point out that compulsion may result in bringing about a certain amount of disinclination among boys, who may not like to take up this kind of training with zest. I have therefore provided that, in the case of those students who, owing either to physical defects or other causes, have good and sufficient ground for obtaining exemption, the school authorities will exempt them from such training. Thirdly, I have tried to come nearer to what my Honourable friend, Colonel Crawford, has said that, so far as pure physical training is concerned, it will be for all boys of all ages attending schools and colleges. I think all schools and colleges ought to give, not only intellectual, but also physical and moral training to their students. These are three or four aspects which I thought I would make clearer in the Resolution of my friend Dr. Moonje, and in these respects my amendment differs slightly from that of Colonel Crawford. Otherwise I give my wholehearted support to Colonel Crawford's amendment. I, however, venture to think that my amendment puts the idea better. There are just one or two words that I would like to say with regard to Colonel Crawford's amendment. Colonel Crawford talks of miniature

* Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

rifle ranges and encouraging their use among boys. My Honourable friend Mr. Bajpai stated that Government had tried to encourage the military spirit among students, and he gave instances in which the students did not take advantage of the opportunity afforded to them. We want really effective means to be taken as much as possible to put this desire into the minds of the boys and students intensively. We have, however, been told that rifles would involve a lot of expense, and that the use of rifles would be a very serious thing to allow students. I thought that what was meant by Dr. Moonje's Resolution was that the military spirit should be encouraged among boys, not that every boy between the ages of 16 and 20 should be provided with a rifle, for which two hundred and fifty thousand rifles would be required. I don't think that that was what was intended. It will be that we are only setting down the general lines upon which the training ought to be given. It is open to the authorities, rather it is the duty of the authorities, to lay down the various kinds of exercises for a boy. Probably a boy of 16 years, to start with, may not handle big rifles. I must honestly confess that I have never handled a rifle myself in all my life. (Laughter.) Therefore it is not for me to say which kind of rifle is suitable to a boy of 16. I think it is the duty of officers and others, who will be in charge of the whole matter, to say what kind of drill should be given to a young boy of 16, or what kind of rifle should be handled by a little boy. Gradually, when the boy grows up from 16 to 20, he may handle bigger rifles. I take it for granted that there are several grades of rifles, some small rising in various degrees to very big rifles, some doing little harm, rising to those which are deadly in their effect. Perhaps all these are matters of detail, and it would be for the authorities, whether on the educational side or the military side, to settle the details among themselves. The general principle will be that, for all boys from the ages of 16 to 20, for all boys attending schools and colleges, there will be compulsory physical training, whatever form that training may take. The school and the college authorities will decide the form of training that should be given to the boys. Further, for all boys between the ages of 16 and 20, there will be this military drill and rifle shooting. Whatever be the kind of rifle, whether German, Italian, Belgian or Swedish which the great votary may be able to bring before the educational authorities, or whatever form the drill may take, it will have the effect of inculcating a manly character among the boys. In the wording of my amendment, I have in fact tried, as far as possible, to meet the arguments of either side. Lastly, very great objection was taken—I am glad to see the Education Secretary and the Army Secretary sitting together—very great objection was taken to compulsion and it was said that if the drills should take the form of compulsion or conscription, very woeful results would befall the boys. They were afraid that disastrous consequences would follow by applying the theory of compulsion or conscription. In my amendment, I have made sufficient safeguard for the boy between 16 and 20, who, for good and sufficient reasons, does not want, or who has not the ambition, at any time of his life, to take part in the defence of his country. In that case, I will ask the school or the college authorities to exempt that boy. Even if the boys who seek such exemption be 50 per cent., the other 50 per cent. of the boys can be given military drill and rifle shooting practice. My own idea is that we should not carry the idea of compulsion to the extreme limit of saying that every

boy between 16 and 20 should attend military drill. If the boys are willing and if they have got the spirit and the desire, I should like to give every possible encouragement to them. That is what Dr. Moonje wants and that is what Colonel Crawford also seeks to support by his amendment, and what I hope even the Army Secretary and the Education Secretary would be for. Provide military drill and rifle shooting for as many boys as possible, except those who may, for good and sufficient reasons, be exempted from the same by the school or college authorities concerned. In this amendment I have tried to meet what I thought to be the objections on the one side and the contentions on the other.

One word more and I have done. The object of the Resolution is to introduce a new spirit or a new ideal in our educational system. Dr. Moonje has very rightly quoted what the ideal is in England. This is what he said on the last occasion:

"In England the educational system has been definitely adapted, in part at any rate, to the production of efficient leaders of men."

What is the ideal of the educational system in India? I do not want to be hard upon the system. We are all the products of that system. At the same time, speaking from my own humble experience—I had something to do with boys' education for over twenty years—speaking from my own experience, what is the ideal of education? I shall not go into the Genesis or other parts of the Old Testament. It is an undeniable fact that the educational system in this country has not been so developed, and to this day it continues to be a system which aims at producing not men but machines. It aims at producing not men who become leaders of men, but men who will become subservient tools in the hands of others. That is our greatest complaint against the present system of education. Education has been not only not godly, but not manly. It has tended to produce a lot of quill drivers, submissive quill drivers; but in spite of this system of education, not through its help, we have been able to produce some people at least who have been able to proceed for higher education. Therefore the whole object of the Resolution is to put in a new spirit and a new ideal into our educational system, and surely the most bigoted constitutionalist of the Government of India must not back out by saying that it has no business to interfere in the domain of Provincial Governments. It is not only the privilege, but it is the duty, of the Government of India to change the general policy and ideals of the educational system and to tell the Provincial Governments that, on these and other new lines, which will be adapted to the ideals of the rising generation, the education system ought to be changed. Therefore, I hope that, in the light of the humble explanation I have been able to offer to the House, they will find that my amendment tries to meet, as far as possible, the ideal of Dr. Moonje and also tries to meet the practical objections on this side of the House, and at the same time wants the Government of India, not only to express their lip sympathy, but wants the Government of India definitely to pledge themselves to a policy and programme of education which will enable the boys to realise some of their ambitions in life. It has already been pointed out that the youth of the country are impatient. The Government of India are on their trial now. They may treat the older men lightly, but they cannot treat lightly the rising aspiration of the youth of the country, who are very anxious that they should bear their own part in the future development of the

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

motherland. If the Government dare deny the youth of the country full opportunities for development to their highest stature of manhood, well, the Government will have their day to reckon in a very short time. It is that spirit that animates all of us in putting forward this amendment and, I ask all those who are really interested in the youth of the country on the one hand, and in the very stable foundations of the Government on the other, to support this amendment.

Dr. B. S. Moonje (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I am thankful to my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford for the constructive suggestions that he has given to us, (Hear, hear.) and I shall deal with them in my own way later on. I was really amused at the remarks of my Honourable friend Mr. Bajpai, the Education Secretary. He says that he is a devotee of *ahimsa*. He may be personally by temperament devoted to *ahimsa*, but the training that he has received, the service that he represents, the traditions of the service that he is serving in, the caste in which he is born, all these are against the traditions of *ahimsa*.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur cum Champaran: Non-Muhammadan): He is a Brahman.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: He represents in this House the Indian Civil Service. What is the tradition of the Indian Civil Service? An English boy takes a pen in his hand, goes to the school and college, passes his Indian Civil Service examination and comes out as an administrator in India. But when a war is declared, immediately he leaves his pen on the desk, takes a rifle and goes to the field to fight for his country. After the war is won, he comes back to India again and serves as an administrator, and after serving his full term of service, goes back home, finds that his pension is not sufficient for him; then comes back to India as a merchant and trader and makes money. That is, both the Brahmin and the Kshatriya and also the Vaishya is evolved in him. That is the tradition of the Indian Civil Service, the heaven-born service of which my Honourable friend the Education Secretary is a highly placed Member. The wielding of both the pen and the sword with equal facility, that is the tradition of the service to which he belongs. As for the tradition of his caste, he may perhaps remember better if I remind him of a poem that we used to sing in our childhood. That is:

*Bolo Ram dhanukdharee,
Pakad chutaiyya dai maree.*

("In the name of Ram, the wielder of bow and arrow, let us seize him by the hair of his head and throw him down on the ground").

That is the tradition of the caste in which he is born.

Honourable Members: Translate.

Mr. B. S. Moonje: The tradition of his caste is: "Catch hold of the tuft of the man and bring him down". That is the tradition of his caste, and if he wants to know his *dharma shastra*, I shall tell him:

*Agrash chaturō Vedah prishatah. susharam dhanuk.
Idam brahmamidaṁ kshatram śhapadapi śharodopa.*

That is the rule of our *dharma shastra*.

12 Noon.

Honourable Members: Translate.

Dr. B. S. Moonje:

"The ideal of our education is that the boy should have access to all the knowledge that the world has produced, but at the same time he must be prepared to meet his opponent if he wants to meet him in arms. He must tell him that he has also had his training in arms."¹

That is the ideal of education that was, since hundreds of thousands of years ago, in practice in this country and is, to-day, in practice in the Home land of the Englishmen, in the service of whose Government my Honourable friend is a valued Member. But I did not take him seriously when he talked about *ahimsa*. I understood him in a different sense. I was reminded of an advertisement in the papers—he heard "his master's voice". (Loud and continued laughter.)

Well, Sir, before dealing with the other objections raised by him, I should like to deal with the misunderstandings that have cropped up about the meaning, the scope and the motive of my Resolution. Let it be clearly understood that it was never my intention that every boy should have a rifle and go about with the rifle back to his home and keep it in his private possession. That was not my idea. He will only have the rifle at the time of the practice and when under the charge of the trainer; at other times the rifle will be kept in safe custody. So, on that point, let there be no misunderstanding. The second point was that eight crores of rupees worth of rifles would be required. Eight crores—yes, it is a big sum, there is no question about the impracticability of my Resolution. That is what my Honourable friend means to convey.

Honourable Members: Eight crores or millions?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Eight crores, for the cost of the rifles, he says, will be required. That was the estimate of my Honourable friend Mr. Bajpai. I have made my own calculations, and I am going to tell him it is nothing of the kind. I have made my calculations for a thousand boys, and then we can make calculations for 8,80,000 boys. This is the number of boys, he says, there are between the ages of 16 and 20. We may take the thousand boys in batches of 25; that comes to 40 batches. We may have one trainer to work two hours in the morning from 7 to 9 and two hours in the evening from 4 to 6 that is, four hours a day. For two such trainers, on a monthly salary of Rs. 100 each, the total comes yearly to Rs. 2,400. Each batch of 25 boys receives training in rifle practice for one hour once a week. One trainer can thus train 100 boys daily, and two trainers can train 200 boys daily. Taking into account all holidays throughout the year, we may calculate five working days in a week at an average. Thus, 1,000 boys can receive training in rifle practice in one week at the hands of two trainers. Thus also, only 50 rifles will suffice for the training of 1,000 boys. Therefore, 15,000 rifles for three lakhs of boys at the rate of say Rs. 100 per rifle will cost only Rs. 15,00,000. But, Sir, you must also understand that when you go in for big purchases, the price is generally very much less. The present market price may be Rs. 100 per rifle; and if, on account of making big purchases, the price is one-fourth less or half less, the total price for 15,000 rifles for three lakhs of boys will be say Rs. 6 lakhs or Rs. 8 lakhs or Rs. 10 lakhs at the most. Do you think that India, with a population of 30 crores of people with the revenue which

[Dr. B. S. Moonje.]

we are giving, cannot afford Rs. 10 lakhs or Rs. 8 lakhs for the training of her sons, who will, of course, be of use to you when an emergency comes? You may say no, but I cannot understand that attitude. That the Government cannot, when the time comes, spare Rs. 8 or Rs. 10 lakhs, I cannot understand. Now, I shall calculate what will be the charge per student for the training.

If each boy—let us suppose—were to fire 25 cartridges in one hour's training once a week, he will fire about 1,200 cartridges in a year. The market retail price of 22 cartridges is Rs. 2 per 100; each boy will thus require ammunition of Rs. 24 per year. For three lakhs of boys, the yearly cost of the ammunition will therefore be Rs. 72 lakhs; but again when large quantities of ammunition have to be purchased, we may expect a reduction in the rate of retail price by say one-fourth, if not, by half. Thus, roughly, Rs. 50 lakhs may be the yearly cost of the ammunition required. And if you desire to reduce the number of cartridges to be fired by half, the cost also will be reduced by half: that is, it will come to Rs. 25 lakhs only. Is that a large sum for India?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: What about the rifle ranges, the purchase of lands, the provision for safe custody of cartridges, etc.?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: About the rifle ranges also, I have made my own calculations. I thought my calculations would not perhaps be acceptable to the Government, and it was for that reason that I asked questions as to the cost of the rifle ranges, the provisions made for custody for the Territorials and the Auxiliary Force, etc.; but unfortunately the Army Secretary could not supply all the information at that time, and therefore on the question of the cost of the custody, and of the rifle ranges, I am not in a position to give details. I am sure, however, they will not cost much.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: That is the reason why I suggested miniature rifle ranges.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Yes; boys between the ages of 12 and 16 cannot be expected to handle big rifles. Therefore, when I said "rifles", one could have understood that I meant miniature rifles for boys below 16. You can certainly think of ordinary rifles for boys between 16 and 20, and the ordinary rifles do not cost more than Rs. 200 each in the market.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: The miniature rifle is the more suited for training, and it is more or less the same as the ordinary one, except for the Morris tube, and the cost will be less.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I have got a miniature rifle for my grandson and therefore I say the retail price of the miniature rifle will be Rs. 100; and at that rate there will be a further reduction in my estimate.

My Honourable friend Mr. Bajpai has said that I have singled out a section of the population, meaning thereby that I have been hard upon a section of the population. I have been unfair to them; but does he know what experts have to say on that point? Experts say in support of my proposal for the selection of boys:

"Education for the purpose of spreading military training and the inspiration of military service among the manhood of India should commence in schools."

The Shea Committee Report itself says that the commencement should be made in schools

Mr. President: I may remind the Honourable Member that he has got two minutes more.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I have much that I have to say, Sir. Because it is a subject which requires a little elucidation, I thought a little more time would be given to me; but if I can have only two minutes more, I have nothing more to say, Sir, and I have finished.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): I fear, Sir, that the word *ahimsa* which I used the other day has caused a good deal of offence to many of the Honourable Members opposite. And as I heard the criticism, the intense, disdainful criticism of *ahimsa* that flowed in full round sentences from the other side, I was reminded of a phrase in scripture—I think I had better use it with an emendation, "How quickly doth political opportunism corrupt our early faith!" Was not *ahimsa* an important political doctrine until very recently? In any case, Sir, what I said the other day in regard to *ahimsa* was personal to myself. I did not wish, for example, to suggest that the martial ardour of my Honourable friends opposite should be subdued to the tenets and the methods of *ahimsa*. My Honourable friend Colonel Crawford also took me to task for using the word *ahimsa* and for being a devotee of *ahimsa*, and proceeded to suggest that the sooner the educational system of the country was brought into line with his own particular and peculiar ideas of martial training, the better it would be for the world at large. Well, Sir, a soldier I assume is always a soldier, and in his soldierly zeal is apt to forget that the business of the educationist is to educate and not to prepare people for slaying.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: May I suggest that education has something to do with the body as well as with the brain?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I do not for a moment dispute that education has something to do with the body and it has also something to do with the mind. A healthy body makes a healthy mind, and I did not, in the remarks which I made the other day, say anything to contest the truth of that statement. I was merely trying on that occasion to explain the constitutional difficulties which stood in the way and also the educational difficulties. Now, Sir, I think it might be permitted—because of this coruscation of martial ardour which has been going on in this House since this morning—it might be permitted even to a man of *ahimsa* like myself, in a wholly sportive spirit to say something about one or two remarks which fell the other day from Honourable Members opposite. Particularly, Sir, I would refer to the somewhat sweeping indictment of the educational system of this country which fell from my friend Mr. Jayakar. He quoted the authority of one Mr. Thackeray who gave evidence before a Select Committee of Parliament in support of the contention that the ideals of education, or anyhow the ideals of Government's educational policy, still aim at the production of husbandmen and not at the production of legislators, of statesmen and of generals. Well, Sir, I do not for a moment claim that the educational system of this country is perfect, but, whoever has listened to the oratory of Mr. Jayakar himself and witnessed his various legislative efforts inside and outside this House, would rather hesitate to

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

accept the criticism of the educational system of this country which makes out that it is completely sterile of statesmanship or of political and legislative talent. In fact, Sir, a system of education which can produce men like Mr. Jayakar and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has nothing to be ashamed of.

