

11th July 1930

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(Official Report)

Volume IV

(7th July to 18th July, 1930)

SEVENTH SESSION

OF THE

THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1930

Chamber Kamgaod.



**SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1930**

CORRIGENDA.

In the Legislative Assembly Debates, Simla Session, 1930—

- (1) Vol. IV, No. 3, dated the 10th July, 1930—
 - (i) page 69, line 4 from the bottom, *for* "catchwards" *read* "catch-words".
 - (ii) page 72, line 7 from the bottom, *for* "conceiably" *read* "conceivably".
 - (iii) page 91, line 14 from the bottom, *for* "I do not.....Resolutions" *read* "I do not want to read to you all the recent Resolutions".
 - (iv) page 93, line 10, *for* "if your please" *read* "if you please".
- (2) Vol. IV, No. 4, dated the 11th July, 1930, page 129, line 22, *for* "those are in favour" *read* "those who are in favour".
- (3) Vol. IV, No. 6, dated the 14th July, 1930—
 - (i) page 291, line 13, *for* "I am aware" *read* "I am not aware".
 - (ii) page 306, *for* the reply to unstarred question No. 53, *substitute* the following :—
 - " Mr. G. M. Young : (a) Yes.
 - (b) A copy of my letter, dated the 24th March, 1930, to Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is in the Library".
 - (iii) Page 340, line 20, *for* "importance" *read* "importance".
- (4) Vol. IV, No. 7, dated the 15th July, 1930, page 464, from the first subject-heading *delete* the word "Ajmer-Merwara".
- (5) Vol. IV, No. 9, dated the 17th July, 1930, page 610, line 18, *for* "Mr. S. C. Mitra" *read* "Mr. B. N. Mitra".
- (6) Vol. IV, No. 10, dated the 18th July, 1930, page 661, *after* the reply to part (c) of starred question No. 296, *insert* the following reply to part (d) of the same question :—
 - " (d) Certain concessions were given in the 1929 examination which was for departmental candidates only."

Legislative Assembly.

President.

Sir

THE HONOURABLE MAULVI MUHAMMAD YAKUB.

Deputy President.

SIR HARI SINGH GOUR, KT., M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen.

MR. M. A. JINNAH, M.L.A.

MR. M. R. JAYAKAR, M.L.A.

SIR HUGH COCKE, KT., M.L.A.

NAWAB SIR SAHIBZADA ABDUL QAITYUM, K.C.I.E., M.L.

Secretary.

MR. S. C. GUPTA, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary.

RAI SAHIB D. DUTT.

FRIDAY, 11TH JULY, 1930—

Member Sworn	99
Statement of Business	99
The Negotiable Instruments (Second Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	100
Election of the Deputy President	100
Demands for Supplementary Grants	100—149

SATURDAY, 12TH JULY, 1930—

Election of the Deputy President	151
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	151—152
Demands for Supplementary Grants	152—223

MONDAY, 14TH JULY, 1930—

Questions and Answers	225—81
Unstarred Questions and Answers	281—333
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Continuation of Repressive Measures in the North-West Frontier Province—Ruled out of order	333—42
Statement laid on the Table <i>re</i> Hydro-Electric Power supplied for the Great Indian Peninsula Railway	342—43
Preliminary Report upon the Expenditure of the Central Government	343
The Indian Lac Cess Bill—Passed	343—44
The Negotiable Instruments (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed	344—47
The Indian Forest (Amendment) Bill—Passed	347—48
The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill—Passed, as amended	
The Bombay Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill—Passed	349—50
The Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill—Passed	350—60
Resolution <i>re</i> Convention for protection of workers against accidents—Adopted	361—64
Resolution <i>re</i> Convention concerning the marking of weight on heavy packages transported by vessels—Adopted	365
Resolution <i>re</i> Termination of the contract of the Assam Bengal Railway—Discussion adjourned	366—77

TUESDAY, 15TH JULY, 1930—

Questions and Answers	370—427
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	427

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 11th July, 1930.

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

MEMBER SWORN.

Mr. Satish Chandra Sen, M.L.A. (Calcutta : Non-Muhammadan Urban).

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Leader of the House) : With your permission, Mr. President, I wish to make a statement concerning next week's business in this House. On Monday Government propose to put the motions necessary in order to pass the official Bills which have come before the Assembly at one stage or another during the present Session. First of all, there are the Lac Cess Bill and the Bill further to amend the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. Reports of the Select Committees on both the Bills are before the House. The other four Bills are (1) the Bill to amend the Indian Forest Act, 1927, (2) the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, (3) the Bill further to amend the Bombay Civil Courts Act, 1869, and (4) the Bill further to amend the Benares Hindu University Act, 1915.

After the legislative business is finished on Monday, I propose to move two Resolutions, both dealing with draft conventions made by the International Labour Conference at its 12th session held in Geneva in 1929. The first relates to the protection against accidents of workmen employed in loaded or unloaded ships, the second to the marking of the weight of heavy packages transported by vessels.

The House will also be asked to elect two of its Members to be members of the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association. Subject to your approval, Mr. President, I propose that nominations should be made on Monday and the election held, if necessary, on Tuesday.

Finally, with your permission, Sir, I shall move a Resolution regarding the exercise of the option which the Governor General in Council will shortly have of purchasing the Assam Bengal Railway. The option of giving notice of the intention to purchase must be exercised before the 31st December, and it is important that the House should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion.

Tuesday will be devoted to non-official Bills, Wednesday and Thursday to non-official Resolutions. If the Government business is not finished on Monday, Government will ask you to direct that the House should sit on Friday, the 18th.

THE NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL.

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member) : Sir, I beg to lay on the table the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, for a certain purpose.

ELECTION OF THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

Mr. President : More than one Member having been proposed for the office of the Deputy President, the House will now proceed to the election by ballot of a Member to fill that office in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 5 (3) of the Standing Orders of this House. The names of the candidates proposed, together with the names of their proposers and seconders, were read out to the House by me yesterday. Since then Sardar Gulab Singh has intimated to me that he has withdrawn his candidature. There thus remain the following three candidates who have been duly proposed and seconded for election :

1. Sir Hari Singh Gour.
2. Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah.
3. Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.

The rules regulating the manner in which the ballot shall be held have already been circulated to Honourable Members.

Honourable Members will now come up to the table and receive the ballot papers for the first ballot from the Secretary in the order in which I call their names.

(The ballot was then taken.)

Mr. President : I hope that votes have been recorded by all Honourable Members who desired to vote.

(After the votes had been counted.)

Mr. President : The result of the voting is as follows :

Sir Hari Singh Gour	62
Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney	17
Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah	15

As Sir Hari Singh Gour has got more than half the total number of votes, I declare Sir Hari Singh Gour duly elected. The approval of His Excellency the Governor General is necessary by statute for this election and it will be duly sought for.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS—*contd.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

Inadequate and Unsatisfactory Suggestions and Recommendations of the Indian Statutory Commission.

Mr. President : The House will now resume discussion on the supplementary grant which was moved by the Honourable Sir George Schuster yesterday and on the cut moved by Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz. Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan was speaking last and I will now call upon him to resume his speech. But before I do so, I would like to

inform Honourable Members that there is a desire on the part of a very large number of Members to speak on this question. Considering that there are so many new Members in the House, who will have only this opportunity of addressing the House, I am very anxious to give an opportunity to as many Members as possible. This can only be done if Honourable Members would try to restrain themselves in making speeches. Although there is no time limit, and I do not want to gag Honourable Members, still I hope that Honourable Members will try to be as brief as possible, in order that a larger number of Members may have an opportunity of speaking on this subject. Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (United Provinces : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I was talking about the problem of minorities yesterday when the House adjourned for the day. Once it has been found by the Simon Commission that the problem of India is the problem of the minorities, and that it should be solved as amicably as possible, I submit that there cannot be proper progress, proper constitutional progress in India as long as the problem of the minorities is not solved. Now, Sir, as regards the system which has been proposed by the Simon Commission for representation in the Federal Legislature, that is, the indirect method, although I am in favour of the indirect method, the method which has been recommended is not acceptable to any one. They limit the franchise to only a few people, and when they wanted that the indirect method should be applied for the election of Members to the Federal Assembly by Provincial Legislative Councils, they had a difficulty before them. That difficulty was that in certain Councils certain communities had a very limited number of their representatives, and it would not have been advisable to suggest that ten persons should elect two representatives of their own community for the Federal Assembly. They laboured under that difficulty and they proposed that the entire Council should send representatives to the Federal Assembly. At the same time they should have realised that it would be impossible and impracticable for the entire Council to vote and send people who might be considered true representatives of the communities coming up in the Provincial Councils through the separate electorates. They realised that Members of particular communities should vote for their own representatives. But they could not suggest it because they knew there would be few voters of each community in the Councils of the provinces and they did not want to limit the franchise in such a way that it would make their suggestion ridiculous if they had proposed it. In trying to avoid the impression in the eyes of the public that their suggestion was ridiculous, they have proposed a scheme which cannot be acceptable to any one. If an indirect method had to be sought, they could have given wider representation even there. Why should not the members of the Municipal Boards and District Boards, who come up from different constituencies, be included in the list of voters in the scheme of indirect election ? They play the part of representatives of certain constituencies in a limited sphere. Why should they not be allowed to come up and have a choice in the selection of the Member who comes to the Federal Assembly ? There may be others under this method, like the members of the Courts of the University. There may be a wider franchise for this than that for the Provincial Councils. They knew that the proposal which they were putting forward must be disguised in such a way that it might look to

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

be a practical proposition. It is a practical proposition only in theory, but in practice it is not a practical proposition at all. As far as I have gathered the views of a majority of the people in India, their views are opposed to this system and they will never accept the recommendation which has been put forward for the election of the Federal Assembly, as has been suggested by the Simon Commission. There may be a direct or indirect method. I would much like the indirect method but not in the way suggested by the Commission. Undoubtedly everybody wants that the qualifications of the people, who want to seek election to the Assembly, must be higher than what are generally accepted as sufficient for the Provincial Council, but we cannot discuss that question now because it will be framed in the rules that will be made under the constitution.

The second point is about the Council of State. Here I think they were in a difficulty to make any suggestion at all. They did not know what to say. They wanted to say something. They wanted to say something different from the present constitution. While labouring under that idea, they put up a suggestion which is novel and which I think is absolutely unacceptable to anybody. In a bicameral system, if there is an election by indirect method to one House, certainly there ought to be representation by direct election in the other House. They ought to have proposed for the Assembly a direct election and for the Council of State an indirect election. But while they have suggested that there should be an indirect election to the Federal Assembly, they thought, as the Council of State is going to be a revising chamber, that they could not possibly suggest a direct election there and they had no idea at all as to what to suggest. They found no fault whatever with the present system of election and the constituencies of the Council of State, and unless they have shown any good ground for changing the present system, the change they have suggested cannot be accepted. I think the present constitution of and the method of election for the Council of State is quite satisfactory and that must continue if the Council of State exists at all. Taking away the right of vote from the people to elect to the Council of State cannot be accepted by any one, and I think this suggestion about the Council of State should be absolutely done away with and the Council of State should remain as it is.

About the reserved powers of the Governors. That is a debatable question. My friend Mr. Shah Nawaz does not agree with that. He only agrees with a limited portion of that. I find that the United Provinces Provincial Committee have recommended that the Governor should have considerable reserve power. That is reported in the Simon Commission's Report and they laid great stress upon this. This was an unanimous suggestion of the United Provinces Provincial Committee and I wholeheartedly agree that the Governor should have considerable reserve powers in the provinces, because India at present is changing from a bureaucratic system into a democracy. Formerly we were accustomed to autocracy. Now, we have bureaucracy, and in future we will have democracy. Until all the communities are accustomed to the democratic ideas, we will require, during the transition period, that the Governor should have extensive reserve powers which will mean the protection of those interests which cannot be protected in the provinces in any other way, and unless the Governor has got considerable power, there will be many communities

which will not get the proper protection which they can get if the Governor enjoys those powers, and I think most of the people in my province whole-heartedly support the idea of giving those powers which have been suggested by the Simon Commission.

There is another point about the Army. I think no Indian in the House can agree to the suggestion which has been put forward about the Army. In 1923 I moved a definite Resolution in the Assembly about the Indianisation of the Indian army and my suggestion seven years ago was that the Indian regiments should be officered by the Indians in future, and the system which I proposed at that time was to fill up all new places of officers as they fell vacant by the appointment of Indian officers and that Indians should be given the King's Commission in such number as might be required by the vacancies that occurred. If that principle had been accepted seven years ago, we would have made considerable progress in 1930, but unfortunately, as the Assembly was about to pass my Resolution by a large majority, the announcement came from His Excellency the late Lord Rawlinson that eight units were going to be Indianised at once. That took away my votes, but I thought, even at that time, the best solution was not the one which had been suggested, and that it would not be accepted by Indians in future at all. That system of separating the eight units was not really the proper solution for the problem which we have to face. There ought to have been no separation of any units, but there ought to have been new ranks filled up by Indian officers, who would have worked under European officers and inherited the traditions of those officers, which they have kept in their regiments, and they, after having enjoyed the confidence of the men and the officers, would have been useful officers and would have kept up the same traditions which had been kept up by European officers in Indian regiments. But that system was not accepted at that time, and I think it is time now that an effort be made in this direction. That would eliminate greatly the feeling existing at present in India. While I still think that the retention of British regiments in India is absolutely necessary for keeping the peace in India, unless and until the different communities living in India find their own solution and give up their communal riots and communal disturbances and have got confidence in one another and learn to live peacefully, as they used to do in the past, unless and until that time comes, the retention of British regiments is absolutely necessary. But there is no reason whatsoever why the Indian regiments should not be officered by Indians. There have been in the past many officers who have taken a glorious part in the conquests on many fields in many countries, and their children are living today who have inherited the same feeling, and such people can be greatly useful as officers even today. The military classes in India and the sons of properly educated Indians of the martial classes are second to none and can lead their men in the same efficacious manner as any European can do, and this has been proved on the battlefields of France, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Palestine and other places,—that Indian officers worked in the same way as European officers on those fields and have proved their worth, and I do not see any reason why they should be denied altogether the right of officering their own regiments. Every Indian regiment, whether it is infantry, cavalry, or artillery, should be officered by Indians. I think, in all units, and in the Air Force also there should be Indian officers; there should be a policy adopted that in the shortest period they must be all Indianised; and if an effort is made in that direction

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

and it is shown to India that such an effort is seriously being made, that will bring peace and quiet, and that will show that the British Government are not simply trying to postpone the day on which it could be really said that Indians had got the confidence of the British Government. At present there is a feeling in the minds of many Indians, and especially amongst the martial classes, that they are not properly treated, that they do not enjoy the same confidence as is reposed by the British Government in the British officers. Once the principle I have advocated is adopted, that will eliminate many controversial questions and India will progress, and those Indian people, who are agitating today, probably will find that they have no cause which can be supported by anyone if this principle is conceded by the British Government. I think the policy about the Army should be changed at once and there should be a principle laid down in the constitution that, in the nearest future and shortest period, all Indian regiments should be Indianised absolutely and should be officered by Indians alone.

Now I shall come to the last point about the Round Table Conference. We have had people coming up here who have sat for a long time and met at different places under the name of the Patro Committee. That was a kind of Round Table Conference of all political parties. (Hear, hear.) You may say they were not representative, that they were not elected by their people; but of course some people who thought they were the representatives of their community met, and they thought that they might go on and talk and find out a certain solution between themselves. Well, these self-styled representatives of India met in different places and came to no conclusion at all. Every community was putting up its own demands, and the other community was reluctant to concede the demands of the other community. They wanted to see things from their own angle of vision and they did not like to see them from the angle of vision of the other community; and if the Round Table Conference is going to be composed of such people, who cannot come to any conclusion, I think it would be the laughing-stock of everybody, and if Indian leaders of the Patro Committee are being laughed at today in India, then the whole of Europe and the whole world will laugh at the whole of India tomorrow when these representatives at the Conference will come to no conclusion and no solution. Then they will not have the audacity to claim to have put forward any constructive proposals; they will be weak and led by the people instead of their leading the people. We want such people to go to the Round Table Conference who can lead the people and who will not be led by the sentiments of the masses, who can come to a certain agreement between themselves. We want such people to go to the Round Table Conference as will be ready to see the other peoples' point of view, as will be ready to grasp the true situation in India, and as will not be trying simply to get the upperhand for their own community.

An Honourable Member : How to discover that ?

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : That will have to be seen. If the leaders on the other hand behave like advocates of their own communities only and talk on behalf of their own communities only, then they will be unable to come to any conclusion whatsoever. (Hear, hear.) That is the point. As I have said, the problem of India is the problem of the minorities. (Hear, hear.) When people can appreciate the rights and privileges of the minorities, as asked for by them, when they can see that these

rights and privileges are not jeopardised, then and then alone can there be a proper solution of this problem ; otherwise you will make yourself a laughing-stock before the whole country, and whatever prestige India has got today will vanish in the eyes of the nations of the world when they come to know that these so-called representatives of India cannot come to any agreement whatsoever. Each man will be fighting.....