Now, Sir, I have to address myself to the Resolution of Dr. Moonje and to the amendment moved by Colonel Crawford. It was not quite clear from what Dr. Moonje said whether he was prepared to accept the amendment of Colonel Crawford or whether he adhered to his original Resolution.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: I am prepared to accept Colonel Crawford's amendment.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am very glad to hear that, Sir. I wish now to explain the position of Government both in regard to the original Resolution and in regard to the amendment. The amendment has much in common with the original Resolution. In so far as physical training goes, in so far as drill goes, in so far as military drill goes, the amendment of Colonel Crawford is in strict conformity with the Resolution of Dr. Moonje. Colonel Crawford has added to the Resolution 'games', and he has also extended the age limits within which the principle of compulsion shall be applied for the purpose of physical training and for the purpose of games. I think, Sir, that it would be as well if I were to make it absolutely clear that, so far as Local Governments are concerned, the position of the Government of India is to-day what it was the other day when I addressed the House, namely, that the constitutional position in regard to education is such that we cannot direct Local Governments to adopt either compulsory physical drill or compulsory physical training or compulsory games into their educational system, but it is open to the Government of India to impress upon Local Governments the desirability of considering these suggestions of my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford and the Honourable and gallant Doctor opposite. That we are prepared to do.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that my Honourable friend Mr. Aney would be at once upon me if I tried this way to dispose of the responsibility of the Government of India in regard to their own directly administered areas. He made a point of the directly administered areas, and it seems only right and proper that I should state the attitude of Government in regard to the directly administered areas. Well, Sir, as regards directly administered areas, undoubtedly the responsibility for educational administration and policy is ours, and on behalf of Government I am prepared to accept the principle that physical training and drill and games should be made compulsory in the institutions for which they are responsible. Of course my Honourable friends must realise that the principle of compulsion, even though it is accepted, may take some time to apply, for the simple reason that you have to make financial provision, you have to provide trainers, you have—where there are aided schools or private schools under your control—you have to endeavour to carry them with you, and that, as I said, is a process which requires time and therefore Honourable members must understand that my acceptance of the principle does not involve the immediate introduction of compulsory physical training. (Laughter.) But there is no need why my Honourable friends should laugh in that sceptical fashion. I wish to reiterate or reinforce what I

have already said by the statement that we shall endeavour, in so far as in us lies, to make practice follow close upon the heels of our acceptance of the principle.

Dr. B. S. Moonje: What about rifle practice in schools under your control?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If my Honourable friend would only let me complete what I have to say I think he will have no occasion to be dissatisfied. Now, Sir, I come to rifle practice. Colonel Moonje's Marshal Moonje's or Dr. Moonje's—it is difficult to choose the particular title which should apply to my Honourable friend in the military hierarchy, because he is at once a Carnot and a Roon and a Wellesley—original Resolution in respect of rifle practice I certainly understood to mean that as many rifles should be provided for rifle practice as there may be boys between the ages of 16 and 20. In fact the other day I was twitted with being a man who, treading as he did along the paths of *ahimsa*, was totally ignorant of the exact scope and significance of military training; but I think my gallant friend who perhaps shares this misconception with me, though not the principle of *ahimsa*, stated just now in the course of his speech, that on the face of it he understood the Resolution to be a plea for compulsory military training. I confess I was definitely under the impression that what my Honourable friend opposite wanted was that we should provide as many rifles as there were boys between 15 and 20 in schools. He has cleared up that misconception now. Mr. Aney cleared it up and Mr. Jayakar cleared it up, and I understand their position is exactly the same as the position of Colonel Crawford, namely, that we should provide facilities for what is comprehended in the phrase miniature rifle ranges. That is to say, we should have a range, we should have instructors, and we should have rifles for practising there. Further I find that the Doctor has resiled from his original position to the extent that he does not want this practice to be made obligatory, but that he would be satisfied with the voluntary principle in regard to this particular form of training. As regards that again I would say that we accept the principle. It is not, of course, possible for us just now to say what the attitude of the local administrations in regard to this would be. I am sure the House will recognise the essential reasonableness of our trying to carry with us in this matter the Local Administrations; but having accepted the principle, it would obviously be the duty of the Government of India, in consultation with these Local Administrations to devise ways and means of carrying out its acceptance also.

To sum up, Sir, and to make the position absolutely clear, so that there shall be no doubt in the mind of anybody as to what Government accept: For the provinces it is not competent to us to accept either the original resolution or the amendment, but we do agree to forward the amendment, together with copies of the debate to Local Governments to ask them if, on considering the suggestion they come to the conclusion that it is something which they can accept, to introduce the principle, and further to submit to us reports from time to time to show what action they are taking. Then, as regards the directly administered areas, as I have said, we accept the principle of compulsory physical training; we accept the principle of compulsory drill; we accept the principle of compulsory games. As our resources permit and as schemes are worked out, and as far as our finances go, we hope to be able to introduce them in the

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

schools in the areas for which we are responsible. As regards miniature rifle ranges again, our attitude is that in consultation with the heads of minor Administrations we shall do what we can—again as I have said subject to our financial resources—to give effect to this proposal.

Well, Sir, I have finished all that I had to say. But to return again to that principle of *ahimsa*, perhaps the House would now be glad that I am a man of *ahimsa* or a man of peace, in that I have met them in a spirit of compromise and not in a spirit of contumacy which, if I had not been a man of *ahimsa*, might have been displayed towards this Resolution.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: In view of what has happened, Sir, and since Colonel Crawford has moved his amendment, if you will permit me; I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. President: What does the Honourable Member want?

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Permission, Sir, to withdraw my amendment also in favour of Colonel Crawford's.

Mr. President: The question is that leave be given to Mr. Acharya to withdraw his amendment.

The amendment was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President: The original Resolution was:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps should be taken as early as possible to provide for compulsory physical training, military drill and rifle practice for Indian boys attending schools and colleges between the ages of 16 and 20 years."

Since which the following amendment has been moved:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that with a view to remove the defects in the character training of Indian youths as emphasised by the Sken Committee, steps should be taken as early as possible to provide compulsory physical training, games, and drill, for Indian boys attending schools and colleges between the ages of 12 and 20, and to provide and encourage the use of miniature rifle ranges'."

The question is that the amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I understand Mr. Jogiah does not wish to move his Resolution:

("That the contiguous Telegu-speaking areas in the Madras Presidency be constituted into a separate province for all legislative, administrative and judicial purposes").

Mr. V. V. Jogiah (Ganjām cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadian Rural): No, Sir.

RESOLUTION RE CIRCUMSTANCES OF LALA LAJPAT RAI'S DEATH.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra (Central Provinces: Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I beg to move the Resolution that stands in my name. It runs as follows:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey a message from this Assembly to the Secretary of State for India, and through him to His Majesty's Government that this House strongly regrets the

insulting reply of Earl Winterton, the Under Secretary of State for India, given on 26th November, 1928, to questions from the members of the Labour Party regarding the circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death and that this House believes that the death of Lala Lajpat Rai was accelerated by the injury he received at the hands of the police while leading a boycott procession on the arrival of the Simon Commission at Lahore, and is of opinion that the enquiry conducted by the Boyd Committee was unreal and instituted deliberately to justify and whitewash the crimes committed by the police."

Sir, it is now three months since Lala Lajpat Rai breathed his last at Lahore under circumstances that have aroused the deepest feelings of indignation throughout the length and breadth of this country. Hundreds of public meetings attended by thousands of people have been held all over the country to mourn his loss and to condemn the Government of the Punjab and the Government of India for having justified the virtual murder of their revered leader by the police officials of Lahore. Sir, we the members of this House will be failing in our duty, both as the colleagues of our late lamented leader and as representatives of the people of this country if we did not join our voice of protest to the voice of protest that has been raised by the nation outside this Legislature.

I should believe, and as a matter of fact I do believe, that my Honourable friend the Home Member was not indulging in the art of polite falsity when the other day he paid a glowing tribute to the late Lala Lajpat Rai. He spoke of the intense and active solicitude of Lala Lajpat Rai for the suffering, for the poor and for the weak. I am sure, Sir, this House fully appreciated my Honourable friend when he said that this House would long be sensible of the vacancy caused by Lala Lajpat Rai's death. But, Sir, it is our misfortune, the misfortune of the Indian Members of this House, that we would long be sensible, not only of the vacancy caused by Lalaji's death, but also of the circumstances under which he met his end, as also of the solicitude, active and intense, of the Government of India to shield their police officials at Lahore, who murdered Lala Lajpat Rai.

Speaking on the same day, my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, regretted that Lala Lajpat Rai died before the Government of India and the Government of the Punjab had had an opportunity of apologising to him. With the respect that is due to the Honourable Pandit, I beg to ask him, what led him to think that, had Lala Lajpat Rai lived longer, the Government of the Punjab or the Government of India would have apologised to him? So far as I am aware, the facts are just the opposite. From the reply of Earl Winterton, the Under Secretary of State for India, given in the House of Commons, to a question from Colonel Wedgewood, that life-long friend of Lala Lajpat Rai, it is quite clear that the Government would not only, not have apologised to him, but that they would have justified their action even if the police officials of Lahore would have murdered Lalaji on the spot. Sir, this is what happened in the House of Commons. Colonel Wedgewood asked if the Punjab Government had expressed regret to Lala Lajpat Rai's family owing to his death being possibly caused by blows. Earl Winterton said that no Government, when it was found necessary to use force, were justified in apologising to anybody and no evidence was forthcoming to show that the death was due to the action of the police. The latter used no more force than to restrain the crowd from breaking the barricades and possibly assaulting the Simon Commission. Sir, this reply means,

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

if it means anything at all, that, but for an attack on Lala Lajpat Rai, the people would have crossed the barricades and assaulted the Simon Commissioners. I would like to know, if this can mean anything else. Now, Sir, this is the police story, the story concocted by the police, eagerly swallowed by the Punjab Government and the Government of India, and accepted as gospel truth by Earl Winterton. But whatever these august bodies, the Punjab Government, the Government of India and the Under Secretary of State might think or do, millions of people in this country believe that Lala Lajpat Rai was assaulted by the Punjab police gratuitously, and that he died of the wounds thus caused. Even outside India, people who take an intelligent interest in our affairs, believe that Lala Lajpat Rai died on account of the wounds that were caused to him by the police. Only two or three days ago we read in an English paper extracts from an article published in the *New York Herald Tribune*, in which occurred the following sentence :

“Lala Lajpat Rai . . . died on November 17 as a result of wounds received in a clash between the police and Lahore processionists demonstrating against the Simon Statutory Commission.”

Now, I ask, Sir, what have the Government of India done to make the people of this country and outside believe that these statements were untrue? May I know, Sir, why the Government refused a judicial inquiry? Is it not a fact that Lala Lajpat Rai demanded an inquiry consisting of two non-officials and a judicial officer, and offered to give evidence before such a committee? Why did the Government refuse this? The reason is obvious. Both the Government of India and the Government of the Punjab knew in their heart of hearts that their hands were red with the blood of Lala Lajpat Rai, and they dared not accept an open inquiry. Sir, the Government never wanted an open inquiry; they wanted only the show of an inquiry, and in Mr. Boyd, the Commissioner of Rawalpindi Division, they found a willing instrument. This will be clear to anybody who reads the statement of the Punjab Government. There have been three different versions of the Government, while the version of the leaders is one and has remained consistently one from beginning to end. In their first statement the Government denied that the police attacked the people gratuitously, and they charged the public with a deliberate attempt to cross the barrier. As soon as Lala Lajpat Rai read this statement, he promptly contradicted it, because he was not a man to take such things lying down. He repudiated that and said that the Government version was a “contemptible lie”, and challenged the Punjab Government to prosecute him in a Law Court for that statement. The Punjab Government, Sir, were now placed on the horns of a dilemma. If they prosecuted Lala Lajpat Rai for that statement, the whole truth would be out in a Law Court. If they did not prosecute him, the world would believe that they had assaulted Lalaji without provocation. But in order to save their faces they instituted the Boyd Inquiry. This they did after deliberating for a full week. In this Government communiqué, which perhaps appeared on the 7th of November, the Government invented an absurd story. When challenged by Lala Lajpat Rai, they found that they could not substantiate their charge against the public of having made a deliberate attempt to cross the barrier, and therefore, Sir, they withdrew that charge against

the public. But the Government never had the face to confess their crimes openly. They withdrew that allegation, but they did so, as I have said, by inventing a story, the story of one Serjeant Ward going into the crowd to fix a barbed wire to a trestle and being knocked down by the public "probably unintentionally". Now the House will please mark the words. They, the Government themselves say "probably unintentionally". From this it is quite clear that the public never made an attempt to cross the barrier. The major portion of the communiqué that was issued by the Government was devoted to telling the world that the police were not to blame. At the tail of a long statement, they announced that they had appointed Mr. Boyd to inquire into the truth of the allegations of the non-officials. I do not know what Mr. Boyd was to inquire into when the Punjab Government were already satisfied that the police had not used unnecessary force. From this it is obvious that the Punjab Government, who appointed Mr. Boyd, have not acted impartially in this matter. But, Sir, what of Mr. Boyd himself? Anybody who reads the Report of the inquiry conducted by Mr. Boyd will at once see that, from the very beginning, he found that his only function in the enquiry was, to use the words of Milton, with necessary variation, "to assert eternal police domination", and "to justify the ways of the Punjab police to the people of this country."

Sir, I now proceed to show how Mr Boyd has acted partially and most unjustly in this matter. The Inspector General of Police, Mr. Stead, comes to tender his evidence before Mr. Boyd. He tenders his evidence and sums it up by giving a hint to Mr. Boyd. This is what he said:

"Witness did not see why a fuss was made over minor injuries of which the ordinary Punjabi took no account whatever."

Sir, if Mr. Boyd was an impartial man, he ought to have at once rebuked Mr. Stead for making a statement of that nature before him. The witness was to place facts before Mr. Boyd and not to express his opinion. But Mr. Boyd at once takes up the hint. The next witness, the Deputy Commissioner of Lahore, appears before Mr. Boyd, and he puts a question to the Deputy Commissioner, which smashes once for all the alleged impartiality of Mr. Boyd. What does Mr. Boyd ask the Deputy Commissioner? I would like my Honourable friend the Home Member to listen to that question. Mr. Boyd asked the Deputy Commissioner why there was so much fuss about this incident. Now, Sir, what does this question mean? Mr. Boyd, the person who was appointed by the Punjab Government to do justice to the assaulted leaders, and was expected to keep an open mind till he came to the end of his inquiry, takes it for granted, at the mere suggestion of a police official, one of the accused, that the whole incident of the leaders having been assaulted was an ordinary fuss and no more! And in order to show to the House that Mr. Boyd, not only took this hint from the police official, but that he even went to the length of embodying this in his Report, I should like to read a small extract from his Report. But before I do that, may I ask, Sir, what does the Honourable the Home Member think of Mr. Boyd's question to the Deputy Commissioner? Perhaps, he will not reply, but I would like to tell him what the Deputy Commissioner of Lahore himself thought of this question. The Deputy Commissioner of Lahore at once found out that Mr. Boyd was overdoing his job and he said:

"I prefer not to say anything which is really a matter of opinion."