Mr. President : I hope the Honourable Member will avoid repetition.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : Now, Sir, the conclusion I come to, and which I ask the House to consider, is that all persons who seek to represent India at the Round Table Conference should meet in India before proceeding to England, and only if they can come to conclusions here in India, should they seek to proceed to England. If they do not come to any conclusion here, then it is useless for them, unless of course they are desirous of making a trip there and of having enjoyment at the public expense. (Hear, hear.) That is the point. I know there are many people who would be very anxious to go there. The Central Committee had been denounced by many people even here in this House. How then can those very people who denounced the Central Committee on the score that they did not represent them, now seek to go to the Round Table Conference and say that they are the representatives of India at all ?

An Honourable Member : They are not going.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : How can anybody who did not take part in the selection of the personnel of the Central Committee have the decency of accepting, even now, an offer of invitation to the Round Table Conference ? But if he even chooses to go there, then I will sug-

12 Noon. "

gest to him that he should, by his action and not by word, prove that he is a sincere well wisher of India and is not a man who tries by crookedness to get power for his own community at the expense of others.....

Mr. President : Probably the Honourable Member is now going into very minute details.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : I bow to the ruling of the Chair that I am now going into the details, but I shall try to avoid them.

Now, Sir, my point is that, as I have laid stress on the question of the zemindars, I will suggest to the Government that nothing can be acceptable to the zemindars unless and until, in the Round Table Conference, there is a proportion of the zemindars to the extent to which they wield influence. These zemindars are the only responsible people who can come to any agreement, and among them there is the least communal feeling at the present moment. They can certainly come to an agreement very easily, as compared to the other classes. Sir, seven-eighths of the population of India depend entirely on agriculture and therefore, in the Round Table Conference, the proportion of the people who will represent agricultural interests must also be the same. Of course, Government should see that such people are the natural leaders of the people. If this is not done, then there is a danger that the Round Table Conference may be denounced as an unrepresentative body and therefore their decision and agreement cannot be binding upon that community. With these words, I support the cut which has been moved by my friend Mr. Shah Nawaz.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan (North Punjab : Muhammadan) : Sir, while I fully appreciate and acknowledge the arguments advanced by the Leader of my Party and some other leading Members on this side that it was not appropriate to raise this discussion on the Simon Commission's Report in connection with the Demand for Grant for the Round Table Conference, looking at it from another point of view, I think my friend Mr. Shah Nawaz has done some service by providing this opportunity. The only conclusion we can draw from the result of the voting on this amendment, which I am sure will be unanimously carried, is that the amount of disappointment and resentment caused by the publication of the Simon Commission's Report is so wide that a mere apprehension in the minds of certain Members that this document may possibly form part of the material to be placed before the Round Table Conference, they have decided to repudiate it unanimously. I say this motion will be carried unanimously because the wording of the amendment is so modest that I do not think there is any Member in this House who would like to commit himself to the converse of what is contained in the amendment. Even the Treasury Benches, I am sure, would not oppose this amendment and thus indirectly commit themselves to the principle that they regard the recommendations contained in the Simon Commission's Report as adequate and satisfactory, and thus practically contradict what is contained in His Excellency's speech.

Now, Sir, I will try to act according to the advice given by you, namely, that we should confine our remarks to the principles of the Simon Commission's Report. Sir, the first thing which, with your permission, I want to point out is that every section of the House has been working for one object with regard to the future constitution, and it is that the constitution should be based on such lines that it should automatically lead them to full responsible government within a reasonable period, subject to certain conditions, and that it should not be necessary, at the end of a short time, to appoint other Commissions and hold more inquiries and get more statutes passed by Parliament. Now, in this connection, if we turn to page 7 of the Simon Commission's Report, we find that, while criticising the 10 years' limit, they themselves say that the constitution which they are giving us is of such a nature that the object now to be aimed at is a reformed constitution which will not necessarily require revision at stipulated intervals but which will provide opportunities for natural development. Now, I have very carefully gone through the various proposals contained in that Report and I have not been able to understand by what means India, through the constitution recommended by the Simon Commission, can achieve that end within any humanly foreseeable period. It is very difficult to reconcile this statement of the Simon Commission with another paragraph which occurs in the same Report on the next page, wherein they say :

"We do not think that within the compass of a single statute, provision can be made for a continuous evolution of the main government of India by the method of internal adjustment and growth."

So, they themselves acknowledge that they have failed to give a constitution which would automatically lead us to the achievement of responsible government within a definite period.

Now, Sir, my second objection to the Report is with regard to the provincial autonomy which they claim to have bestowed upon the various provinces. Now, what does that autonomy come to if we examine it rather closely ? If we consider the innumerable restrictions placed on the powers of the Legislature and the overriding powers vested in the Governor, we come to the conclusion that this provincial autonomy does not lead us anywhere. Our experience shows that, in the modern democratic constitutions, where the elected Presidents have been vested with enlarged powers, it has been found that this procedure, instead of stabilizing the democratic form of government, has substituted a dictatorship. What would be the result if such enlarged and enhanced powers are vested in a Governor ? Secondly, let us look at the constitution of the Cabinet. The Governor may call upon certain officials to become members of the Cabinet. He may call upon certain other Members from whatever group he likes to come and assume the responsibility of Ministers. Now, it is an admitted fact that, if the Government or the Cabinet is so constituted that the coalition consists of various hostile groups, then it is impossible to expect that they will be able to adopt any creative policy. As long as such conditions remain in any constitution, it will be found absolutely unworkable. Now, again, while they have agreed to transfer the portfolio of Law and Order to the popular control, while discussing the military policy, they say that the troops will be put under the charge of the Imperial Government and the Member in charge of Law and Order, if he wants the assistance of the military to quell any internal disturbances, shall have no right to call for the troops but shall have to apply to the Governor. The Governor will then hold an inquiry, and if he is satisfied that it is necessary to send military aid, he may recommend to the Imperial Government to lend the troops. If that is the limit of power which is intended to be given to the Minister for Law and Order, who will be responsible to the legislature, it will be impossible to expect that he will be able to run the Government efficiently.

Now, Sir, there is only one other point about the Simon Commission's Report and I will finish with that, and that is with regard to the Central Government. The Commissioners themselves say that they do not want to give any enhanced powers to the Central Government. The chief argument, which they have given for taking away the military entirely from the control of the Governor General, is based on the fact that they do not want to introduce diarchy in the Central Government, because a thing which they have found to be unsuitable for the Provinces they cannot now very well recommend for the Central Legislature. I could have seen the force of this argument if all the other Departments under the Central Government were transferred to the control of Ministers responsible to the Legislature, but if there is not a single Department or portfolio which is going to be transferred to any Minister responsible to the Legislature, then how does this argument come in ? Therefore, we are unable to find what exactly is the policy behind this suggestion of taking away the Army from the control of the Governor General in Council.

Then, Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Yamin Khān, in the first volume of his speech (Laughter.) yesterday, said that there were certain proposals contained in the Simon Commission's Report which may be acceptable to few of us on this side. As typical instances, he mentioned the federal system and the separate electorates. As far as the federal

[Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan.]

system of Government is concerned, if we see the Report of the Commission, we find that one of the main reasons why they have recommended a federal system is contained in page 15 of the second volume of the Report, wherein they say, "There is the wish of certain minority communities to take full advantage of their local majorities where these exist".

An Honourable Member : In which volume ?

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan : This is not in the first volume, which contains only maps and figures. It is in the second volume. Now, Sir, on the other hand we find that there is not a single province in India which, according to the recommendation of the Simon Commission, will give a majority to a minority community. Our chief object in asking for a federal form of government was really this, that the minority communities, at least in those few provinces where they are in a majority, should have the privilege of commanding a majority, while the Simon Commission's Report does not give a majority to any minority community in any province. Is this the federal system of government which my Honourable friend desired ? Or is this the form of government which any of us desired ?

Then, Sir, turning to the question of separate electorates, everybody will agree that a separate electorate is after all a means to an end. It is not an end in itself. (Hear, hear.) Are we prepared to accept separate electorates on the condition that we reduce ourselves to a minority in the provinces, where we are in a majority ? And that is what the Simon Commission gives us. In the Punjab, in Bengal, where we are in a majority, according to the recommendations of the Simon Commission's Report, we are reduced to a minority. Now, what consolation can separate electorates give us if these recommendations are given effect to and we find ourselves helpless in every province. The only province where, in spite of the Simon Commission's Report, or in spite of anybody, we could be in a majority is the North West Frontier Province, and what form of government have they recommended for the Frontier Province ? Is that the form of government which was desired by my Honourable friends, or is that the form of government which anybody belonging to any political thought in India desired ? If not, then, what is there in the Simon Commission's Report which can be acceptable to any Member on this side of the House ?

Now, Sir, leaving the question of the Simon Commission's Report at that, I would just make a few observations with regard to the Round Table Conference. Sir, it is impossible to discuss this question without taking notice of what has happened in India during the last three months. It is really very regrettable and unfortunate that some of our countrymen, the Congress Party, should have decided not to participate in the deliberations of this Conference. Although I am of opinion that, even if the Congress is left out, the other delegates who will be going to the Round Table Conference do represent a fairly large section of public opinion, particularly that section who have got large stakes and interests in the country, although this class may not be as vocal as the other parties. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that, without the Congress participating in the Round Table Conference, the Conference would not be as much representative as it would be otherwise. Therefore naturally it should be the desire of every Indian to pray and strive.....

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural) : Has the Congress not a stake in the country ?

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan : This was not the question I was discussing. What I was saying was that naturally any Conference which also contained the representatives of the Congress would be more representative than it would be otherwise. (Hear, hear.) Therefore naturally it should be the desire of every one in this House to strive in his own humble way to persuade our friends to give up the course which they have adopted and to take part in this Conference.

Now, Sir, I think there can be no two opinions that the object is common, the object of the Round Table Conference and the object of the Congress activities are the same. Both are intending to get a scheme for India which would make India an equal partner in the British Commonwealth. If that is the object before us, is it not possible still to co-operate and to give up the method which they have so far adopted, when we all agree that that method is not going to lead us to any constructive results ?

An Honourable Member : Question.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan : The Honourable Member may question it, but I am strongly of opinion that those of us, who are aspiring to take charge of this machinery of Government, which we now find in the hands of others, would naturally desire that we should take charge of this machinery while it is in running order and while it is in working condition, and not when it has been absolutely ruined and wrecked by our own hands. I can assure you that, once the passions and the feelings of the masses have been roused, and the respect which they entertain for law is gone, whoever may be the party in power, they will find it very difficult to restore that feeling. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, Sir, all who have got the betterment and welfare of the country at heart will not shirk from taking courage and putting their case before the Round Table Conference in as reasonable a way as they can possibly do. On the other hand, I am absolutely certain that a sympathetic friend of India like His Excellency Lord Irwin would not hesitate to withdraw all the repressive measures which, I am sure, he had promulgated against his will, because as long as Government is to remain in the country, they have got to carry on, whatever the legal means they may have to adopt. I am also certain that, as far as the question of releasing the prisoners is concerned, the Government would only be too glad to create a feeling of friendship in the country which is so essential for the successful termination of the Round Table Conference.

Then, Sir, another question which is of very grave importance is the united front which Indians must offer in the Round Table Conference if they really desire to achieve some results, and the only hope of achieving that end lies with the leaders who will go there, if only they would show courage to speak out their honest opinions without caring what one or the other party might say. And after they have agreed to some conclusions, they should have the courage to fight for the adoption of those by their parties.

The two obstacles upon which too much emphasis has been laid by the Simon Commission, as well as by other persons, who are not very anxious to give India her rights, are the minority question and the question of the

[Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan.]

Indian States. About the minorities I can assure you, Sir, and I can assure my friends that I am voicing the sentiments of all my friends, when I say that the Muhammadans are more anxious than any other community to get their full share in the responsible government of India and to see that Dominion Status is given with necessary safeguards at an early date. Though they might be in a minority in certain provinces they would not stand in the way of the other communities enjoying their majority provided the other communities are broad-minded enough to see that when they may happen to be in a majority they should not stand in their way. As regards Indian States, the leading Princes have already expressed their views through the Princes Chamber that they are agreeable to British India getting Dominion Status. I am sure, now that the time has come to give practical proof of their sympathy with the welfare of their country, they will co-operate actively with the British Indian leaders and will certainly not hesitate to agree to a settlement which will lead to the betterment of the Motherland and will not be influenced by the small considerations of individuals.

Mr. B. S. Sarma (Bengal : Nominated Non-Official) : Mr. President, I strongly oppose the motion for the cut of my Honourable friend Mr. Shah Nawaz, because to my mind there is no sense in that motion. I know, Sir, that the remarks I make will not be acceptable to a section of the House. I think that already much time has been wasted on this debate, and I hope no more time will be wasted by unnecessary interruptions. I must confess—and I hope I will not be misunderstood by those who have already taken part in the debate—that during the last 12 months that I have been a Member of this House I have never listened to a more purposeless, meaningless, futile, and therefore in its total effect most mischievous, debate than what I have listened to in the last 24 hours. The debate is bound to create a most disastrous effect outside the country. I cannot persuade myself to appreciate what this particular cut has got to do with the Round Table Conference. I could understand a cut of Rs. 100 if the personnel of the Round Table Conference had been announced and considered unsatisfactory by this House.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Are you sure of your nomination ?

Mr. B. S. Sarma : No, Sir. I am not going there. You may take it from me that I am a very humble individual and I do not aspire to that honour.

If the personnel of the Round Table Conference had been announced and considered unsatisfactory by this House, there might have been some justification for a cut of this nature ; or there might have been a motion that so much money should not be spent upon this delegation, or that the democratic representatives, who are going from a poor country like India to settle the future constitution of this country, should not have the luxury of a P. and O. First Class, but should go as deck passengers ! That attitude I could really appreciate, but I certainly cannot understand what the Simon Report has got to do with the Round Table Conference at all. We do not want to give any importance to the Simon Report, but as Miss Mayo's book was advertised, so it is the people who do not want the Simon

Report who have been giving importance to that Report. In this connection, I must say that I was amazed yesterday that so shrewd and eminent an advocate as Mr. Jinnah should have drawn conclusions from his own arguments which did not lead to those conclusions. He was developing a line of argument yesterday to which I listened with great respect, and I thought that the conclusion of his arguments would be that, for the particular reasons that he advanced, he was going to oppose the cut and support the original motion. He himself said that he did not care at all for the Simon Report. He said that he would discuss the implications of that Report at the proper time and analyse it at the Round Table Conference. He said that the Viceroy himself had declared that the Simon Report would probably be one of the Reports that would be considered at the Round Table Conference. If the Simon Report is one of the Reports that will be before the Round Table Conference, I think it is possible and probable that the Nehru Report itself will be one of the Reports, and Sir Muhammad Shafi's memorandum will be one of the Reports that will be considered at the Round Table Conference; and with equal justification and equal relevancy, any Member can bring a cut of Rs. 100 for the purpose of discussing the recommendations of the Nehru Report. I think it will be ridiculous at this stage to carry on a discussion on either the Shafi memorandum or the Nehru Report.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City : Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, may I explain my position to the Honourable Member? I think he has misunderstood me. I said that the motion for this cut was entirely out of order in my humble opinion; but since it was before the House I must, if I was forced to vote, vote in favour of this cut because I was already of opinion that the Simon Report was not acceptable to India.

Mr. R. S. Sarma : The statement of Mr. Jinnah has added to my amazement, because of the very fact that the Simon Report has nothing whatever to do with the Round Table Conference. If, as he himself suggested yesterday in the course of his speech, there had been a clear-cut Resolution to discuss the recommendations of the Simon Report, I could understand the attitude he has taken. But to my mind it has nothing to do at all with the Conference, and as such I expected from his line of argument that he would draw the conclusion that we must support the original motion and not the cut.

Sir, I myself said that more time should not be wasted on this debate, and therefore I will take only a minute more to refer to a statement made by my new nominated colleague Mr. Sen. In the very admirable maiden effort that he made yesterday, he showed that he has inherited from his great leader and chief, whom he has replaced in this House, Mr. K. C. Roy, the qualities of prudence, wisdom, tact and worldly-mindedness in such a measure as to keep the Treasury Benches as well as the Congressmen in good humour! After paying a well-merited tribute to the Viceroy and the Civil Service, he made a passionate appeal to the Treasury Benches yesterday to pursue a policy of conciliation.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Why not?

Mr. R. S. Sarma : Is there any need to offer any advice to the Government of Lord Irwin after the clear statement and announcement of policy that His Excellency made in this House day before yesterday? Behind the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy there is a boundless love of India; there is a grim determination to advance India along the line of

[Mr. R. S. Sarma.]

self-government ; there is a passionate plea for conciliation and goodwill, and I think it is unnecessary to offer this advice. On the other hand I honestly feel that, after the most conciliatory policy enunciated by His Excellency the Viceroy the day before yesterday, it is the clear duty of Members of this House, who call themselves public men, to go into the country and tell our countrymen not to pursue the mad folly of civil disobedience, and as my Honourable friend, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar said yesterday, to go to the London Conference and try to get what they want by argument, which they are now trying to get by other means.