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

But, Sir, the poor Deputy Commissioner did not know that it did not matter to Mr. Boyd whether facts were placed before him or opinions were expressed. Now I read the small extract from the Report, from which the House will be able to understand how the suggestion of Mr. Stead the Inspector General of Police, was stated in the Report of Mr. Boyd as a conclusion impartially reached by Mr. Boyd himself! In the Report we read:

"I think that the undue sensitiveness of the politicians in the front rank of the crowd is at the bottom of the fuss which has been made over a very ordinary incident."

(Cries of "Shame" from Swarajist and Nationalist Benches.) The other day Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya said that, from the very beginning, Lala Lajpat Rai felt that he was assaulted unjustly, and being a sensitive man he died of the shock. Now, Sir, that is Mr. Boyd's reply to Pandit Malaviyaji. But if we go into the details, we find that even this man of superiority complex, Mr. Boyd, is not himself free from sensitiveness. He wanted Lala Lajpat Rai and Lala Hans Raj to appear as witnesses before him. Lala Lajpat Rai properly did not reply to his letter and Mr. Boyd states in his Report that Lala Lajpat Rai had not the courtesy to reply to him . . .

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar (Home Member): May I interrupt the Honourable Member? No, Sir. That is an entire misrepresentation of what Mr. Boyd stated in his Report.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Misrepresentation of what? This is what the Report says:

"I am unable to set out the allegations in any more detail because, although I had a notice published in the Press inviting statements with regard to the incidents under enquiry, and although I addressed letters to Lala Lajpat Rai, Dr. Muhammad Alam, Raizada Hans Raj and Dr. Gopi Chand, only one witness appeared in support of the allegations, and I have no reason to think that he was the authorized spokesman of the political leaders. I may note, that Lala Lajpat Rai and Dr. Muhammad Alam refused my invitation to make a statement while the other two gentlemen had not the courtesy to answer it . . ."

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: Precisely. The Honourable Member attributed to Mr. Boyd an imputation on the courtesy of the late Lala Lajpat Rai.

An Honourable Member: It was a mere slip.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: I wanted to state that Mr. Boyd was touchy because Lala Hans Raj did not reply to his letter. It was a mere slip when I spoke of Lala Lajpat Rai and not of Lala Hans Raj. Is that a misrepresentation? (Some Honourable Members: "Go on".)

An Honourable Member: The Honourable Mr. Orerar misunderstood it.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: So he has done the whole thing from the very beginning. Now, my submission is, whatever Mr. Boyd may do, and whatever the Government of the Punjab and the Government of India have done, the murder of Lala Lajpat Rai cannot be suppressed. A murder has never been suppressed. A murder will cry from the housetops for revenge and for redress. The more the Government of the Punjab and

the Government of India have tried to suppress Lalaji's murder, the more they have been led to confess. As I have already explained, in their first statement, which appeared on the day of occurrence, namely, the 30th October, the Government of the Punjab stated two things. Firstly, they said that the public made a deliberate attempt to cross the barrier, and secondly, that the police did not attack the crowd without provocation. After a week they changed it and admitted that the public did not make an attempt to cross the barrier. Thus in this statement, while admitting one thing, they denied that the police attacked the public without provocation. But in their third statement—I consider Mr. Boyd's Report as their third statement—the Government have been led further and have accepted that the police attacked without provocation. This I want to prove to the House and I would request Honourable Members to listen carefully to the following extract from Mr. Boyd's Report:

"It is clear that when the procession reached the barrier it was fairly orderly although there was shouting and waving of black flags. Mr. Ewart, Deputy Inspector-General of Police, and Mr. Saunders, Assistant Superintendent of Police, say that one or two persons put their hands on the barrier and began, according to Mr. Ewart, to try to climb over it, or, according to Mr. Saunders, to try to push it back. Mr. Saunders says that they were rapped on the hands with a cane by the Senior Superintendent of Police and himself. These raps may have accounted for some of the injuries complained of. The Senior Superintendent of Police did not mention this incident as his evidence related entirely to the subsequent scuffle which occurred about ten minutes later."

If we examine this passage carefully, four points emerge out of it. The first point is that the crowd was orderly; the second is that Mr. Saunders confessed that he and the Senior Superintendent of Police rapped some people with canes merely because they placed their hands on the barrier; the third is that the Government themselves believe that some of the injuries that have been complained of by the leaders may have been caused by these raps; and fourthly that Mr. Scott, the Senior Superintendent of Police, did not mention this story to Mr. Boyd. Now, Sir, if we only substitute *lathis* in place of canes, and if we make it clear that the "one or two persons" referred to in Mr. Saunders' statement were Lala Lajpat Rai and his friends, I submit that we have the whole non-official version out of the mouth of the police officials themselves. But as Mr. Boyd was appointed not to confess the crimes but merely to whitewash them, he has very cleverly tried to belittle the importance of this in an ingenuous manner. He has divided the whole incident that occurred at the Lahore station on the 30th October into two parts,—what occurred ten minutes earlier and what occurred ten minutes later. Now, if I were disposed to be charitable to the Punjab police to the utmost extent possible, I would only say that what occurred ten minutes earlier was that Lala Lajpat Rai was gratuitously assaulted by the police officials, and what occurred ten minutes later was that the public, when they came to know that their leader was being assaulted, became naturally anxious to know why and how he was being assaulted and therefore some people—it is only natural—might have made an attempt to go over to Lala Lajpat Rai, and this must have given an opportunity to the police to attack these unfortunate people. That is the whole thing, and it stands to reason that there can be nothing else.

Before I conclude this part of my speech, I would like, Sir, to draw your attention and the attention of the House to the fourth point emerging out of Mr. Boyd's Report, that is, the silence of Mr. Scott, the Senior

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

Superintendent of Police, about this incident. It is very significant. Mr. Boyd explains away that silence by saying that Mr. Scott's evidence was entirely devoted to what occurred ten minutes later. But why Mr. Scott was conveniently silent will be understood rightly only when we read Lala Lajpat Rai's own words. Lala Lajpat Rai said:

"The attack by the police was absolutely unprovoked and unwarranted and it was led by the Superintendent of Police himself as, I am told, he gave me two blows on my chest. . . ."

Then he says:

"I asked the man his name about a dozen times but he did not give me his name. Once I shouted to him, 'If you are a man you should give me your name', but he did not reply. From the very first he seemed to be bent on doing mischief."

As it is generally seen, Sir, that unprovoked assaults and cowardice go together, it is no wonder that Mr. Scott, not only refused to give his name to Lala Lajpat Rai, but even conveniently entirely omitted to mention his own part in the mischief to Mr. Boyd. Sir, I have clearly explained to the House, and I have proved it to the hilt, that the police attacked Lala Lajpat Rai and other leaders gratuitously. Now, I want to tell the House how Mr. Boyd has tried to disprove the non-official version of the story. The reasons that Mr. Boyd has given for this, if read out to this House on a less solemn occasion, would have been hailed with amused laughter by the Honourable Members, but on this occasion they can only serve to fill them with grief and indignation. Mr. Boyd says:

"It is extremely improbable that without any provocation a Police sergeant or three Police Officers, according to the *Tribune*, should wantonly attack members of the procession. Such an attack would have been contrary to paragraph 4 of the Police Instructions which had been issued for the day and the Sergeant or Officers would have been liable to disciplinary action for breach of orders."

In my humble opinion, Sir, instead of saying that the police did not attack Lala Lajpat Rai because such an attack would have been contrary to paragraph 4 of the Police Instructions, Mr. Boyd could have as well said that the Punjab officials did not attack Lala Lajpat Rai because such an attack would have been against the Sermon on the Mount. The second reason given is this. He says:

"I reject this story as hopelessly improbable and as contradicted by the evidence of the Senior Superintendent of Police, the Assistant Superintendent of Police Mr. Saunders, Sergeant J. W. Ward, Sergeant Roblin, the Inspector General of Police and Rai Sahib Lala Nathu Ram, Magistrate."

May I know if Mr. Boyd was to reject the non-official version only because it was contradicted by one of the accused, where was the necessity of Mr. Boyd's conducting an inquiry? The non-official charge was against Mr. Scott, the Senior Superintendent of Police, and Mr. Boyd says that he rejects the story because it is contradicted by the Senior Superintendent of Police. Sir, this is the stuff which Mr. Boyd wants us to swallow and with which the Government of India and my Honourable friend the Home Member want to suppress the murder of Lala Lajpat Rai.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lall has publicly stated that Lala Lajpat Rai's dying declaration was that the Punjab police wanted to kill him on the spot, and that he was saved from being killed

on the spot only because some friends stepped forward and afforded protection to him. But though Lala Lajpat Rai did not die on the spot, there is ample evidence to prove that he did die as a result of the brutal, deliberate and murderous attack that was launched upon him by the police officials. If we examine . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member must conclude his observations.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Sir, if we examine from day to day the state of Lala Lajpat Rai's health—we have read so many statements about it—we would be able to know that he died as a result of the injuries. Lala Lajpat Rai himself spoke of his injuries as follows:

"The blows on my left chest fell just over the heart and have left a bruise, slight fever and a swelling."

Sir, in order to cut short my remarks, I would only quote what Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya said in this House the other day. He said:

"I saw him (Lala Lajpat Rai) a few minutes after the attack, and I am sorry to say I saw him three times after that, but I never saw him happy again. It seemed that the effect and the shame of the attack had gone down deep into his heart."

I am obliged to cut short the circumstantial evidence and entirely omit to place before the House the medical evidence. Both taken together leave no room for doubt that Lalaji died of the injury brutally inflicted upon him by the police officials of Lahore. Sir, thus died Lala Lajpat Rai on the 17th November, leaving behind eternal glory for himself, an undying record of patriotism for us young men to try to surpass, and lasting shame for the rule of England in India. I have noticed, that some Honourable Members who have moved amendments to my Resolution want an inquiry into this matter. I have no objection to such an enquiry. But speaking for myself and the rising generation of India, I say we have lost all faith in the Government. Lala Lajpat Rai's murder has only confirmed us in our attitude of uncompromising hostility to the British Government. To-day the Government find their position secured and can afford to treat us like a pavement to be trodden upon, but how long will it be so easy and simple? Echo says—how long? Sir, I move my motion.

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

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

Mr. President: Resolution moved:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey a message from this Assembly to the Secretary of State for India, and through him to His Majesty's Government that this House strongly resents the insulting reply of Earl Winterton, the Under Secretary of State for India, given on 26th November, 1928, to questions from the members of the Labour Party regarding the circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death and that this House believes that the death of Lala Lajpat Rai was accelerated by the injury he received at the hands of

[Mr. President.]

the police while leading a boycott procession on the arrival of the Simon Commission at Lahore, and is of opinion that the enquiry conducted by the Boyd Committee was unreal and instituted deliberately to justify and whitewash the crimes committed by the police."

Munshi Iswar Saran (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have the honour to move that. . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. The Resolution has already been moved. Does the Honourable Member wish to move as amendment?

Munshi Iswar Saran: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President: Will he say so?

Munshi Iswar Saran: I apologise. I beg to move, Sir:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased:

- (a) to appoint a committee consisting of the Honourable the Home Member, Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir Abdul Qaiyum, Maulvi Muhammad Yakub and Munshi Iswar Saran to enquire into the allegations which have been made regarding the assault on Lala Lajpat Rai, the leader of the Nationalist Party in the Assembly, and its effect in causing or hastening his death, and to issue instructions to the committee to submit its report within one month of its appointment'."

With your permission I do not propose to move the second clause of this amendment.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member wish to substitute this amendment for the original Resolution?

Munshi Iswar Saran: That is so. Sir, I am anxious that no words of mine should embitter an already embittered situation. I am anxious that I should give only a few salient and important facts, painful as they are, of this tragedy, and to appeal to Government and to this House to accept the amendment which I have the honour to move.

The House is well aware that on the 30th October, 1928, the Statutory Commission visited Lahore, and the boycott procession went there, as indeed it has gone to other places where the Simon Commission has gone, in order to show its resentment at the action taken by Government in appointing a Commission of this character, and Lala Lajpat Rai, as well as other leading men of the province, were present as members of that procession.

The fact that Lala Lajpat Rai was assaulted is not in dispute. That he was assaulted on the 30th October, while he was a member of that procession, there is no doubt about. It may be that there will be differences of opinion as to the nature of the assault and the effect of the assault, but I submit, that, as far as the fact of the assault is concerned, there is no doubt about it.

I wish with your permission, Sir, and the permission of the House, to read exactly the statement that was made by Lala Lajpat Rai on that very day. And may I here pause for a moment and remind the House of the gracious reference made to Lala Lajpat Rai by His Excellency the Governor

General in his opening speech, and the graceful reference made by the Honourable Home Member in his capacity as the Leader of the House in his speech on the opening day. The reason why I mention these facts is to remind the House that the testimony of a gentleman of this description cannot be lightly treated or ignored.

Now what does Lala Lajpat Rai say about the assault on the 30th October, 1928. These are his own words :

"The attack by the police on the people was absolutely unprovoked and unwarranted, and it was led by the Superintendent of Police himself, as I am told. He gave me two blows on my chest and one or two constables, I cannot say how many, gave me two blows with regulation *lathis* which happily did not fall very heavily on me. The blow on my left chest fell just over the heart region and has left a bruise, a slight fever and swelling. I asked the man his name about half a dozen times, but he did not give me his name. Once I shouted to him, if you are a man you should give me your name, but he did not reply. From the very first he seemed to be bent on doing mischief."

Then later on he said :

"I was just in front of the crowd near the gap and the Superintendent of Police attacked me perfectly gratuitously."

Then it appears, Sir, that on that very day a public meeting was held and this is what he said at that public meeting :

"We were absolutely peaceful and gave no provocation to the Police to attack us, but an unprovoked police officer, said to be the Superintendent of Police in Lahore, whose name was afterwards given as Scott, began to strike with *lathis*. He had a knobbed hunter in his hand. He gave me two blows and two of his constables gave me another two. One of these blows was aimed at my heart and very near my heart I received a stroke which had caused a bruise sufficiently long and broad."

Continuing Lalaji said :

"Similar blows were struck at Raizada Hans Raj whose hand was profusely bleeding even there on the spot."

"Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava, Member, Punjab Legislative Council, received a blow on the head and the mark on his head was visible. Dr. Alam, Member, Punjab Legislative Council and Dr. Satyapal received blows on their arms, which are still paining."

I shall beg the House to mark these words :

"and I can swear by anything sacred to me that none of these gentlemen did anything, which deserved this cowardly treatment from police."

Sir, here is the testimony given on that very day by Lala Lajpat Rai himself, and it is for this House to attach such weight as it may in its wisdom think proper to attach to it. But what is more? We find that other independent witnesses who were present with Lala Lajpat Rai at the time of the occurrence have made their own statements. Raizada Hans Raj, who was then a Member of the Punjab Legislative Council, and who is now a Member of this House, said from his place in the Punjab Legislative Council that Mr. Scott, the Senior Superintendent of Police, assaulted Lala Lajpat Rai. Then we find that Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava, a Member of the Punjab Legislative Council, said on the floor of the House that he had himself heard the police officers say that they had attacked the leaders in the hope that they would run away in their cars and they would better be able to disperse the procession. Then, Sir, that is not all. Now, we find that Dr. Shaikh Muhammad Alam, another Member of the Punjab

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

Legislative Council, who had been present on the occasion, said from his place in the Punjab Legislative Council that he had seen wooden slippers being taken by a Sub-Inspector of Police out of his own pocket.

Now, Sir, I shall beg the House to allow me to say that here you have got the testimony of Lala Lajpat Rai, in support of his statement you have the testimony of various Members of Council. I am not going to trouble the House with statements made by other Members of the Punjab Legislative Council or by other important men. Time being short, I am necessarily going to refer only to a few. Then, it appears that on 2nd November—this is very important—notice was given of a resolution to be moved in the Punjab Legislative Council, which runs as follows:

"This Council recommends to Government that a committee of non-official members of the House be appointed to enquire into the conduct of those officials including Mr. Scott, the Superintendent of Police, Lahore, who had assaulted and beat the public leaders on 30th October, 1928."