In conclusion, Sir, I would say this to those Benches. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, said to these Benches yesterday as a warning, " Play fair ". I will say the same to the leaders opposite, " Play the game and leave the rest in the hands of Lord Irwin, who by the common consent of friends and foes alike is considered today as God's greatest gift to this country at this critical juncture ".

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Sir, the Honourable the Nominated Member has spoken.....

Mr. R. S. Sarma : On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is repeating a joke that has been repeated half a dozen times and I want to know whether this repetition is in order.

Mr. President : Repetition of jokes is not out of order. (Laughter.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Truth, says Professor Max Muller, must be repeated, though this is the first time that I use the expression with regard to the Honourable Member for the Imperial Secretariat. (Laughter.) I thought he was an Honourable Member for somewhere else.

It is very impertinent, Sir, for an Honourable Member who has no constituency to face to come and tell us what we should do and what we should not do. It is very impertinent, Sir, for the gentleman to characterise this debate as " mischievous ". It is, in the first place, an impertinent attack on those who are responsible for initiating this debate, that is, the gentlemen to whom he owes his nomination to this House. (Laughter.) We did not ask for this debate. If it is " mischievous ", the mischief lies entirely on the shoulders of those who brought him into this House ; and if he presumes that our contribution of a little wisdom to this debate is " mischievous ", I think he is talking through his hat ; he has no business to say that about this debate, which is one of the most important debates held in this year, including the discussions of the Delhi Session—it is an important debate, a Report of which I hope will be duly submitted by the Government of Lord Irwin to His Majesty's Government ; it is a debate by way of which the Government have come to us and asked us to vote for the expenses of the representatives of this country going to the Round Table Conference ; and here is a gentleman who advises the Government that His Majesty's nominees, representing the Indian nation, should travel by I do not know what class he has in mind—that perhaps they should not have the luxury of a P. & O. first class. (A voice : " He said they might go as deck passengers ".) Sir, I know of one man in India, about whom even Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan will not dispute as having a stake in the country—I know of one man who never indulged in the luxury of a P. & O. first class, and that gentleman today is one of His Majesty's guests in the Yerrawada prison—the greatest man

in the world today—but who has travelled as a deck passenger ; and when an invitation is issued to him, as it must be in the fulness of time if the Indian dispute is to be ended, then I believe he may reject the Government's offer of a P. & O. first class. But, Sir, it is very remarkable that a gentleman with the views and practices to which the Honourable Member, let us presume, is addicted, namely, luxurious habits—and I do not consider them to be very bad habits.....

Mr. B. S. Sharma : On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I never suggested that such facilities should not be given. I merely said that the cut could be discussed on the ground that so much money cannot be spent. I cannot understand the Honourable Member's reference.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I am not concerned with what he can understand or what he cannot understand, but I say that the Government are acting according to their own wisdom in the matter. The leaders of the Irish movement were brought to England in His Majesty's saloons—Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith. I am not in the confidence of the Government, but I believe that they propose to extend the luxury of a first class P. & O. though Honourable Members like my Honourable friend, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar who, by the way, has very little time to spare, might like to travel by air. Sir, we are not today discussing the point about luxuries and about what are luxuries and what are not luxuries.

The Honourable Member then referred to the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party. I am sure he did not listen to the speech of the Honourable Mr. Jinnah. We on this side of the House are perfectly in agreement with him. What he said was—and it is necessary to repeat what he said in order to show what the position exactly is—what he said was.....

Mr. President : Order, order. Today being *Juma*, I would like to adjourn the House after ten minutes ; and so I would request the Honourable Member to conclude his speech within ten minutes.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I shall try my best, Sir, to conclude in ten minutes, but the act of speaking sets the mind thinking (Laughter.) and as I want to dispose of the arguments already mentioned before developing my own point of view, I am afraid I may take another additional twenty-five minutes ; but, Sir, if I had this intimation before, I might have ignored the previous Member altogether. (Laughter.) Sir, it is a very essential point that the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party has placed before this House. We did not want a debate on the Simon Report. Perhaps some of us had not read it, though we might not think it “very criminal”—as an acting Congress President, since incarcerated, put it—to read the Simon Report. We might like to read it with a view to combat the tactics of our enemies ; and undoubtedly Sir John Simon is one of them, for he has contributed his best to destroy the effect of the Irwin Proclamation ; he has not only omitted it from the papers published with his Report, but avoided the use of the expression *Dominion Status* in that Report. I emphasise the word “Status” ; for I was present at the debate, even as Sir John Simon was present, in the House of Lords. Both of us were witnesses of that debate, although both of us were not Members of that House. (Laughter.) He was in his place as a Member of the House of Commons and I was in my place as a member of the Empire Parliamentary Association ; and, Sir, the word that was emphasised in the debate by Lord Birkenhead and other

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

speakers, including an *ex*-Lord Chief Justice and *ex*-Viceroy, who at least ought to have known better, the word that was emphasised was "status"; and if you read the Report of the House of Lords on that debate, you will find the word "status" italicised in that Report. As Honourable Members are aware these italics are put not so much by the Reporter, as by the gentleman who revises the report. There is a great deal of difference between Dominion *Status* and Dominion *form* of Government. Lawyers know what fundamental difference there is between those two words. However, Sir, Sir John Simon has avoided the former expression and what India demands is Dominion *Status*; and if Dominion *Status* is not granted you know what India—or that part of India which is absurdly supposed not to have a stake in the country—is going to do; and it may not be very long before the other part prepares itself to march alongside that part of India which is fighting for India's rights. (Hear, hear.) Today we are taking our stand on Dominion *Status*; the Viceroy has promised it; His Majesty's Government have promised it; Lord Birkenhead an *ex*-Secretary of State for India, one of His Majesty's Ministers, has repudiated it in language the severity of which is worthy of a better cause. Lord Reading has repudiated it in a manner which is unworthy of the position he occupied in this country; and, Sir, I have only to add that the Simon Report, instead of following the evidence that it had in this country, has trampled under foot the Viceregal proclamation (*Cries of "Shame"*); and surely if the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party wanted that we should not be asked to give a vote on a side issue, it will not be characterised by a sensible Member, even though nominated, as "mischievous".

Sir, he was trying to teach lessons to another member of his own community, the community of nominated. I honour the maiden speech of Mr. Sen. It is usual in Parliament for maiden speeches to be treated with respect, but perhaps the Honourable the Nominated Member from the neighbourhood of Calcutta—(An Honourable Member: "Not Calcutta.") (Another Honourable Member: "Bihar and Orissa.") (A third Honourable Member: "Don't slander Bihar and Orissa please.")—there seems to be a controversy about the origin. (Laughter.) of the Honourable the Nominated Member's constituency,—but be that as it may, the Honourable the Nominated Member, thinking in terms of his tribe unknown to other Parliaments, thought that the other gentleman had no business to tell even Lord Irwin that he should adopt "a policy of conciliation". Lord Irwin's policy, Sir, at present is not wholly a policy of conciliation. I do not blame Lord Irwin for it. The blame must be taken by us as much as by Government, but to say that you must adopt a policy of conciliation when we are faced with the situation that we find in this country, and for a Nominated Member to say that, shows that all Nominated Members are not tarred with the same brush. Sir, I take off my hat to Mr. Sen for having expressed sentiments which should have come from this side of the House.

Then came the climax of impertinence on the part of the Honourable the Nominated Member when he advised us "to play the game". What does he understand by that expression? Does he mean to say that we are not playing the game? I say, even those who are not in this House are playing the game; I say the Congress people are playing the game;

but Lord Birkenhead and a majority of the Members of the House of Commons I do not believe have played the game with us. I do not think they have played the game with Lord Irwin. (Hear, hear.) I was witness to that debate ; I do not think they have played the game with " the man on the spot ", the great Viceroy, who thought, and rightly thought, that he had a great mission, though the pinchbeck Empire builders, indulging in the luxury of irresponsibility that freedom from office gives them, spoke against His Excellency like irresponsible journalists. They uttered the language of the *Daily Mail* ; they became the megaphones of misguided Imperialism. They have contributed everything to make the movement, which, all of us deeply regret, has been prematurely set on foot, but a movement of that kind once set on foot cannot stop unless a policy of conciliation is resorted to.