This is the relevant part with which I am concerned. After this, on 7th November, 1928, a Press communiqué was issued by the Punjab Government, after a departmental enquiry and even in that communiqué, they say:

"It is possible that a few *lathi* blows were given, but there was no general use of *lathis* in this way."

In the same communiqué an announcement was made that an executive enquiry would be made by Mr. Boyd, a member of the Indian Civil Service, and the Commissioner of Rawalpindi Division. When this announcement about the executive enquiry was made, Lala Lajpat Rai—I have got his words before me, but I shall give only the substance in order to save time

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member please bring his remarks to a close?

Munshi Iswar Saran: May I have a few minutes, Sir? The object of my reading this statement is that it should be made clear to this House that on the one side you have the testimony of Lala Lajpat Rai himself, supported by the testimony of others, and on the other side, I admit, you have the results of the departmental and the executive enquiry. It is true that the executive enquiry was carried on by Mr. Boyd under very difficult circumstances, for Lala Lajpat Rai and his friends declined to appear before him. It is perfectly obvious to the House that these gentlemen would not care to appear before the executive enquiry that was being held by Mr. Boyd. All the time what they asked for was an enquiry of a judicial character, where they would be able to cross examine witnesses and bring forward all the evidence they had in support of their view of the matter. After this, there was a debate in the Punjab Legislative Council. That was after the death of Lala Lajpat Rai.

We know that two eminent doctors have said—I have no time to read the opinions in extenso, but I shall simply refer to them—that the death of Lala Lajpat Rai was accelerated by the assault by the police. I have it on the authority of Mr. Neogy that he read in a Bengali paper of an interview given by Sir C. C. Ghose, a distinguished Judge of the Calcutta High Court, that he came to this part of the country after the assault,

that Lala Lajpat Rai and Sir C. C. Ghose were put up together in Delhi and that Lala Lajpat Rai described to the Judge the nature of injuries inflicted on him near the region of his heart.

What I say to Government is this. Here is a matter which has never been enquired into. The departmental enquiry had not to deal with the question as to what connection this assault had with the death of Lala Lajpat Rai. The reason is obvious, the departmental enquiry as well as the executive enquiry took place before the lamented death of Lala Lajpat Rai. I say therefore that it is up to Government, if they are sincere in their references to him—as I believe they are—to accept our demand for an enquiry by distinguished Members of this House and to come to the conclusion whether or not there has been any connection between the assault on Lala Lajpat Rai and his death.

Let me say one word more before I sit down. I dare say, the Honourable the Home Member is aware that Sir Muhammad Shafi, Nawab Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Diwan Bahadur Raja Narendra Nath, all these distinguished gentlemen who are co-operators with the Simon Commission say. . .

Mr. President: Order, order. Lala Hans Raj.

Lala Hans Raj (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Mr. President, allow me to stand before this House as I did in the Punjab Council, not only as a Member, but also as a witness, as an accused.

The incidents which occurred at Lahore, on the 30th October, 1928, are well known, but I would like to narrate a few facts in order to convince you that Mr. Scott knew Lala Lajpat Rai, that the attack was aimed at Lalaji, and that the action of the police was not justified. (*Cries of "Shame and Hear, hear."*)

A public meeting of the students was held on the 28th October, in the Bradlaugh Hall. It was addressed by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji. In this meeting it was decided to rehearse the boycott procession. As soon as the meeting was over, a procession was arranged. In the Anarkali Bazaar an English Police Officer, with three Indian Police officers, was seen coming from the opposite direction. The leaders made way for the car, but the students did not do so. The car stopped, but still the students persisted in blocking the way. Fearing trouble, I made for the place, and persuaded the students to let the car pass. I was astonished, when the English officer addressed me by my name, and thanked me, because I did not know him. After a little while he met us again, and addressing me as before, asked me the route to be followed by the procession. This happened on the 28th October.

On the following day we came to know that Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code had been put in force. At an emergency meeting of the Congress workers, it was decided to ignore the said Section, to carry out our programme as decided before, and to remain absolutely non-violent. This decision of the Congress workers was announced in the public meeting which was held outside Mochi Gate.

On the morning of the 30th, again at a large public meeting, non-violence was emphasized by the speakers. The order in which the procession was to start was announced in the presence of a large number of policemen. Accordingly, after the meeting, the procession started with Lala Lajpat Rai and leaders, who were followed by volunteers, and then

[Lala Hans Raj.]

came the people. When we reached the end of the Landa Bazaar, nearest the railway station grounds, our way was blocked by thick barbed wire five feet high. On the side of the railway station, there were many English and Indian officers. On one side of the barrier there was an opening of about eight feet, where a cordon of police constables in three rows was posted, and thus the whole row was blocked, and every policeman held a long mounted staff in his hands. We were ordered to stop there by Lalaji and accordingly we stopped.

Lalaji was old and not a gymnast, that he might have jumped over the barrier. Nor am I a hurdler. We were at the head of the procession. After us came the volunteers, followed by the people shouting "Simon, go back". So far, no one threw stones or used abusive language. I can say so with certainty, for at the time I could see both the people and the police. We were there for quite 15 minutes, when Mr. Scott came through the opening and, without any explanation, gave Lalaji two hard blows with his stick. (Shame.) I was standing next to Lalaji. He was the same officer who had accosted me in the Anarkali Bazaar on the 28th October. I was astonished at his sudden and wild action. The officer who struck Lalaji was a lean fellow, and if I had not been an advocate of non-violence, or had this incident occurred before 1921, I would certainly have struck the man in his face with my right hand, but instead, I extended my left hand to ward off the blows aimed at Lalaji and received three blows on my hand, two from Mr. Scott and one from his assistant. My hand began to bleed. I still have a scar and a little swelling on my finger, and if anybody wants to see it, I am quite prepared to show it to him.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member might exhibit it. (Laughter.)

Lala Hans Raj: At this juncture, Dr. Gopi Chand, M.L.C., brother of Mr. Thakurdas, and Santanam and others, protecting Lalaji received blows. I am sure that he meant to strike not us, but Lalaji, and I am positive, that if all the blows had fallen on Lalaji, he would have died on the spot. (Shame.) Lalaji demanded his name and told him that he was a coward. We used to read in our elementary books that a brave man was one who did not strike the aged, women and unarmed persons. As that gentleman has contravened that rule, he was rightly called a coward. The fact that so far nothing violent happened is not only my opinion, but also that of Mr. Jenkin, the Superintendent of Police. He appeared as a witness before the Boyd Committee and stated that he did not know why blows were struck. Mr. Wakefield stated that one of the European police officers did strike and that the person struck could be Lala Lajpat Rai. We allege that we know the person who struck the blows. He is now the Senior Superintendent of Police.

Now as to the question whether the beating was accidental or intentional and was definitely aimed at Lalaji or not. There are only two ways of digging out the truth about this. Either the Senior Superintendent of Police should admit it, or we must depend on circumstantial evidence. It is impossible to believe that the Senior Superintendent of Police, Lahore, did not know Lalaji. If he did not, he is not even fit to be a constable there. (Laughter.) The person who was not only known throughout India but even abroad, cannot possibly have escaped his notice. When he knew such an unknown person like myself, as I have stated

before, how could he fail to know Lalaji? Thirdly, an unknown person held an umbrella over Lalaji. This was the only umbrella to be seen in the crowd. Some say that the man who held the umbrella belongs to the Criminal Intelligence Department.

Surely this made Lalaji conspicuous. Besides this, every time we needed advice, we approached Lalaji. Any one with a little common sense, leave alone some one holding the responsible position, for some years, of a Superintendent of Police of Lahore, could have guessed that Lalaji was the leader and a man of great importance. All these facts prove that Mr. Scott struck the blows, knowing Lalaji full well all the time he was striking.

We did not want the Boyd inquiry. What we wanted was that the witnesses of both sides should be examined and be allowed to cross-examine each other. This would have thrashed out the truth. If a mistake has been made, it must be admitted unhesitatingly. I have come to the conclusion that, in the excitement of the moment, Mr. Scott lost his balance of mind and acted like a mad man. Possibly he thought that, when so-called big persons cringed before him, it would be an easy matter to subdue a common person, who had the audacity to lead thousands of men, to offer an insult to the great Sir John Simon.

The officials say that the crowd pushed Lalaji into the barrier. This statement is absolutely incorrect. How could they have pushed with such violence and insolence the person they loved and revered so much? The crowd pushed neither Lalaji nor did they push us.

I was not willing to go to the Governor to give my statement, but I had to yield to the orders of my leaders. They wished me to go so that Government would not have the opportunity to object, that they never received first-hand information. I was interviewed and His Excellency very kindly took down my statement on four pages and also saw the three wounds I had received. He replied that, to institute an enquiry was not in his power and that he would place the matter before the Council. I feel the blame lies on the shoulders of the Executive Council of the Punjab.

Much stress has been laid on the fact that the Government instituted an inquiry into the incidents of the 30th October, but an inquiry was held in the Bardoli case also, the taxes so much resented by the people were levied after that inquiry. The people of Bardoli resolutely stood against the decision of the Government and insisted on another inquiry being made, and, as is well-known, the Government have been wise enough to yield to their wishes. If the Government were to follow this excellent example, set by the Bombay Government, we would be ready to place every bit of information in our possession before the inquiry committee. In the opinion of such eminent doctors as Dr. Dharam Vir and Dr. Gopi Chand of Lahore, this cowardly attack hastened the death of Lalaji, and thus Government stands accused of murder in the eyes of the public. This is my statement.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: Mr. President, it is a very sincere regret to me that the loss which the country and this House sustained by the death of the late Lala Lajpat Rai should have been revived in the manner and in the circumstances in which it has been revived by this Resolution. The Mover of the amendment referred to the speeches which

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

were made in all parts of the House, and in particular by myself, on the occasion of the opening of this session of the Assembly, and even the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution did not for a moment suggest that the expressions of regret which fell from these Benches were not perfectly honest and sincere. I am glad at least of that, but the issue which is now before the House is not the general issue of the regret which we all feel in the death of Lala Lajpat Rai, but the specific question whether his death was caused or accelerated by unjustifiable and deliberate assaults made upon him by the police on the 30th October. I will deal, Sir,—because it is my duty to oppose both the Resolution and the amendment—I shall deal, in the first place, with the Resolution. It invites the House to arrive at what I can only call precipitate and intemperate decisions, without any consideration of the large mass of evidence which is available, and without attempting to base those decisions on any substratum of facts. And indeed, Sir, I must enter a very grave protest against the manner in which the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution referred throughout his speech to the “murder” of Lala Lajpat Rai.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: It was murder.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: I venture to say,—though like Munshi Iswar Saran, I am very desirous of avoiding anything that might embitter this discussion,—I am bound to say that language and arguments of that character are not such as are compatible with the dignity of a deliberated Assembly. I would further say this, that no one will believe that allegation.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Everybody does.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: I believe, and I take it from what fell from the last speaker, that what is alleged on that side of the House is something totally different. It is that the death of Lala Lajpat Rai was either caused or accelerated not by deliberate intention but by the use of excessive force by the police. Now, Sir, I contest both of those propositions; but what I wish to emphasize very strongly here is that they are essentially and fundamentally different from the proposition which was advanced by the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution. I have some ground to cover, Sir, and I am aware that the time which you can permit me is limited, and I shall therefore speak as briefly as possible. I want to put before the House, as concisely as I can, some of the real and relevant facts of the situation. They relate, firstly, to the policy adopted by the Punjab Government, the general policy adopted by the Punjab Government; secondly, to the expedients which they adopted; and, thirdly, to the manner in which those expedients and methods were actually carried out. My Honourable friend Munshi Iswar Saran referred briefly, at the outset of his speech, to the movement to refuse co-operation with the Simon Commission. Well, Sir, I do not propose to go into that, which is largely an irrelevant topic. It is relevant to this extent, however, that I must explain that the policy of the Government of the Punjab, as well as the policy of the Government of India, was to allow the greatest possible liberty and latitude to every variety of opinion bearing upon that important question. It was their determination that so long as the opinions expressed, whether by means of public meeting or demonstrations or processions or

otherwise, so long as that opinion was expressed, whatever direction that opinion might take, whether it was in favour of co-operation or against co-operation, it was their policy that the greatest liberty should be granted for any demonstration of that opinion which was consistent with the maintenance of law and order and which did not involve, or appear likely to involve, a breach of the peace. Now, Sir, it was, acting upon that policy, that the Government of the Punjab took the steps which they did take. There were special reasons why precautions of a particularly complete character should have been taken on the 30th of October. They had behind them the experience of March 1928, when the crowd passed beyond the barriers, beyond the cordon of police which was intended to control the crowd in the interests of traffic and law and order. Fortunately, no serious consequences resulted though the crowd did break the cordon. But I should like to impress upon the House the view which the Punjab Government took from their experience in March. It was this, that it was necessary to have complete control over the movements of the crowd because, if they passed beyond these cordons or any barriers that might be constructed, it was impossible to restore control without using a much greater degree of force than otherwise would be necessary. } There were other and very cogent reasons for special precautions which were fully explained in the debate in the Punjab Legislative Council and which I do not propose to recapitulate, though I must invite special attention to them. Well, Sir, the object of the particular arrangements made on this occasion was that the necessity of using any force in excess of the necessities of the case should, as far as possible, be avoided. Now, Sir, what happened? [The District Magistrate, on October the 29th, published an order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He did not forbid public meetings, but he did prescribe that any processions taken out should conform to such directions as might be given by the police authorities. The police authorities,—the Deputy Inspector of Police,—issued orders in conformity with, and in supplementation of, that order. I mean to say there was no modification of the District Magistrate's orders, as has sometimes been suggested; it was merely a supplementation. On the evening of October the 29th a meeting was held at Mori Gate, where it was decided that those orders and those regulations should be disobeyed. There was another meeting at the Mochi Gate on the morning of October the 30th, in which those decisions were re-affirmed. "From the accounts of the proceedings received by Government"—I am now quoting the statement made by the Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government:

"From the accounts of the proceedings received by Government, it appears that various speakers said that the orders of the District Magistrate should be trampled under foot, that it was the duty of every true Punjabi to revolt against the tyrannical order of Government, that every member of the audience should defy the order of Government without fail and that the gauntlet thrown down by Government should be picked up."

In view of that, Sir, I think it was the plain duty of the Punjab Government to make their precautions as strict as possible, consistently with their general policy. Those were the instructions which were given to the police, and I maintain that those instructions were acted upon by the police to the letter. } I do not intend, because I have not the time available, to go further into details regarding what actually took place at the barrier. But ample evidence bearing on the point will be found in Mr. Boyd's Report and in the proceedings of the Punjab Legislative Council. The point I wish to make is this. Munshi Iswar Saran has

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

quoted to the House the statement made by the late Lala Lajpat Rai; and Ruizada Hans Raj has repeated his own impressions. Now, Sir, I have no doubt whatever that both those statements. . . .

An Honourable Member: Why do you call them impressions? They are not impressions.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: I have no doubt whatever that both those statements, which were made perfectly correctly, conveyed the impressions received by the two gentlemen who made them. But I think the House must recognise that impressions received on a tumultuous and disorderly occasion like this with which we are now dealing, may very well be incorrect; and I think Lala Hans Raj himself will admit that that is so, because I think I am correct in saying that, at one stage, the view he expressed was that this incident had taken place after the Commission had left the Station and not before. . . .

Lala Hans Raj: Yes, I said that.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: That was the inference drawn by Lala Hans Raj, but I think he will now agree that that is incorrect, and that in point of fact the incident took place quarter of an hour before the Commission left the station. That may seem a small meticulous point. . . .

Diwan Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): How was he to know?

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: The matter is now decided and it was dealt with in the inquiry by Mr. Boyd. That, Sir, is a small illustration of a fact that a perfectly honest and a perfectly veracious attempt to recall an impression might nevertheless be an erroneous inference and be in fact quite inaccurate. Now, Sir, I proceed to the enquiry. In the first instance, the Punjab Government appointed a departmental enquiry, presided over by a very senior police officer who had not himself been present at the occurrence. That officer reported. In the meantime various non-official versions of the incident had been published; they were entirely consistent with themselves; different views were expressed at various stages. In view of that, the Punjab Government, suspending judgment on the result of the first departmental enquiry, decided to have a second inquiry. For the purposes of that enquiry, they appointed a very senior officer whose impartiality no one has any good ground for impugning. (An Honourable Member: "The Report itself.") The inquiry was a public enquiry, an open inquiry; and those who were convinced of the validity of their criticisms of, or charges against, the police were perfectly at liberty to bring them forward. That they did not yet do so is not the fault of the enquiring officer, nor the fault of the Punjab Government. Now, Sir, I pass on, and I must do so very briefly, to

3 P.M. that part of the Resolution which refers to the statement made by Lord Winterton in Parliament. Press reports of replies and statements in Parliament are very frequently, if not actually, inaccurate, so imperfectly summarised that they convey a wrong impression. If I had time I should read through the whole of the official report of the replies and the supplementary replies which were made by

Lord Winterton on that occasion, and if any Honourable Member will do so now, I think he will agree that there is not a single syllable, not a single line in those replies which, read fairly in their context, could possibly convey anything of an insulting character. I say emphatically that nothing could possibly have been more remote from the intention of His Majesty's Under Secretary of State for India than to say anything of an insulting character, and indeed that no such intention could possibly be inferred even by the most unfair misrepresentation of what he actually said, that any intention of that kind was in his Lordship's mind. I pass that, and I trust that, before Honourable Members record in their own minds any conclusion on that point, they will carefully consider what I have said, and if possible satisfy themselves by a perusal of the proceedings, that my representation of the facts is correct.

Now, Sir, I shall refer very briefly indeed, as my time is limited, to the contents of the amendment which has been moved to this Resolution, which is, that a further inquiry should be instituted consisting of Members of this House. I regret that I am unable to accept that amendment and for two reasons. In the first instance, I maintain that the Punjab Government, on whom rests the responsibility for the local arrangements in connection with this incident, have now instituted two enquiries, and I am unable to admit the validity of any arguments that have yet been adduced to suggest that the enquiry of Mr. Boyd was anything but an impartial, open and public enquiry. Further, the matter has been fully debated in what I submit is the proper forum, namely, the Legislative Council of the province concerned. Apart from that, I observe that the subjects of the enquiry contemplated by the Honourable Member are two. The first substantially is the allegation of police misconduct on the 30th October, and the second that the lamentable decease of Lala Lajpat Rai was directly attributable to misconduct of the police—I prefer to modify that, because the Honourable Member did not use language of that kind. I prefer to say that the second part of the enquiry he proposes is whether or not the lamented death of Lala Lajpat Rai was accelerated by the occurrence of that day. Now, with regard to the first of these two matters, my contention is that, in view of the enquiries which have already taken place, in view of the prolonged debates which took place in the local Legislative Council, there is, so far as the police action on that occasion is concerned, not a case to go for further enquiry; and as regards the second part, my contention is that there is no prospect that any concrete conclusions beyond surmise and speculation could possibly emerge from the enquiry into the matter propounded in the second part of the Honourable Member's amendment.

I hope, Sir, the House will reflect very deeply and gravely before committing itself on either of the issues before it.

Mr. President: What is the second part that the Honourable Member refers to?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I am referring, Sir, to the closing words of the amendment. There are two points which seem to emerge, namely, the allegations regarding the assault, and secondly the question of the effect of the alleged assault, that which I refer to as the second part.

[Mr. J. Cregar.]

Now, Sir, I would ask the House to reflect very deeply before they commit themselves to the views implied in the amendment on either of the propositions before them. The responsibilities of the police in regard to the maintenance of law and order are difficult and delicate, and as an instance which occurred not very long ago in Lahore itself will show, they are frequently dangerous and sometimes fatal. I venture to submit to the House that action taken in regard to matters of that kind by the police should not be made, what I must call, something in the nature of a political demonstration. At any rate, it is quite clear to me that it is the duty of the Government, when they are satisfied that police officers, in the discharge of their difficult and dangerous duties, have discharged them properly and have not exceeded the limits by law or specific order imposed upon them, I say it is the duty of the Government, having satisfied themselves on those points, to prevent any victimisation on political grounds. I do not suggest for a moment that the Honourable the Mover of the amendment had any such intention in his mind, but I do submit to the House that inquiry into an executive matter of this kind without making out any *prima facie* case to justify it, is not one which is reasonable, not one which is proper, indeed one, which is very doubtfully within the constitutional competence of this House. Sir, I oppose the Resolution and the amendment.

Mr. President: Honourable Members who take part in this debate will remember that the time limit is 15 minutes.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, it has been a matter of deep pain to me to listen to the remarks of the Honourable the Home Member. The first part of the statement regarding the precautions taken by the police and the instructions given to them might be left aside for the moment. The question that is of importance is as to what happened at the Railway station. Time would not permit me, Sir, to go fully into the order which had been issued under section 144. I said on a previous occasion that that order, in my opinion, was an illegal one and a silly one, and I repeat that opinion today. I should like any Member of Government to show me whether Government have any authority, whether the District Magistrate or the Inspector General of Police has any right to tell me that I shall not proceed by any of the King's public ways so long as I do not obstruct the traffic. So long as I do not stand in the way of any other subject of the King moving on that road, nobody has the power to tell me that I shall not pass by a particular open route. This is what that order amounted to, and when that order was received, rightly did the Congress Committee at Lahore resolve that it would disobey the order. I reached Lahore on the morning of the 30th, and when I heard of that order, I expressed the same opinion that it was utterly illegal. Sir, I have had experience of about six such orders under section 144, which I have disobeyed, and if such an order were to be issued again today I should disobey it, in order to vindicate my right. I disobeyed the order at Lahore, when we were passing in a Swaraj procession, and police officers and constables came and stood in our way. We stood there beyond the cordon and asked them to arrest us, but they did not arrest us. What happened earlier in the day was this. As I said on a previous occasion, Lalaji and I had no intention, nor were we desired

by our friends, to go to the railway station and join the demonstration there. But as the procession was being started we were served with an order, under section 144, telling us that anybody who disobeyed the order would be taken under arrest and kept in custody, and we wanted to be taken under arrest along with our fellow men who were going to the station to demonstrate their sense of resentment at the arrival of the Simon Commission. Now, Sir, I was not present at the railway station when the attack took place. I stood a hundred feet or so behind in a *tonga* at the request of my dear lamented friend Lalaji, because I was not in strong health at the time. The moment I heard that the attack had been made, I went up to Lalaji and asked him what had happened. He said the attack was utterly unprovoked. I asked him if anybody had tried to go beyond the barrier, and he said "No". I saw the barrier myself. It was about five feet high made with barbed wire, and no man could be so foolish as to try to force his way through it, because if anyone attempted to do so, his body would have received many cuts and he would have bled profusely. Lalaji told me, not more than two minutes after the occurrence, that there was no provocation at all on the part of the crowd, and the attack was utterly unprovoked and uncalled for, and I am sorry to say that I now believe, from all I have heard from Raizada Hans Raj and other friends, that the attack was a wanton attack, deliberately aimed at Lala Lajpat Rai. (*Cries of "Shame" from Swarajist Benches.*) I am sorry to say so, Sir, because, from all the circumstances that have been mentioned, not omitting the presence of a man who did not belong to the people's party, who came a little time before the attack with an umbrella and held it over Lala Lajpat Rai, as if to point him out and whom none of our party has been able to discover or to find out who he was,—from all these circumstances one cannot but come to the conclusion that the attack was aimed at our late lamented friend Lala Lajpat Rai, and that it was a wanton and deliberate one. I say it is shameful that it should have been made. I saw Lalaji a few minutes after the attack, and I feel sure that, if Lala Lajpat Rai was not there at the time, if he did not appeal to the crowd to remain non-violent,—he himself told me that he had used his utmost persuasion to keep the crowd non-violent,—I say if it was not for the appeal that he himself made to the crowd to remain non-violent, even after the attack made on him, the crowd would not have come away without trying to attack the man who had attacked Lala Lajpat Rai and the policemen who had followed him in doing so. It was because Lalaji persuaded the whole crowd to remain absolutely non-violent, that the thing stopped there. I saw my friend Lala Hans Raj there and his finger was bleeding. Dr. Gopichand and Dr. Alam were also hurt. Our friend Dr. Satyapal threw himself between Lalaji and his assailant in order to save Lala Lajpat Rai from further blows. You have the statements of all these gentlemen that this attack by the police was entirely unprovoked and you have Lalaji's own words to that effect. I knew Lala Lajpat Rai for about 40 years, and I have not known a man who was more scrupulous about truth than Lala Lajpat Rai. When he made that statement I should expect every Member of the Government to accept it as correct and not try to put it aside by saying that Lalaji gave expression to his impressions. I am surprised that the Honourable the Home Member should try to say, without saying that he did not believe the statement, that it was the impression which Lala Lajpat Rai had formed which he expressed. Lala Lajpat Rai stated the facts of which he had personal knowledge. He himself had received the attack; he knew that neither he nor any one of his party had given any

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

provocation. He knew that neither he nor any of his party crossed the barrier. None of our party wanted to cross the barrier. Our decision was that, if a barrier was placed in the way, we must stop there, that was the limit, we had preached. Many of us had addressed the crowds before they started, and had exhorted them, for the honour of the country, of the Congress, and of the leaders who were going with them, to remain absolutely non-violent whatever happened. It was that and the appeal of Lala Lajpat Rai which kept them non-violent, though they were very much excited when their leader was attacked. I submit that, when you have got the statements of Lala Lajpat Rai and others, made on the spot to me, made later to those who interviewed him, made before many friends, when you have got a statement in his own words dictated by him in the course of a Press interview, and in the speech which he made the same evening before a large public meeting, when you have got the statement of Lala Hans Raj, who was present there at the time of the attack and was himself attacked, when you have got the statement of Dr. Gopi Chand and Dr. Alam, Members of the Punjab Legislative Council and other persons who witnessed the attack, for the Government to say that they merely expressed the impression of these gentlemen is certainly, . . . (*Cries of "Shame" from the Swarajist and Nationalist Benches*)—What is the use of crying "Shame"—is certainly not what we expect of the Government. I submit that the Government have not been fair to us, Indians. What sank into the heart of Lala Lajpat Rai,—and as I said on the last occasion, I never saw him happy after the attack, and another friend who saw him several times after that has said that he never saw him happy again—what sank into his heart was the shame and pain of it, that in our own country a man who was so widely respected, so universally honoured, who was once the President of the Indian National Congress, who commanded the reverence of his countrymen, and the respect of many foreigners that such a man should be liable to an attack from a small Superintendent of Police in broad daylight without any justification. It painfully brought home to him the curse of our present position under a foreign Government, and showed that we cannot maintain our self-respect if we allow the existing system of Government to continue in this country. And, Sir, the action of the Government in this matter, the attitude which the Government of the Punjab took up, the attitude which I regret to say the Honourable the Home Member has taken on this occasion, makes that conviction deeper, that pain deeper. Why could not the Government, even now, accept their statements? I ask my Honourable friend why, if he is opposed to an enquiry, the Government have not the decency to say, "We accept the statements made by Lala Lajpat Rai and Lala Hans Raj and we recognise that the policemen had no justification for the attack they made on them, and we shall give the offenders the punishment which is due to them." If such a thing had happened in their own country, say, in England—would they have treated any of their leaders in that way? Would they have attempted to burke an enquiry if such an attack had been made on one of their Front Bench Leaders in Parliament? I submit, no. It is therefore most deplorable that the Government should take up the attitude which they have taken. I submit again that if they do not want to hold an open and impartial enquiry, let them not hold an enquiry, but in that case we certainly expect the Government to accept the statements of Lala Lajpat Rai and Lala Hans Raj and other gentlemen of position, to accept them

as true, and not be remain content with the wrong impression that the Boyd enquiry and other enquiries which have been made have elicited the whole truth. I submit those enquiries have not elicited the whole truth. When we have got the clear statements of Lala Lajpat Rai and Lala Hans Raj, I certainly accept them, the country believes in the truth of those statements, and for the Government to say that they cannot accept those statements is, I submit, placing themselves in a most undesirable position exposing themselves to just criticism for not understanding the feelings of us Indians on this matter and for not showing that courtesy which we are entitled to expect from the Members of Government who come to this country, as they say, to promote the good of the people. I submit that this painful event has gone deep into the hearts of the people. I cannot express the depth of the feeling that exists on this matter throughout the country. The Government have not enhanced their reputation for considerateness towards us Indians. They have given us greater reason to be dissatisfied with the existence of the present system by the attitude which they have taken up. I still ask the Honourable the Home Member and the Government to reconsider the matter. Why should they not at least accept the statement of Lala Hans Raj which he has made on the floor of this House and express their regret that an unprovoked attack should have been made on Lala Lajpat Rai?

So much for the first part of the Resolution. The second part deals with the question of the effect of the attack on Lala Lajpat Rai. Now, when I saw Lala Lajpat Rai again on the second day of the attack, he opened his coat and showed me the wound he had received on the heart and a scratch that he had received in another place. I cannot undertake to say that that blow caused his death, but two doctors who attended him have stated it as their opinion that it accelerated his death. Who on earth, who in this House, will undertake to say that the statements of the two doctors are not true? And who will undertake to say that the cowardly attack made upon a person of the age and position of Lala Lajpat Rai in broad daylight, in the presence of his own people, without any justification, would not produce a very deep effect upon him? It did produce a deep effect. The physical effect brought on pain and fever and the moral effect produced deep depression of heart. He felt—I do not know how to express it—as he spoke to me about it, he showed he felt it in a way which I cannot express properly, and I submit that it is not too much to ask the House to agree with the belief that this unprovoked, unjustifiable, cowardly attack upon Lala Lajpat Rai accelerated his death. Therefore, in the circumstances of the case we should have expected that the Government would say that they regretted the attack, that they would consider the matter in a calm light in an attitude of fairness, and make up their mind to punish the man who would be found to have wantonly attacked one of the best sons of India. But the Government are not prepared to say so, and I hope every Honourable Member of this House, who loves the honour of Indians, who loves the honour of this country, whether he be an Englishman or an Indian, I hope every one will give his support to the Resolution. (Applause.)

Mr. M. B. Jayakar (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I listened to the speech of the Honourable the Home Member with considerable pain. The pain was caused by the fact that, throughout the speech, there was not one word of regret at the occurrence, nor at the conduct of the police. The speech was a complete whitewashing of the conduct of the

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

police which we are considering on this occasion. I should have thought that, having regard to the allegations made in this House and in the Press, Government, for their own good reputation, would accept this enquiry. The allegations made against the Government and their police are so serious in their character—they almost amount to an allegation of the police having murdered an important man in India. I do not wish to import any feeling into my speech. The cold speech of the Honourable the Home Member may prove very contagious.