And this leads me, Sir, to the Round Table Conference conclusions, for the Round Table Conference will have to conclude its meeting ; whosoever goes and whosoever does not go will have to meet each other and face their own country. Today Lord Irwin's policy and the policy of His Majesty's Government have transferred the responsibility of settling the Indian problem on to the shoulders of Great Britain. If Britain is prepared to play the game, we shall of course shake hands with Britain. If our friends come from the Round Table Conference cheated and disillusioned, then they will know how to deal with Britain. Other parts of the Dominions dealt with Britain likewise. General Botha, once a powerful enemy of England, became its friend. There is no greater admirer of Imperialism today than General Smuts, who was once its inveterate opponent. A policy of conciliation, Sir, was adopted in regard to South Africa. Even so, a policy of conciliation was adopted in regard to Ireland. There was a form of violence, a form of force, not the same force, not of the same noble form that you find in this country, resorted to there, but in spite of that, what happened ? A policy of conciliation was adopted. Human nature is everywhere the same, if it is not always the same in respect of Nominated Members of a certain variety. (Laughter.)

Mr. President : Order, order. The House stands adjourned till Half Past Two.

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

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

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Now, Sir, during the course of this debate let me address myself to the main arguments of the case. But before doing so, I speak, I believe, on behalf of the entire non-official side of this House, be they European or Indian, when I say that we were delighted,—it was with feelings of genuine pleasure—that we read this morning the King's message to India. Sir, the King's message has a vital bearing on the Round Table Conference. His Majesty's message, I suppose, is meant as a healing balm to the bleeding wounds that have been inflicted, that are being inflicted on this country, and His Majesty, we are pleased to find, is not embarrassed by the existence of the minorities in this country on which the Simon Commission have made such an excessive statement.

Sir, the King says, " The emblems of the religions, provinces and States of India " testify to " the unity of India itself ". Sir, I believe

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

I can say, without fear of much contradiction, that India is still loyal to the King, and the symbol and proof of that loyalty was the statement of Mahatma Gandhi himself to a representative of a Government newspaper in England, who had the unique privilege of interviewing him in prison in spite of the jail gates and the jail regulations. In that statement—I look upon it almost as an apology for the Independence movement when he interpreted Independence in terms of Dominion Status and when he said that, Dominion Status not having the same meaning in this country that it has in England, he had been forced to launch the Independence movement,—the Mahatma summed up the demand of the people in his own inimitable words, namely, that India wanted “the substance of Independence”.

Sir, on the eve of his arrest, the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition in this House, with whom I had the privilege to work for long years, with whom also it was my privilege or misfortune, call it what you like, to measure swords—on the eve of his unfortunate, and, in my opinion, imprudent imprisonment—it is not only my opinion, this opinion is shared by such a shrewd judge of men and critic of events, one of the great journalists of England, namely, Mr. Spender, and I believe, Sir, this opinion is shared also by other representative spokesmen of Great Britain, leave alone the Left Wing of the Labour Party—on the eve of his arrest, the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition stated that what he wanted was a settlement, and that settlement made provision for a transitional stage between the transfer of power from that side of the House to this side of the House.

That, Sir, is the entire case of India for the Round Table Conference and for Great Britain. We want a transfer of power from Great Britain, from the British electorate, including the flappers, who do not understand so much about politics as my own village constituents (Laughter.)—Sir, we want a transfer of power, of responsibility from the supremely incompetent, apathetic and ignorant British electorate. They are our masters. Our masters are incompetent, and therefore, we want to transfer responsibility from our incompetent masters abroad to competent masters at home, namely, the Indian people. (Hear, hear.) That was the issue before the Irish people. Redmond, the leader of the Irish constitutionalist party, in his American speeches characterised Dominion Status as Independence. I do not want to quote from his speeches,—for want of time—but any one who disputes that statement has only to say so and I shall read from the book by a semi-official and Conservative authority, “The Revolution in Ireland, 1906-1923”, the author being W. Alison Phillips, who had the unique opportunity of referring to and consulting not only officials of Dublin Castle, but also official documents. That, Sir, was the position in that country, and I am afraid the position in this country is drifting towards the same. Call it non-violent non-co-operation of India which is certainly better, or the violent revolution of Ireland—the spirit behind both of them is the same. So, I am afraid, if the words uttered by His Excellency the Viceroy in this House do not go further in the way of conciliation, just as similar words went further in the way of conciliation in the case of Ireland—I am afraid we will not be acting in the way in which far-sighted statesmanship would have us act. However, I do not want to anticipate events. Those who go to the Round Table Conference—and there will be many who would like to go—and those who do not go to the Round Table Conference—and there will be a larger number out in the

country who may not like to go—both of them are face to face to-day with the settlement of the question. And, Sir, the Viceroy, in his words addressed to this House, said :

“ In my judgment, and in that of my Government, it (the Congress Campaign) is a deliberate attempt to coerce established authority by mass action, and for this reason, as also because of its natural and inevitable developments, it must be regarded as unconstitutional and dangerously subversive.”

I do not want to take exception to these remarks, coming as they do from the highest authority in the land responsible for carrying on the King's Government. Any Indian in that responsible position, I dare say, face to face with a similar movement, would have uttered the same words. Similar words were uttered by Mr. Lloyd George when he was face to face with a similar situation in Ireland. The Prime Minister told the House of Commons that “ the Government intended to take more vigorous measures to suppress lawlessness in Ireland, and that for this purpose more troops would have to be sent ”. On the following day, the Chief Secretary, Sir Hamar Greenwood, declared that the Government would go on “ until the last revolver was picked out of the hand of the last assassin in Ireland ”.

The revolver question does not in India arise at present. We are dealing with mass action, and mass action, according to His Excellency, even if it is intended by its promoters to be non-violent, is nothing but the application of “ force under another form ”. Application of force under another form ! The Indian form is better than the application of force under the Irish form. But when force was applied under the Irish form, when Mr. Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister, uttered words of warning Ireland forged ahead, but Redmond and the Irish constitutionalists had been almost eliminated. That stage does not appear to have arisen so far in this country. But what followed in Ireland ? Soon after the declaration of Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons, in the same year, what happened ? Auspicious date was chosen by Mr. Lloyd George to address a letter to De Valera, as “ the chosen leader of the great majority of Southern Ireland ”, inviting him to attend a conference in London “ to explore to the utmost the possibility of a settlement ”. And then came a settlement which was disapproved by De Valera and approved by some of his comrades. I need not go into it at present, but let me hope that, out of the Round Table Conference will emerge a situation which will bring peace to this country and will lead to something like a settlement on the Irish lines, something in the shape of a treaty between India and England. If you do not like the word “ treaty ”, call it by any other name. I prefer the word treaty. There must be an arrangement made with this great country, for which the King has expressed great sympathy and great admiration, which we all appreciate. We want a treaty on the same lines, so that it will be possible to say that England is playing the game. “ The terms of this agreement ”, said De Valera, in a statement addressed to the Gaelic people “ are in violent conflict with the wishes of the majority of this nation. I cannot recommend the acceptance of this Treaty either to Dail Eireann or to the country ”. But, Sir, there was Arthur Griffith, who issued a statement which defined the attitude of himself and his promoters in clear and statesman like language. He said, “ I have signed the Treaty of Peace between Ireland and Great Britain. I believe that the Treaty will lay the foundation of peace and friendship between

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

the two nations. What I have signed I shall stand by, in the belief that the end of the conflict of centuries is at hand ”.

Judging from the present situation, the darkest clouds hang on the horizon. Sir, the Viceroy says that the Government must either resist or abdicate. The Government not having an intention to abdicate has got to regulate resistance. Here I should like to quote the words uttered by an English lady, however sad they may be. She was a witness of certain acts of the Agents of this Government and those who were responsible for the maintenance of law. I warn you that, in an atmosphere like this, it will be extremely difficult for the Round Table Conference to come to a settlement and even if it comes to a settlement, it will be extremely difficult for those who have come to a settlement to face the country, even as it was difficult for Arthur Griffith to face Ireland. I do not want here the repetition of that chapter of Irish misunderstandings and fratricidal strife. For goodness' sake, when the Round Table Conference is going on, do not go on doing the things that an English lady, the daughter of an Admiral, says are being done. She was a witness of these incidents. Writing in *Young India* Miss Slade tells the distressing tale of the excesses alleged against the police. “No head so cool, no heart so callous but must be stirred to indignation and pity by the tale, if only a part of it was true” says the *Modern Review*. She sums up her charge as follows: “Lathi blows on head, chest, stomach and joints” and then follow words which I would rather not read. These are delicate words. They come from a great-hearted English lady, the daughter of an English Admiral.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig (Home Member) : On a point of order. May I draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that the Bombay Government, in an official communiqué, had denied these allegations ?