The allegations are serious. They have been repeated here. They were made by Lala Lajpat Rai in a declaration which may almost be regarded as a dying declaration, which under the law of this country is entitled to special weight and credence. Even a criminal's dying declaration is entitled to weight and respect, and yet the Honourable the Home Member gets up and says, "Oh! it is merely an impression". May I ask whether all those police officers who gave their evidence before Mr. Boyd were not merely stating their impressions? What is that evidence worth if the Honourable the Home Member is going to reject Lala Lajpat Rai's statement as a mere impression? What is the value of that evidence upon which he lays so much stress, namely, the mere impressions of those police officers who appeared before Mr. Boyd? What could an honest and truthful man do but give his impressions? Let him, however, remember that the impressions given by a certain personality and under certain circumstances are entitled to special weight. But whatever the Home Member may say, the country believes that that statement is correct. Besides the Lalaji's statement, we have also the statement of a Member of this House, Lala Hans Raj, a very respected public man in his own province and in this House. I want Honourable friends, it does not matter whether they are Europeans or Indians, to realise that the dignity of this House is involved in this matter. A Member of this House has been killed—I won't use the word "murdered" because I am accustomed to the language of the law. Is it not our duty to inquire into the causes of that death? The Honourable the Home Member says that not even a *prima facie* case has been made out. Good gracious! The attack was on the region of the heart. That is now admitted as also proved by facts. The person assaulted died within a short time of heart failure. The police had in their hands, as Lala Hans Raj stated, long poles mounted with iron. The police did not have in their hands fashionable ivory mounted sticks, but long staffs mounted with iron. Two or three blows with these *lathis* were given to Lala Lajpat Rai. We have got the statement of Lala Hans Raj that he was injured, and even Mr. Boyd's inquiry admits that, although that inquiry is interspersed from place to place with a strong official bias. Mr. Boyd says "Oh, the police could not have behaved like this, because it would be contrary to police regulation." As the Mover of the Resolution said, Mr. Boyd might have as well said, because it would be contrary to the teaching of the Christian Bible. Are not these all *a priori* grounds? I do submit, Sir, that no impartial and straightforward man who reads Mr. Boyd's report will have any difficulty in finding out—I will not use a stronger expression—that from place to place in his Report Mr. Boyd's impressions and judgment have been very largely coloured by official bias. I am unable to understand on what grounds Government refuse this inquiry. Here is a prominent man dying. A large bulk of public opinion is of the view that he died of the effects of this attack. I have no personal impressions to relate because

I had not the opportunity of being present there like my Honourable friend on my right (Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya). But I will tell the House that I had a talk with Lala Lajpat Rai before he died, that is when we met in Delhi from the 5th to the 7th of November. I asked Lalaji "How do you feel, Sir?" He said "I feel weak, but apart from the wound, I feel that I am not the same man as before. I feel that it is a most disgusting humiliation to be so attacked." It is a humiliation which every one of us on this side of the House shares with him—that a prominent public man should have been dealt with in this manner by the underlings of the police. Suppose Mr. Baldwin was attacked in England by the police in this manner? What would happen? Shall we have miserable speeches in extenuation like the Home Member's? The Home Member says, a departmental inquiry has taken place and also an official inquiry. I am surprised at his argument I should have thought that for their own reputation Government ought to court this inquiry. Rightly or wrongly the impression in the country is this that the police deliberately murdered Lala Lajpat Rai. If the Government have not yet lost all sense of propriety, all sense of decency, for their own sake they ought to meet this serious charge and accept this inquiry. I would ask my friends of the European Group to realise that we are not fighting in a factious spirit. I am standing upon the dignity of the House—that a Member of this House has been killed. Why burke an inquiry? The Honourable the Home Member says "Why do you use the word 'murdered'?" What else shall we call it if Government shirk this inquiry? If the Government feel so certain of their facts, why do they avoid this inquiry? Look at the committee that Munshi Iswar Saran has proposed. Can you find a better committee? Mr. Boyd from Rawalpindi district—after all he was a Mr. Boyd, an official at his best. What else was he? He might have had a good name in official opinion, but after all he was an official. His inquiry has all the defects of an official inquiry. Rightly or wrongly the public did not give evidence before it. Therefore the inquiry was an incomplete and partial inquiry from the public point of view. The Honourable the Home Member cannot disguise that fact. He cannot deny that for some reason or other no evidence from the public point of view was placed before that inquiry. For my argument I am content to take it as an incomplete inquiry. Likewise, the departmental inquiry was an incomplete and partial inquiry for the reason that public evidence was not given before it. We want an inquiry which will be more complete from the public point of view, and before a Tribunal in which the public have confidence. I shall be glad to find this non-official committee reporting that the facts are not as the public believe, and that Lala Lajpat Rai did not die as a result of the blows he received. I am surprised that the Home Member should have made a speech of the description he did. I do submit to my friends of the European Group—apart from any party feeling—we owe this impartial inquiry to the memory of a dead colleague of ours. I am content to place my argument on that humble basis. One of our colleagues has died; it does not matter who he was. It happens to be a great man, Lala Lajpat Rai. That only adds insult to the injury, but does not affect my argument. We want to have an inquiry. The only ground on which it is opposed by the other side is that there have been two inquiries. The departmental inquiry goes out of the question. The other inquiry was public in a sense, but unfortunately its findings, for obvious reasons, cannot command public confidence. So both these inquiries were unable to discover the truth from

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

the public point of view. What we want is a complete inquiry by a trusted Tribunal. I do submit again, Sir, that, unless this Government has lost all sense of propriety and fairness it ought to agree to this inquiry.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, the Honourable the Home Member described the tone and the language of the Mover of the Resolution as not compatible with the dignity of this deliberative Assembly. Sir, I listened to the tone and the language of the Home Member and may I state on the floor of this House that it was not compatible with the dignity of a responsible government? He said that the policy of the Government of India and the Local Governments with regard to the task of the Simon Commission to investigate and inquire into the future constitution of India, was that every shade of opinion in this country—co-operators or non-co-operators—should have the fullest freedom and liberty of action and that they were free to express their opinion and adopt such actions as they thought proper, provided that it was compatible with the maintenance of law and order. I think I have understood him correctly. Well, Sir, I do not want to enter into a discussion of that policy of the Government of India more than I can help it on this occasion because in my judgment I feel and I have publicly stated it before that the policy of the Government and the Provincial Governments and the district authorities—which has been carried out in fact—has not been the policy that everyone should be free to adopt such action as he thinks proper compatible with law and order. But the policy of the authorities throughout the country in fact has been the active support and instigation of the co-operators. Whoever heard of a Royal Commission getting red carpet receptions at every station they go to, in every district and in every town, under the patronage and under the direct instigation of the local officials? Whoever heard of such a thing before? I pointed out in my interview to the Press sometime ago and I say to Government now—of course the work of the Simon Commission is coming to an end and perhaps it is useless to discuss this any further—but I say, even today, though I do not wish to deny a cup of tea to Sir John Simon, or a party if anybody invites them. I do not wish to deny them a sumptuous dinner if anyone wishes to invite them. Stop official association with those functions, those functions should not take place under official patronage (*An Honourable Member* "Official organisation"), yes, official organisation, I accept that word. It is this undesirable factor which makes those who are opposing the Commission maintain that unless they demonstrate opposition their case will go by default. If the authorities had not followed that policy, probably, I think, those who hold the view that they must also establish by clear demonstration that India is not co-operating would have slackened in their efforts.

However I do not wish to go into that question any further, and whatever may have been the policy of the Government it does not matter so far as the issue before the House to-day is concerned. I am not now concerned also whether the orders issued in the Punjab by the Provincial Government were legal or illegal. It is enough for my purpose that it is an admitted fact that the people who met there, behind the barbed wires, were legally and lawfully stationed there. They were not an unlawful assembly. The issue that really then presents itself to us, as it appears to me, is this. Did the police, or any member of the police, assault not

only Lala Lajpat Rai but the citizens who had lawfully assembled there—I attach importance to Lala Lajpat Rai because he was a man of position and a Leader and a Member of this House—but I do not wish to neglect the other people, however small they may be. The question is whether the assault on that occasion by the police was unjustifiable, unprovoked and uncalled for. That is the question that appears to me is the real issue. Now the consequences of that assault may have been grave. It is alleged that it accelerated the death of Lala Lajpat Rai. It may be so, it may not be so. I am not in a position at this moment to pronounce my opinion on the subject. It may be that it might have been still more grave. The consequences might have been that several lives might have been lost on the spot. Really the issue to my mind is, was the assault made by the police on that occasion made on a lawfully assembled gathering of people, or on citizens who were entitled to be there, and who gave no cause, reason or provocation to the police for the assault that was made? The assault was made, that fact is proved that the assault was made is admitted. It is asserted on the one side that it was uncalled for, unprovoked, unjustifiable, and that it was a deliberate, wanton scheme, premeditated, that is the allegation. On the other side I am told by the Government through the Home Member, that the police only used such force as was necessary to meet the situation. We are further told that "an enquiry has been made". By whom? Departmentally. There was further inquiry by the Boyd Committee. Now, do the Government seriously call these inquiries? I will not venture to characterize them but rest content by saying that we do not want a police inquiry or for the matter of that an executive inquiry, but an independent agency to inquire into this matter. Having regard to these serious charges, to these serious allegations which have been made in the Press and at public meetings by responsible men outside and Members of this House of the position of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Hans Raj, is this your answer that a *prima facie* case has not been made out for the appointment of an independent Committee to inquire? Do you wish to shirk such inquiry? If these allegations ultimately are proved to be untrue, let me tell you, and let me tell the Government, the Honourable the Home Member, that your Government will come out of it with a greater reputation than you possess at this moment. If you shirk this inquiry, the only conclusion that we on this side of the House will come to is that you dare not face the inquiry. (Cheers.) Why do you wish to take shelter under these frivolous excuses, that primarily it is a matter for the Local Government. You know what the Local Government has done. The Local Government does not wish to face the inquiry. Have you no power, have you no authority, are Law and Order not a reserved subject? Have the Government of India no voice in the matter? Then, why do you want to shirk it? I say in your own interests, I say in the interests of Government, I say for your own credit, for your own reputation, if you are satisfied that the assault was not wanton, not uncalled for, not unjustified, and not without provocation, then the sooner you agree to this motion the better for your own interests, for your own credit, for your own reputation. (Applause.)

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, it was my intention to record a silent vote on this occasion, which I thought would be a sad occasion, but the

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

amazing speech delivered by the Honourable the Home Member has introduced a measure of bitterness on this sad occasion, which compels me to put a few of my ideas before the House.

I have hardly anything new to add to what has fallen from my friends who have spoken before me. But it appears to me that in the interests of the Government itself the speech that the Honourable the Home Member made just now was a most amazing one. It was only the other day that the Governor General addressed this House and pleaded for mutual trust and confidence. Here we have in the speech of the Honourable the Home Member, a specimen of that mutual trust and confidence. A case is brought to the notice of the House of which the Honourable Members of the House itself have personal knowledge. They stand in their place and they assure the House of the correctness of the facts. What do they demand? They demand an inquiry. As the House has been informed, the whole country has been reiterating this demand; the whole country is convinced that it was nothing but a case of murder. My Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah, the careful lawyer that he is, has not used that word, nor has my Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar used that word. Nor do I accuse any particular person of murder. But, Sir, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that if the facts are as they are stated to be, it was nothing but murder. One single incident of the whole affair which has been referred to by more speakers than one on this side, namely, an unknown person appearing for a moment upon the scene, holding an umbrella over the head of Lala Lajpat Rai, and disappearing the next moment, that single incident is full of meaning. What follows is the attack on Lala Lajpat Rai. Any reasonable man, any man given to the habit of connecting cause with effect, can have no possible doubt in his mind that the holding of the umbrella over the head of Lala Lajpat Rai had a significant connection with the assault. It meant pointing out the target and showing who the victim was to be. I am only taking the facts as they have been stated, and I do not think any Honourable Member of the House on this side asks the Government to take those facts as finally and fully established. What do I ask for? I say that, in the face of these facts, in the face of the very serious allegations against the police and against the conduct of the officials who were there, it is your bounden duty to hold an inquiry of a nature which would satisfy the public demand. The view that I take of the matter is slightly different from the view which has been taken by my other friends on this side. I am not at all keen upon an actual inquiry. I am only anxious to show to the Government the urgent necessity for an inquiry and of convincing them—if it is possible to convince the Government of anything—that in view of the fact that the public and the world at large consider this to be pre-eminently a case for an enquiry, it will be in their own interest to hold it. If after that, the Government will not hold an enquiry, they will do so at their own risk. I am not here to save the Government from the consequence of their own action. If they choose to sit upon the safety valve, it is no business of mine to do more than tell them where they are sitting and what the result will be. Once I have told them, my business is done. If they refuse to budge from that place, and if they insist on sitting on the safety valve, let them by all means do so and take the consequences. In the face of this demand, if you do not hold the inquiry.

what will be the result? The result will be that the popular belief that Lalaji met his death at the hands of the police under circumstances which may amount to murder, that belief will develop into the firm conviction that Lalaji did die at the hands of a murderer and that that murderer was the officer concerned. (Hear, hear.) I say you cannot help people coming to that conclusion. It is the most natural conclusion which they can come to. The most amazing part of it is the manner in which the whole question has been dealt with by the Honourable the Home Member. He has gone into the facts; he has discussed the evidence, as if he was addressing a Court of appeal, and he says upon that evidence that the only inference to be drawn is that the police did their duty.

An Honourable Member: And the House ought to be satisfied with it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: If the Government think that they have such satisfactory evidence, let it be put before an impartial tribunal, let it be placed before a committee in which the public and the world at large have confidence. Why should you shirk that unless you know in your heart of hearts that you have no case to lay before the committee?

An Honourable Member: They know it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: That is what I am saying. The Honourable the Home Member has spoken of the policy of latitude which the Government of India and the Provincial Governments have given in the matter of allowing all kinds of demonstrations whether for or against the Simon Commission. I happen to be one of those who was in close proximity to the scene of one of these demonstrations, though unfortunately not in the demonstration itself. I am talking of Lucknow. The policy of allowing full latitude was observed in this manner. A plot of ground was allotted to the non-co-operators numbering thousands upon thousands. That was out of sight of the exit or the portico from the railway station where they came out. Right in front a whole block was empty. There were a few who were called the depressed classes. They were there in that block. They were made to sleep there the previous night. (Laughter.) There were something like—I forget the exact weight—there were something like several seers of *charas*, *ganja*, and other refreshments supplied to them that night. In addition, each of them was paid cash Rs. 2 or thereabout. In spite of these inducements, they were not there in sufficient numbers to fill that plot of land. Then further on there were co-operators. Of course all these would see the Members of the Commission as they came out of the railway station. The non-co-operators, in their thousands upon thousands, were about three furlongs away from the station. When the Commission arrived near the almost empty space where the depressed classes on the previous night had their revel, some of them were crying—I forgot to say—some of them, in the heat and excitement of the moment, were crying out "Simon, Go back". (Laughter.) There were others who, when they saw that this space was empty, tried to enter it and it was there that the assault took place.

Now, I have no hesitation in saying from the reports which I got then and there, that if Jawaharlal Nehru had not been the young and strong man that he is, his fate would certainly have been the same as that of Lalaji. It was he who was attacked, not from one side but from three sides, and but for the fact that his young following simply surrounded him three or four deep, he could not possibly have been left alive. The attack was so concentrated in one spot. I am making no charge—I do not care, nor does

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

the boy care—but I am talking of the latitude that has been given to all, whether they are co-operators or non-co-operators. And it is known, the country knows too much of this sort of thing now to be deluded by this phraseology. Besides Jawaharlal Nehru there was Govind Ballab Pant, the Leader of the Congress Party in the local Council, and they both came in for concentrated attacks. I saw both of them and they appeared just as if a painter had painted them black and blue all over their bodies, but they are both young and strong men, and they made light of these serious injuries.

Then the Honourable the Home Member says that it was because they defied all orders that such precautions were taken. It seems to me that, in the climate of India, English words have lost their English meaning. What does "strict precautions" mean? "Strict precautions" means belabouring people with *lathis*? And what, in the name of common sense, is the precaution that one can take when an order is defied, an order under Section 144? The utmost you can do is to prosecute the man, or if it is a serious case, to arrest the man on the spot. Well, take the case of Lalaji now. It is not the case of anybody that there was a general rush, so to speak, upon the police or that the police made a general charge upon the mob. It is just the case of a few who are said to have gone beyond the barrier but had to be sent back to the barrier. They might have been easily arrested; but I am not going into that fact. I do not desire any Honourable Member to go into the facts and take it upon himself to say as to what it was that actually happened. All I am concerned with is this. Here is the grave and serious charge against an official, a high official of the Police Department, and here is the Government trying to shelter him from that charge.

Now, the most remarkable thing that the Honourable the Home Member said was that there was no *prima facie* case, no *prima facie* evidence. I really do not know what the Honourable Member's conception of a *prima facie* case is. Here we have on the floor of this House—I say dismiss everything else from your consideration—the statement of Lala Hans Raj. My friend Pandit Malaviya was not there on the spot when this thing occurred.

4 P.M. Now tell me—let anybody who has had anything to do with the weighing of evidence tell me—that that statement does not show a very strong case, much more than a *prima facie* case. If I am right, what is the defence, I ask? Two inquiries have already taken place. If you hold a hundred enquiries of the nature you have held, that would not satisfy anybody. You have come now face to face with a situation which demands an open inquiry by a duly constituted committee or tribunal or commission, or whatever you call it, in which people have confidence, which carries confidence by its impartiality, and the personnel of which commands respect. But if you shirk it, if you are not prepared to grant it, then I would entirely agree with my Honourable friend who said that you have lost all sense of decency.

Mr. Arthur Moore (Bengal: European): Sir, I wish to say that most of us here feel exactly like Pandit Motilal Nehru when he described his feelings, that is to say, we regard it as a sad occasion, and we also would prefer to give a silent vote, if there is any necessity for a vote at all. But Mr. Jayakar has definitely appealed to the European Group to clear its

position on this point, and he appealed to us on the ground that a Member of the Assembly had died in circumstances which are under dispute, and therefore everybody, without reference to his Party, should join in demanding an enquiry. Now, Sir, I do not think that we yield to any one in our feelings in regard to the solidarity and honour of the House. We know also that there is deep feeling in this matter, and deep sympathies are stirred because Lala Lajpat Rai was so well-known to all of us, and particularly to the Members of this House associated with him publicly; and there is every circumstance to rouse interest and feeling and sympathy in the fact that we have, even here to-day, the actual evidence of people who can bear personal testimony. But, Sir, surely it is not enough to be led by this personal emotion, this feeling and sympathy and interest in this House. On the contrary that is reason why we should proceed in this matter with very great care. Ought we in this House to give the impression that we are not prepared to take the same interest in every man in the same circumstances of his death, if there is some similar allegation made? Therefore, Sir, I think we ought not to distinguish between one of our own number and the general public.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I have made it quite clear, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Arthur Moore: I am referring to Mr. Jayakar. I think that we ought to be careful in considering this matter from an emotional point of view, though naturally, this strong feeling will arise where a man or any person so well known to us is concerned. But as to this inquiry that it proposed, let us now try coolly to consider what it can do and what is the object of it. As I see it, and I speak purely as a layman, it could be constituted for two purposes. The first is to discover whether force was used by the police.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is a fact; it is not a question of "whether"; it was.

Mr. Arthur Moore: Very well, let us take that as one possible object of inquiry.

Honourable Members on the Swarajist Benches: Why "whether"; it is admitted.

Mr. Arthur Moore: If Honourable Members will wait, I will return to the point. Whether force was used by the police. Secondly, whether the force used by the police caused or accelerated the death of Lala Lajpat Rai.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: No. Was it justifiable? Whether it was justifiable.

Mr. Arthur Moore: I take it also as to whether it caused or accelerated his death.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That may be or may not be. That is a subsidiary point.

Mr. Arthur Moore: Well now, as regards the first point, as to whether force was used by the police. I think that there is a tendency to ignore the point that the inquiry which has already been held established that the object of the demonstration was to defy the orders of the District Magistrate.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: No, no, that was not the object.

Mr. Arthur Moore: I understand from the speech of the Honourable the Home Member that the demonstrators went there with that object.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: The demonstrators went there to show that there were a lot of people in this country opposed to the Simon Commission, as the Government tried to show by their group, that there were men who welcomed it.

Mr. Arthur Moore: And they were aware that the demonstration had been forbidden under the orders of the District Magistrate.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: No, the demonstration had not been forbidden. The demonstrators were told they must follow a certain route and not go beyond it, and they did not go beyond the barrier.

Mr. Arthur Moore: But I understand from the Honourable the Home Member's speech that the object was to defy the orders of the District Magistrate.

Honourable Members: No, no!

Mr. President: Facts are in dispute.

Mr. Arthur Moore: At any rate it is quite certain that the object was public non-co-operation, and therefore the police had to take certain necessary precautions.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: And assault them because they were non-co-operators.

Mr. Arthur Moore: That depends on the force required to deal with the situation.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhammadian): What was the situation? That is the point. People were standing behind the barricade; that is all.

Mr. Arthur Moore: I think it is quite impossible by any. . . .

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member, but may I make one statement at this point? It was, as I explained in my speech, a decision arrived at at the public meeting on the 29th October; the decision was arrived at and reported to the Government of the Punjab, that the intention of the leaders of that meeting was to disobey the District Magistrate's orders.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Sir, may I ask one question of the Honourable the Home Member? Is it or is it not a fact that when the people were behind the barbed wire and before the assault took place, they were entitled to be there legally?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The whole point was that the action of the police was necessitated by the danger of the crowd breaking through the barrier.

Mr. Arthur Moore: Well, Sir, as I was saying. . . .

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: Sir, may I ask the Honourable Member whether it was not a fact that, even Mr. Boyd says in his report, that the crowd was giving no provocation?

Mr. Arthur Moore: My contention is this, that it is quite impossible at this late date for a new inquiry, after we have already had one, to come to any definite decision on this point, and I would ask Honourable Members opposite to remember that a certain amount of restraint is being exercised in other parts of the House. When, while professing to guard themselves against using such phrases, they tell us that the whole country believes that Lalaji was murdered, I think they ought to remember that there is a similarly widespread belief throughout the country among Government servants that two policemen have since been murdered in Lahore as a result. One Englishman and one gallant Indian who went to his rescue were murdered in Lahore as a result of this; and that those two men were murdered no one will even attempt to deny, whatever may be said in this other case. And we must remember one thing in the case of Lalaji which happened on the 30th October. When people talk of his having been murdered or of having been killed, we have got to remember that a week later he came to Delhi.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: May I ask the Honourable Member if there is anything to show that these murders resulted from the attack on Lala Lajpat Rai?

Mr. Arthur Moore: I have not suggested that there is. In referring to the murders in Lahore, I am not referring to evidence, but I say that when Honourable Members opposite, while professing to guard themselves against using the words, say there is a widespread impression in the country—and more than one speaker has said to-day that the whole country believes it—that the Lalaji was murdered, it ought to be remembered that a certain amount of restraint is being exercised on the other side of this House, because, it is universally believed among Government servants up and down the country that those were two murders

Mr. K. O. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Does the Honourable Member know that he is referring to a matter which is *sub judice*?

Mr. Arthur Moore: It is not *sub judice*. As far as I know, no one is on trial for murder.

Honourable Members on Swarajist Benches: It is, it is!

Mr. Arthur Moore: Anyhow, what I said is the impression which exists throughout the country. But as regards the Lalaji's death, my point is that Lalaji came to Delhi a week later. He attended the All-Parties Conference. He made speeches and he gave interviews. And I wish to point out a very interesting fact. Whatever he may have said in private conversation, some of which have been repeated to us to-day, as far as his public statements go, they show none of this bitterness which has been expressed against Government. His speeches in that week at Delhi I commend to the attention, not so much of Honourable gentlemen opposite, as to some who are not present to-day.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore cum Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): What about the medical certificate?

Mr. Arthur Moore: I am quite aware of what the Lalaji said against the undesirability of an "independence" campaign. I am quite aware of what he said as to the position of any Member of this Assembly who has taken the oath of allegiance yet comes here to advocate independence.

An Honourable Member: What has that got to do with the matter?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Do you know what he said about the evidence itself?

Mr. Arthur Moore: I know what he said. I am quite aware and I wish to point out . . .

An Honourable Member: What about the medical certificate?

Mr. Arthur Moore: The Lalaji has gone and it is impossible to have a *post mortem*. There is nothing left but ashes. Therefore it can never be established what connection there was between the two events. None of us can know whether or no the Lahore incident accelerated his death. But this we do know, that he travelled to Delhi afterwards, that he made speeches without bitterness . . .

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I submit, Sir, he is not speaking with a knowledge of the facts.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is entitled to speak without knowledge of the facts!

Mr. Arthur Moore: Perhaps, Sir, I know a fact or two. I have read what Lalaji said . . .

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: In his speech at Lahore the same evening?

Mr. Arthur Moore: I have read what Lalaji said when he came to the All-Parties Conference at Delhi. Many of us are firmly convinced that Lalaji was present at Lahore Railway Station, pushed on by immoderate and intemperate men, and that he went against his better judgment; or perhaps in so far as he went there willingly, he went in the hope of restraining them. Therefore, Sir, it seems to me that it is very unfortunate, after a public inquiry to which witnesses were invited, and after the people who could have given the most material help to that early inquiry took no notice of it, that we in this House should be seen trying, shall I say, to make some political asset out of that regrettable story, or trying to fan passion throughout the country and stir up bitterness, of which there must be a harvest later. We all know that, however much you preach non-violent non-co-operation, no one has ever yet succeeded in teaching the masses in this or any other country the art of non-co-operation without violence. Therefore we have got to think of the future, to think of the incidents that are likely to arise in another year if this doctrine continues to be preached. Let us not be seen snatching at opportunities of collision between civilians and authority, or encouraging this experiment of non-co-operation which is, for us as Members of this House, fundamentally incompatible with our position.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I think that any Member who speaks on this Resolution from this side of the House can only rise to his feet with great reluctance; and if in my own case there is any alleviation of that feeling, it is that it enables me to pay my own small tribute of respect to the memory of the

late Lala Lajpat Rai. I did not know him well, but I never once experienced from him anything but the most friendly and courteous treatment, and although of course it would be idle to say that those of us on this side who knew him slightly could have the same feelings at the time of his death as those who sit on the other side and were closely associated with him for many years, inevitably felt, yet I do hope it will be realised that the regret which we on this side feel is perfectly genuine and perfectly sincere. It is my wish, Sir, as I know it has been the wish of other speakers, not to say anything to-day which may embitter feeling and which could not do anything but harm to the causes which we all have at heart. My Honourable friend, Pandit Malaviya, found fault with my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, for what he had said regarding the statements made by Lala Lajpat Rai. Now, my Honourable colleague made it perfectly plain that he did not, for one moment, question the sincerity and truthfulness of the Lalaji any more than he questioned the truthfulness and sincerity of Raizada Hans Raj. It seemed to me that my Honourable friend the Pandit went somewhat further and was inclined to claim for the late Lalaji not only truthfulness and sincerity but something approaching infallibility.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I did not.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: After all it is of common occurrence—every one of us either in the Law Courts or elsewhere—must have come across cases where there has been a conflict of testimony, where quite different accounts were given of the same incident by different people, and yet when one was perfectly satisfied that the witnesses on both sides were endeavouring to tell the truth to the very best of their ability

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Hence the reason for an inquiry.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: And if my Honourable colleague suggested as he did, that the statement of the late Lala Lajpat Rai was not necessarily conclusive in point of evidence, I do not think that that justifiably exposes him to criticism from the Honourable Pandit. Now, Sir, the Honourable Pandit went on to say: "Why was not the Honourable the Home Member, if he was not prepared to agree to an enquiry, at least prepared to do this, to get up in his place and accept the statement of the late Lala Lajpat Rai as correct, and on the strength of that to inflict suitable punishment on the various police officers engaged in the incident?"

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Also of Lala Hans Raj.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: But, Mr. President, is it claimed in the name of justice that all the evidence on one side is to be taken as gospel and all the evidence on the other side summarily rejected?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is what you have done.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I am not referring to the suggestion for an inquiry, but for action which my Honourable friend the Pandit asked the Honourable the Home Member to take. Surely, if my Honourable colleague had seen his way to comply with that invitation, his action would have been obviously and clearly unjust.

[The Honourable Sir George Rainy.]

Now, Mr. President, my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, has said the only inference that can be drawn from the attitude of Government is that we are endeavouring to burke an inquiry. Am I not entitled to ask whether we could not retaliate that accusation? Does it lie in the mouths of those who refused to have anything to do with the public inquiry held by a high official of the Punjab Government

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: An executive officer.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Who declined to take the opportunity of appearing before him and to cross-examine witnesses? Does it lie in their mouth to say that it is Government that is burking an inquiry?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Yes, because it was not a judicial or an independent enquiry.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I will come to the point taken by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, in a moment. I should like to associate myself with the protest which has already fallen from the lips of my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, against the way in which the term "murder" has been used in this debate; and I was sorry to hear that term from the lips of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. But, Sir, let us take it on his own footing. He said that, if the facts were as they had been stated to be, it was nothing short of murder. That is his statement, and putting it at its lowest, the allegations of the other Members who have spoken amount to this, that the police officers were guilty of criminal acts rendering them liable to punishment under the Indian Penal Code. But if so, the Courts are open. If it is a case of nothing short of murder, there is the judicial tribunal available to my Honourable friends opposite

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Is that the position that Government takes in a case where a crime like murder has been committed? Do the police leave it to the relatives of the murdered man to go to Court?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: It is still open to those who complain that the police are neglecting their duty to bring a complaint before the magistrate and the magistrate can then issue directions

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I remind the Honourable Member that it is not open to any private person under the law to institute a prosecution on a charge of murder?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: It is certainly open to any private person under the law to complain to a magistrate that an offence has been committed.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: The prosecution can be initiated only by the Government on behalf of the Crown on a charge of murder.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I will not argue the point with my Honourable and learned friend

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I think you had better consult your Law Member.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: After all, it is a legal quibble.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: It is not a legal quibble. I may point out to the Honourable Member that no prosecution on a charge of murder can be initiated by any private individual. It can only be done by the Government on behalf of the Crown.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Then I may point out to my Honourable friend that the facts alleged on the other side do not necessarily amount to murder, and if they did not, they would certainly amount to the commission of a comparatively minor offence. Does that meet his difficulty? Is not a legal tribunal open to him there?

There is only one other matter, Sir, to which I wish to allude. I did regret it when I heard my Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar say that because the late Lala Lajpat Rai was a prominent man it was necessary that special steps should be taken

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: I never suggested anything of the kind. What I said by way of appeal to the European Group to give us their support for the amendment, was that Lala Lajpat Rai was a Member of the Assembly and their colleague.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I heard my Honourable friend say that because Lala Lajpat Rai was a prominent Member of the Assembly

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: I said what is a fact that he was a prominent Member of the Assembly.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I have no desire to attribute more to my friend than he is conscious of having said. I do feel that when the charges made are of the kind described, it should not be a question whether a man is a Member of the Assembly or whether he is a prominent Member of the Assembly. Every member of the public is entitled to the same protection against misconduct on the part of the police, and it does not, to my mind, make any real difference whether a particular individual, who is alleged to have suffered, is a prominent man or not. I think, Sir, I will leave it at that and will not weary the House further.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Diwan Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I had no desire at this stage of the debate, after the very splendid speeches that have been made by the leaders of the various Parties with regard to this deplorable matter, to prolong the debate for any length of time, but I must, coming from the Punjab, enter my protest against the manner in which the Honourable the Home Member and the Honourable the Commerce Member have dealt with this matter. They have signally failed in their duty, as impartial administrators, to deal with the situation which has been created by this Resolution and the amendment moved to it. It was up to them, when a charge was made, and a very serious charge too, that the public in India generally consider that Lala Lajpat Rai's death was due to a deliberate assault being made upon him by the police, it was up to them to institute an impartial inquiry. The Honourable the Home Member will recall the fact that Lala Lajpat Rai himself was willing, when the Boyd Inquiry was appointed, to appear before an impartial

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

tribunal, a judicial tribunal and an independent tribunal. The words he himself used were these :

"We do not want any departmental inquiry. We do not want any inquiry by a single Indian Civil Service officer. If any inquiry is to be made, it must be an open inquiry by a Commission consisting of two non-officials and one judicial officer."