Mr. K. C. Neogy : That is not a point of order.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I admit it is no point of order, but it is a point of pointed information and for my purpose I am satisfied. I am saved from the agony of reading a thing that I felt so very delicate to read. I am glad that the Government have issued a communiqué on the subject, and I leave it for the time being there. Whether the communiqué speaks the truth, or whether Miss Slade speaks the truth, I do hope, when this movement is going on gathering strength, that the Government will bear in mind that a day of reckoning will come sooner or later—I hope it will be sooner than many faint-hearted people imagine—and bearing that in mind see that their method of resistance does not embitter feelings a great deal too much. There is a great and growing party in England which to-day constitutes His Majesty's Government. My association and my conversations with His Majesty's Ministers and also with the Socialist Members of the House of Commons convince me that the day is not distant when Socialism will make Indian Home Rule its battle cry even as Gladstonian Liberalism took up the question of Irish Home Rule. Remember that this is a movement for the achievement of freedom. Every country has fought like this for the achievement of its freedom. If by a fiat of the fates the Great War had ended otherwise

and if the Kaiser's flag were flying over Buckingham Palace, I am sure every Englishman would have resisted that foreign rule. Do not imagine that there is no meaning behind this resistance. Do not imagine that there is no will behind this resistance. They are resisting for the freedom of their country. If you destroy constitutionalism and instal revolution, the responsibility for that shall rest entirely upon the Government in this country and in England. When the representatives of the people, who go to the Round Table Conference, fail to deliver the goods, when they do not rise equal to the occasion, then will begin a sad day. I hope they will mean business. I hope, in the interests of a better atmosphere and better understanding, there will be a meeting of two equal nations, as in the case of Ireland.

Mr. President : I would remind the Honourable Member of his promise to finish in ten minutes.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : All promises are not always meant to be kept. (Laughter.)

Mr. President : I must ask Honourable Members to limit their speeches to ten minutes. I have got a very large number of speakers on my list, and I am anxious that they should get an opportunity to speak. I have given sufficient latitude to Honourable Members till now and I hope that they will be as brief as possible.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I was about to finish when you interrupted me, Sir. I have the right to speak as long as the House is willing to listen though I am in no such mood to-day, because there is no rule to regulate this debate. However, I was only going to say this. Let it not be said, as it was said in the case of Ireland, that Government carried on their fight too long. I will quote here the author of this book on the revolution in Ireland and finish my remarks. His words are pregnant with meaning. With those words I conclude my speech. He said :

"If the Government had accepted the verdict of the Irish elections of 1918 and made it the excuse for taking the line which it adopted in 1921, it would have spared Ireland much of the bloodshed and misery, and itself the ignominy, of the years that followed. *The Times* and other organs of public opinion in England were urging this course ; and indeed it is difficult to see what objections there were to it that were not equally valid three years later. For the Great War was over ; and it was therefore as safe in 1918 as in 1921 to throw over the people in Southern Ireland who had been foolish enough to stand by England in her time of trouble."

I do hope, Sir, the Government will have wisdom and will not put its head into the sand like the ostrich.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, when I rise to speak on this motion, I wish to recall the words of His Excellency the Viceroy, uttered only the other day, when he said that he had summoned a session of the Indian Legislature because it seemed to be clearly right that Members of both Houses should have the opportunity of discussing matters of public interest on which also His Excellency wished to have the privilege of addressing them, before the Legislature was dissolved. In a later passage His Excellency said that his Government was at the present moment engaged in considering the future constitution of India and it is for this dual purpose of assisting the Government of India in their deliberations as to the future constitution for India and for giving our representatives to the Round Table Conference an expression of our views as to what

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

they should press for and what they should resist that this motion has I understand been moved and is being debated in this House. Whatever may be said, Sir, as to the utility or non-utility of the Simon Report, the fact remains that it is there, and in the memorable statement, dated 31st October, 1929, His Excellency the Viceroy made it clear that, after the publication of the Simon Report and the Report of the Central Committee, the Round Table Conference would be convened; and both the Secretary of State for India and His Excellency the Viceroy have made it clear what indeed was clear enough from their previous statements, that whatever may be the view of those of my friends who boycotted the Simon Commission, whatever may be their prejudices and prepossessions, the fact remains that it is a State document, and those representatives who sit round the round table in London will be called upon by the British representatives there to explain why they wished that scheme to be abandoned in favour of any other scheme; and when they give their answer, the question will be, "Have you a mandate from your Legislature, have you the authority of the Legislature of which you have been a Member? Do you pledge the word of the Legislative Assembly against the recommendations made in these two State documents?" And if our representatives who go there say that we have discussed in public these two Reports and we have come here with pronounced opinions supported by the reasons given by our fellow-Members in the Legislative Assembly, the position, I submit, would be very much stronger than if they were to say, "We closed our eyes to the Simon Commission and consequently we have closed our eyes to the Simon Report". Sir, whatever may be said about the sentimental value of these objections, I submit that hard practical men, those who sit to fashion and frame constitutions for a great empire like that of India, cannot ignore suggestions and recommendations—whether they come from a tainted or untainted quarter it does not matter—and I submit, therefore, and I have always felt, that whatever may be our prejudices against the constitution of the Royal Commission, whatever may be our individual views, these recommendations are likely to be placed before the Indian Members of the Round Table Conference, and I therefore desire to speak, if I may be permitted to do so, on the various recommendations made as to the future constitution of this country.

Sir, whatever may be said by those who have boycotted the Royal Commission, that charge cannot be levelled against me. Honourable Members here are aware that I was unfortunately the only elected Member from a general constituency in this House who took my stand on the view that, whatever may be the shortcomings of the Royal Commission, we must co-operate with it and give it such assistance as lies in our power. The result of that is embodied and enshrined in the Report with which Members of this House are already familiar. I contrast the recommendations of that Committee with the recommendations of the Statutory Commission.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : Both are wrong.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : And, Sir, when I read the constitutional history of India, I went back not only to the Government of India Act of 1858, and to the earlier Councils Act, but even to the regulating Acts

of 1774 to find some dim parallel for the recommendations which are the framework of the Royal Commissioners' recommendations. Honourable Members are aware that, ever since India was owned by the Honourable East India Company, the revenues of India were appropriated by that Company in London. In 1858, when the Government of India Act was enacted, following the old procedure of the commercial Company, the revenues of India were declared by statute to be received in the name of the King and were disposed of by the Secretary of State in Council. Honourable Members will remember that the Secretary of State in Council is not responsible to Parliament though the Secretary of State is. The revenues of India, therefore, from 1858 down to this day, have been at the disposal of the Secretary of State in Council, and the fundamental recommendation marking the line of difference between ourselves and the Statutory Commission is this, that while the Statutory Commission retain the vesting of the revenues of India in the authorities in England, we recommend that the revenues of India shall hereafter vest in the Government of India; and from the speeches made by Honourable Members yesterday, and on previous occasions I have been confirmed in my view that the recommendation we have made is certainly a recommendation which obtains the support of the large bulk of the intelligentsia in this country. Sir, if once you postulate that the revenues of India shall hereafter vest in the Government of India, you have got all you want, because once the Government of India becomes the custodian of the revenues of India, that Government must become responsible to somebody and that responsibility must necessarily devolve upon the Central Legislature. I therefore submit that, once you grant that the revenues of India shall be at the disposal of the Government of India, the necessary logical constitutional corollary and deduction follows that that Government must be responsible to a lawfully constituted Legislature.

Now, Sir the other point upon which we have been at variance with

3 P.M. the Statutory Commission is a very vital one.

Honourable Members are aware that, for a long time past, in fact since the early days of the Company, the power of direction, supervision and control, which was held by the Board of Directors, was transferred to the Secretary of State in Council. And, if Honourable Members will study the constitutional document therein on the Government of India, they will find the scheme working in this way. The Secretary of State in Council is the ultimate authority; the Government of India are subject to the direction, supervising and control of the Secretary of State in Council; and then comes lower down the Governor: the Governor in Council is subject to the control of the supervision, direction and control of the Government of India. Thus, within these three circles you have the entire authority, the sovereign authority, vested in three distinct bodies under the Government of India Act. Now, if you really want to have a responsibility in this country, if you really wish that the Central Legislature and the Provincial Legislatures should exercise any degree of autonomy, then the first thing we have to do is to see that the Secretary of State in Council's authority to supervise, direct and control is limited, and it indeed was so limited by the Act of 1919, where the words "subject to the provisions of this Act" were added by the Reforms Act of 1919. But, mark you, now what have the Simon Commission done? While the Act of 1919 nullifies the right of direction, supervision and

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

control, and while the section of the Government of India Act of 1919 gives the Secretary of State the power to further transfer his power of control to the Government of India, the Statutory Commission now recommend that the ultimate control shall remain with the Secretary of State in Council. Honourable Members will find (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah* : " We will take it from you.") this view if they will turn to three paragraphs of Volume II of the Royal Commission's Report. (*Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty* : " Do not read the whole of it.") The paragraphs are 97, 98 and 181. If you read these three paragraphs, you will find that the scheme of future Government of India according to the Statutory Commission is that, whatever may be the devolution of power in the circumference, and whatever may be the devolution of power in the centre, the power of the Secretary of State in Council remains unfettered and unqualified, even indeed, as it was before the Act of 1919. And in that respect, I submit, this recommendation goes back upon the Montagu reforms.