Does it now lie in the mouth of the Honourable Member over there to say, why did not Lala Lajpat Rai give evidence before the Boyd Inquiry? He did not do so, because he considered he could not get justice from it, and every one of us knows, after the verdict given by the Boyd Inquiry, that that inquiry could not have afforded us any justice. In the nature of things it could not be an impartial enquiry. The executive are the accused and at the same time the judges. What Mr. Boyd has done is to take the verdict from the police and place his signature to it. Now, Sir, here is one statement which I want to bring to the notice of the House which will shew that we could get no justice from Mr. Boyd. Here is the Senior Superintendent of Police, who is being charged with having assaulted Lala Lajpat Rai. He comes before Mr. Boyd to give evidence, and Mr. Boyd, after all the evidence that he has taken, discovers that it is the Senior Superintendent of Police who made the first assault, that he was responsible for the first attack upon the demonstrators, and that in his evidence the Senior Superintendent of Police did not make any mention of the assault which he himself made upon the demonstrators. I want to recall the actual words to the notice of the Honourable the Home Member. It is the police who made the first attack on the demonstrators. The late Mr. Saunders says in his evidence :

"they were rapped on the hands with a cane by the Senior Superintendent of Police and himself."

And Mr. Boyd adds :

"These raps may have accounted for some of the injuries complained of. The Senior Superintendent of Police did not mention this incident, as his evidence related entirely to a subsequent scuffle which occurred about ten minutes later."

Now, Sir, imagine the position of a man who is appointed to inquire into this matter. The Senior Superintendent of Police comes before him to give evidence and hides from the inquiring officer one of the most essential factors in that evidence, one of the most essential incidents in that evidence, and he forgets or ignores to mention the fact that he himself started the assault.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I am very reluctant to interrupt the Honourable Member, but may I point out to him that the incident to which Mr. Boyd refers as not having been mentioned was not the incident which is alleged against the Senior Superintendent of Police.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I am perfectly well aware of the facts, Sir, and I have said so. I hope the Honourable Member will give me a little credit for intelligence. (*Some Honourable Members from the European Group:* "Why?") I am perfectly well aware that the incident was the first incident. It was the first incident, as I said, when Mr. Scott, the Senior Superintendent of Police, actually goes out of his way to rap the demonstrators with his cane. That is how the whole trouble originated. Then they

go on to justify what they call the second scuffle, and there are several stories which Government put forward. The second scuffle arose they say because a Sergeant was told to put more barbed wire over the top of the barrier. When he reached the gap Mr. Saunders lost sight of him, and almost immediately afterwards the crowd surged forward and were definitely pushing the constables who were holding the gap. The Report says:

"I am quite satisfied that the scuffle arose because Sergeant Ward was, probably quite unintentionally, jostled and knocked over when stooping down to fix barbed wire to a trestle."

And therefore the police started assaulting. But what I want to drive at is this. Here is the Senior Superintendent of Police, who makes his first attack—and this is also part of the attack—he appears before Mr. Boyd, and does not mention even one word in regard to the attack which he himself first made. He himself was the originator of the whole trouble, and yet he does not mention one word about it in his evidence before Mr. Boyd! And yet, the Senior Superintendent of Police is to be believed as to what he has said, and the inquiry that is conducted by Mr. Boyd is to be believed as a just and impartial inquiry. Sir, I say this Inquiry, this Report is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Now, Sir, I come to the second point. It has been alleged that, without any provocation, an assault was made upon Lala Lajpat Rai and other members of the demonstration. What do the Government themselves say?

"When the crowd reached the barricade, it stopped under the orders of the police, and the different accounts so far seen by the Government agree, firstly, that there was at first no attempt on the part of the members of the procession to rush the barriers, and secondly, that there was no aggressive action by the police."

Now, Mr. Boyd himself says this:

"I am quite satisfied that the scuffle arose because Sergeant Ward was, probably quite unintentionally, jostled and knocked over when stooping down to fix barbed wire to a trestle. But up till that time"—

—this is a very significant remark—

"the crowd was orderly, if noisy, and was behind the barrier, but was being pushed forward from behind . . ."

There is no other evidence. Nobody has ever said that the crowd was being pushed forward from behind. We have three different statements. One set of evidence is to the effect that they were trying to climb over five feet of barbed wire. Imagine anybody daring to climb over five feet of barbed wire in order to go and make an exhibition of himself. Another statement is that they were rushing the gap that was in the barrier. A third statement is—and that is Lord Winterton's statement,—that they were being pushed from behind. Nobody, not even Lord Winterton, could say that any of these demonstrators had crossed the barrier. Has anybody alleged it? Has the Honourable Member alleged it? And yet we have the statement on the other side of the House that the demonstrators over there were orderly; although they were noisy they were peaceful and stopped there under the orders of the police. The story about a certain Ward being jostled is a concoction and would not deceive a child. Then, what is the real basis of all this? The basis, I submit, is perfectly clear.

[Diwan Chaman Lall.]

We have heard the statement of Lala Hans Raj. Does the Honourable Member say that the Punjab Government and its police officials are stating the truth, or that Lala Hans Raj is telling the truth? One set of statements is a lie. Either the Punjab Government and the police are liars, or the late Lala Lajpat Rai, my Honourable friend, Lala Hans Raj, and all those other people who were there at the spot, are liars. It is no good saying it is a question of impression. My Honourable friend, the Home Member says it is an impression. He knows what he is talking about, what he wants to say, though he does not say it, that Lala Hans Raj is a liar . . .

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I deny that absolutely, Sir. That is a most unjustifiable inference.

Diwan Chaman Lall: What is the use of turning round and saying, it was merely an impression? The impression of this man, the impression of a man with a hand that was bleeding, because of an unprovoked assault, the impression of Lala Lajpat Rai, whom I saw with two big scars, as soon as I arrived from Europe, the next day, and I have repeated in the Press and I repeat on the floor of this House that he said that the attack was a deliberate attack made with the intention to murder him! There are four witnesses to this. If the Honourable the Home Member is prepared to have an enquiry, I can produce them. If that was the impression of Lala Lajpat Rai, and if that is the impression in the public mind, may I ask what justification the Honourable Member has for denying us an impartial and judicial enquiry into this matter? If he will not face an enquiry, as pointed out by Pandit Motilal Nehru and by Mr. Jinnah, it is perfectly obvious that the Executive stand condemned in the eyes of every decent Indian, and that they are really trying to shield and shelter people who are guilty of this wanton assault upon the late Lala Lajpat Rai. (Applause.)

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): I move that the question be now put.

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

The motion was adopted.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Sir, my Leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru, is surprised at the callousness of the Benches opposite. So far as I am concerned, I am surprised at the colossal ignorance that they have displayed in this debate. I have been in this House for over two years but I have never seen the Government Benches so ill-prepared to meet the case of Members on the non-official side as I found them today. I was still more surprised at my Honourable friend, Mr. Moore, standing over there, taking the Honourable the Home Member's ill-informed and ill-delivered remarks and trying to make a case out of those remarks. Sir, how can the blind lead the blind? So far as my Honourable friend, Mr. Moore, is concerned, he made an astounding statement. He said that Lala Lajpat Rai lived for 17 days after the assault, but he never showed any bitterness in his speech . . .

Mr. Arthur Moore: I did not say so. I said he made speeches in Delhi without bitterness.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Here I read to the Honourable Member, what Lalaji said, just after the assault:

"Every blow that was hurled at us this afternoon was a nail in the coffin of the British Empire."

Is that bitterness or not, I ask the Honourable Member?

Mr. Arthur Moore: It is much more important what he said a week later when he had had time for reflection.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: All right, if only that will satisfy the Honourable Member, I proceed and tell the House what Lalaji said in Delhi a week later. He said at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee held a week later in Delhi as reported by the Associated Press:

"He agreed with most of what Pandit Motilal Nehru had said. His wish, however, was to turn out the British from India even by force. They had to gain their freedom by any means which was practicable and available. He declared that the British did not occupy their present position by peaceful and legitimate means. Non-violence as a policy was all right, but it should not be accepted as a creed."

A statement of this nature was never made by Lalaji in all his life before that assault took place. I ask my Honourable friend to tell me if there is bitterness in it or not.

Mr. Arthur Moore: Will the Honourable Member read the end of the passage?

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: Let the Honourable Member do it for himself. So far as my Honourable friend the Home Member sitting opposite is concerned. I again repeat that I have always believed in his sincerity of purpose, and believing as I did I spoke in that way about him. I believed and I said that when he paid a glowing tribute to the late Lalaji on January 28th in this House he did not indulge in the art of polite falsity. But I am sorry to say that while I am prepared to accept that the Honourable Member is sincere he is not prepared even to tolerate sincere words coming from the other side. I tell my Honourable friend that it is only on rare occasions that I take part in debates in this House, but I tell him that whenever I do so he should not expect that all the things that come from this side will always be very smooth and palatable to him. The oath that I took on the first day in this House will remain inscribed in my heart so long as I am in this House, and that oath was to the effect that I would sincerely and honestly perform my duties in this House. I had thought that the Honourable Member would be willing to concede that much honesty of purpose to me

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I made no imputation on the Honourable Member's honesty, and if any expression that I used gave him that impression, I desire to assure him that I had no such intention.

Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra: I thank the Honourable Member for that. The death of Lalaji is a matter about which we, the youth of India, feel very keenly. I would be less than human if after I found that any of my leaders like Pandit Motilal Nehru, or Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya or Mr. Jinnah behind whom I have the honour to sit have been assaulted like this, I say I would be less than human, and I

[Pandit Dwarka Prasad Misra.]

would not be loyal to them if I did not raise the strongest voice of protest I could raise in this House. I am sorry that my Honourable friend accused me of unparliamentary language. I am sure, Mr. President, you would have promptly called me to order had I used any such expression. But I really sympathise with my Honourable friend the Home Member, because the same expression against which he protested when used by me has been used by my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah and Pandit Motilal Nehru who, I am afraid, cannot be accused of ignorance of parliamentary language. I cannot but repeat that in the debate that has taken place in this House today so far as the Treasury Benches are concerned, they have shown colossal ignorance as well as callousness. I tell them that, whatever they might think, say or do, the murder of Lala Lajpat Rai has gone deep into the heart of the nation. So long as these front benchers are here, the Government may be able to hear smooth parliamentary language, but the day is sure to come when they will hear more and more of that unparliamentary language in this House of which the Honourable Member has accused me to-day.

Sir, I have nothing more to add to what I have already said.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: Mr. President, as the hour is late, I do not intend to detain the House with more than a few words. It was inevitable that the Resolution moved by the Honourable Member who has just resumed his seat should rouse a great deal of passion and prejudice, and I fear that, at this stage, no word that I could say will materially affect the passion and prejudice which have been aroused. I only wish to touch on two points and I shall then resume my seat.

The suggestion was made—indeed, something more than a suggestion—that I cast an imputation on the veracity of the late Lala Lajpat Rai, or of the Honourable Raizada Hans Raj. Now, Sir, I had no such intention, nor from any word that I said could such an intention be possibly derived. I merely pointed out that, in a confused and tumultuous situation, impressions may be very honestly derived which nevertheless are not entirely coincident with the actual facts. A further suggestion that was made, which I shall do my best to remove, was that it is part of my case that the police used no force at all. That was never part of my case. It was inevitable, in the circumstances, that some force should have been used, but my case and the case of the Punjab Government—the case which was placed before the inquiring officer—was this, that whether by deliberate attempt on the part of the crowd—and indeed a deliberate attempt was not definitely alleged—or owing to the surging forward of the crowd, the effect was an effect which is very frequently caused not by any deliberate intention by the persons in the front but by the instinctive motion of the large masses of persons behind—the effect was that the barricade was in immediate danger of being forced. (*Honourable Members on the Opposition Benches:* “No, no.”) That at any rate is my convinced impression and the view of the police was that if that took place.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: It did not.

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: a situation—they were omitting the question of the personalities involved—much more serious, from the police point of view, would have inevitably resulted and would have probably rendered it necessary on their part to use a great deal more force

than was actually employed. I myself am convinced that this was the view honestly taken by the police officers concerned—and it was justified by the circumstances. I do not deny nor does anybody deny it. But no force was used which is in excess of the requirements of the situation, and in particular no deliberate force was used on any single individual. That is our case, and I maintain that it has been satisfactorily proved by the facts adduced before the three inquiries which have been made, because I include the debate which took place on the floor of the Legislative Council. I now come to the question of the inquiry. Honourable Members of this House have demanded a further inquiry and I have been told, in the emphatic and impressive phraseology which Mr. Jayakar knows so well how to use, in the incisive and deliberate phraseology which Mr. Jinnah wields with so dexterous an effect, by the Honourable gentleman who leads the opposition and by many others, that if Government refuse this committee of inquiry they will be putting the last nail in the coffin of their credit. I do not know of any occasion when an inquiry has been demanded and when Government have been unable to comply with that request, that that allegation has not been made. But I say that on this occasion the allegation is an unjust one. If an open and public inquiry had not been made, this demand for an inquiry might have arisen. A local and public inquiry has taken place and if those who were concerned to bring home the allegations for which they made themselves responsible, had appeared before that inquiry, and if their evidence had not been treated in a satisfactory manner, if the officer presiding over that inquiry had arrived at unjust findings against the plain weight of the evidence, then again, I say there might have been some reason in this request, but neither of these things is the fact. For these reasons I much regret, notwithstanding the deep and genuine feeling which I am conscious prevails on that side of the House, I find myself unable to comply with that request.

Mr. President: The original Resolution was:—

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey a message from this Assembly to the Secretary of State for India, and through him to His Majesty's Government that this House strongly resents the insulting reply of Earl Winterton, the Under Secretary of State for India, given on 26th November, 1922, to questions from the members of the Labour Party regarding the circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death and that this House believes that the death of Lala Lajpat Rai was accelerated by the injury he received at the hands of the police while leading a boycott procession on the arrival of the Simon Commission at Lahore, and is of opinion that the enquiry conducted by the Boyd Committee was unreal and instituted deliberately to justify and whitewash the crimes committed by the police."

Since which the following amendment has been moved:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a committee consisting of the Honourable the Home Member, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir Purnshottamdas Thakurdas, Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, Maulvi Muhammad Yakub, and Munshi Iswar Saran to enquire into the allegations which have been made regarding the assault on Lala Lajpat Rai, the Leader of the Nationalist Party in the Assembly, and its effect in causing or hastening his death and to issue instructions to the committee to submit its report within one month of its appointment."

The question is that that amendment be made.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—57.

Abdoola Haroon, Haji.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
 Abdullah Haji Kasim, Khan Bahadur
 Haji.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sessa.
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
 Birla, Mr. Ghanshyam Das.
 Chaman Lall, Diwan.
 Chatterjee, the Revd. J. C.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Ismail Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
 Jiunah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogiah, Mr. V. V.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.
 Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.

Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
 Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
 Mitra, Mr. S. C.
 Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Moonje, Dr. B. S.
 Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
 Murtuza, Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayyid.
 Naidu, Mr. B. P.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Rahimtulla, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim.
 Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Roy, Mr. K. C.
 Roy, Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Kumar Rananjaya.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Kumar Gangamand.
 Sinha, Mr. Rajivaranjan Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar Prasad.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—45.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Alexander, Mr. William.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Ashrafuddin Ahmed, Khan Bahadur
 Nawabzada Sayid.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bower, Mr. E. H. M.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
 Coatman, Mr. J.
 Cooke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Orerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
 Dalal, Sardar Sir Romanji.
 French, Mr. J. C.
 Gavin-Jones, Mr. T.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Mr.
 Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hira Singh, Brar, Sardar Bahadur,
 Honorary Captain.
 Jowahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar.

Keane, Mr. M.
 Lall, Mr. S.
 Lamb, Mr. W. S.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Mukharji, Rai Bahadur A. K.
 Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Rao, Mr. V. Panduranga.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sams, Mr. H. A.
 Sassoon, Sir Victor.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
 Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
 Simpson, Sir James.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stevenson, Mr. H. L.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 18th February, 1920.