Then, Sir, the third point was recently debated in this House. Honourable Members will remember in connection with the Cotton Tariff Protection Bill when the question about fiscal autonomy was debated in this House. The Honourable the Leader of the House then stated that you have got fiscal autonomy but you have got no machinery to enforce it. It may be that in the Round Table Conference such a machinery will be devised for the purpose of making fiscal autonomy a real convention. These are the words of the Leader of the House. Now, what is the recommendation of the Statutory Commission. They say that this fiscal autonomy places the Government of India and the Legislature in antagonism with the Secretary of State ; the ultimate authority must be with the British Cabinet ; and they therefore suggest, though they do not expressly say so, that this fiscal autonomy in India is a dead letter. Now, I ask Honourable Members to notice that this fiscal autonomy convention was strongly emphasised by the Joint Parliamentary Commission in their report and they have further pointed out that, following upon this fiscal convention, the Government of India should make it a practice that, when they and the Legislature were in agreement upon other matters, the Secretary of State should stand aside. In other words, though fiscal autonomy was granted to India as an incident of what the Secretary of State said about Dominion Status in action, the Joint Parliamentary Committee wanted that the convention should be extended and enlarged in other spheres. But what have the Royal Commission recommended ? They have passed a blue pencil through the whole fiscal autonomy convention. Sir, I do not think that there is any Indian in this House, whatever party he may belong to, who will ever subscribe to this most reactionary recommendation of the Statutory Commission. The present Government of India Act takes for granted that the further advance must be along the line of the British Parliamentary system. The Statutory Commission sapiently observe that this form of Government is wholly unsuitable to India.

Sir, I pass on to other phases of the Government of India Act, and I hope Members of the Executive Council will listen because their own future depends upon the new convention or the new constitution that the Royal Commission propose for them. In the Government of India Act—and that Government of India Act follows the old Government of India

Act—India is defined in two places. It is called “India,” where it includes India and Indian States. It is called “British India,” where it deals with British India alone, excluding the Indian States. Now, mark my words. Under the Government of India Act, since 1858 and earlier, the whole of India, including Indian States, were under the control of the Governor General in Council. The Statutory Commission say that this will never do. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah* : “They are quite right.”) The Viceroy should hereafter be in charge of Indian States and the Governor General in Council shall only be in charge of British India. But the matter does not rest there. What is the position of the Executive Council ? According to Mr. Montagu’s Report and the convention since established, the Viceroy’s Executive Council, leaving out the Commander-in-Chief, consists of six Members, of whom three are Indians (*Honourable Members* : “No, no.”) and three British people. Now, we have been complaining from 1921 that the Viceroy must keep on changing the portfolios, so that the Indian Members.....

Mr. President : Order, order. I wish to remind the Honourable Member that we have already decided that we will not go into the details of the scheme.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : I am not going into the details (Ironical Laughter) but I am simply trying to explain point by point. Honourable Members will remember that we have been complaining from 1921 that some of the important portfolios, such as the Home Department, the Finance Department and the Railways, should occasionally be transferred to the Indian Members of the Executive Council, so that there may be a gradual association of Indians in the higher administration of the Government of India in accordance with the declared policy of the Government of India Act. From 1921 down to date this has been the desire of the Legislative Assembly. At any rate, there is an equipoise between the British Members and the Indian Members, a partnership in which the British and the Indians are half and half. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah* : “Are they ?”) At any rate, nominally they are. Now, look at the scheme suggested by the Royal Commission. They say that one civilian Member in charge of the Army Department should be added to the Executive Council and he should be the Leader of the Federal Assembly. Well, Sir, I have read the Report again and again, and I can only understand that the real effect of this would be that there would be a standing majority of four European Members in the Viceroy’s Executive Council and a standing minority of three Indian Members. I am still dealing with the Executive Council. Up to now the Army and defence have been in charge of the Governor General in Council, but under this scheme the Army is removed from the Executive Council and is placed directly under the Viceroy, and a suggestion is made that India should contribute a certain definite sum of money to England, and England should make herself responsible for the defence of India.

Sir, this is the constitution of the Central Government. If we turn to the provinces, what do we find ? Look at this picture and at that. Under the Montford reforms, at any rate in the diarchical system of Government, in the subjects transferred to the charge of Ministers, the Governor has only a nominal control, and the amount which is required for the administration of the transferred half of the Government is voted. Now under the recommendation of the Statutory Commission, the present

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

division between votable and non-votable subjects, both in the Legislative Assembly and in the Provincial Governments, shall continue and yet we are told that diarchy is dead. So long as the difference between votable and non-votable subjects in the province continues, I cannot understand how there can be and has been an end of diarchy. Then, it has already been pointed out, and I do not wish to repeat it, that official Members are to be in charge of defined portfolios and they are to be called Ministers, and the curious recommendation is made to this effect that a vote of censure or a vote of no-confidence by the local Councils shall not be directed against any one Minister, but shall be against the Ministry as a whole. On that, what will be the result? Let us assume to ourselves a case of a very unpopular official Minister who has made himself very obnoxious. I am only assuming, I do not say that such things will happen, but we have always to take extreme cases for the purpose of making our point. Suppose we get a very unpopular official Minister to sit in the Cabinet and four non-official Ministers are in utter disagreement with him, and thereupon the Council passes a vote of censure against the Ministry: now what is the result? The result is that, for his offence, the other four non-official Ministers resign. Sir, I have heard that in China vicarious punishments were above time permitted to a condemned man, but I have never heard or thought that that system, which has long since been abolished in China, would be introduced in India and innocent Ministers would be sacrificed for the vagaries of official Ministers. And as if this was not all, the Royal Commissioners pointed out that, ordinarily speaking, supposing there was a reconstitution of the Ministry, what was the suggestion? The suggestion is not that the offending Minister should go. Generally speaking he is not to go at all but, there should be a reconstitution. Supposing Sir, four other Ministers come and the official Minister makes himself equally unpopular to the others, the same system is repeated. I know what the answer will be. The answer will be that you must leave the Governor a large discretion to deal with a situation of this character, but that is exactly what I object to. If you wish to trust your Ministry with the duty of carrying on the Government of the province, do not create a *deus ex machina* for the purpose of coming down upon the Ministry with a heavy hand at any time when it is found that the Ministers are not in entire agreement with the head of the Government. You must assume that either the provinces are ripe for autonomy or they are not. If they are not, then cancel the reforms. Let us have a pure, undiluted system of bureaucratic Government, but I do not believe in this masked government, which is in reality bureaucratic, but of which the semblance is democratic. Sir, there are many other points. I do not know whether the recommendations or the schemes prepared by the various Local Governments have been published. I see there is an advertisement here that all the schemes have been published. I do not know whether the memorandum submitted by the Government of Madras is published. I wish to ask the Honourable the Home Member whether it is a public document, I mean the recommendations of the Madras Government.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I believe, Sir, that all the Reports of the Local Governments have been published.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Very well, Sir. Just think of this. The Madras Government in their recommendation very clearly point out that

the existence of an all-India service responsible to the Secretary of State is incompatible with the establishment of provincial autonomy. If you wish to create provincial autonomy, you must equally provincialise the services. The Ministers must be free to engage the tools with which they will work. But what is the recommendation? The recommendation is that, while we give you provincial autonomy, the services will be all-India services.

Mr. President : I hope the Honourable Member knows that he should address the Chair.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : Yes, Sir. The recommendation is that while we give you provincial autonomy, the services will be all-India services, not subject to the provinces, but to the Secretary of State. Now, Sir, I wish to ask Honourable Members how is even that attenuated provincial autonomy, which the Statutory Commission recommend, practicable or workable when you have got the Agents not-responsible to you and not removable by you and not even subject to your discipline. I submit, Sir, that that is the weakest point in the scheme of the Statutory Commission. Honourable Members will further remember that, in the days when Mr. Montagu published his scheme, he saw at the time the difficulty that would arise and the conflicts that might be engendered between what is a votable subject and what is a non-votable subject and between what is a reserved subject and what is a provincial subject or an Imperial subject. In other words, conflicts between province and province, between the centre and the circumference and between India and the Home Government were extremely likely. He said that, during this transitional period of ten years, he would leave the Governor General in Council to decide all these questions. But the provinces and the Ministers complain that the Government of India, being the complainant, ought not to be the judge in its own case and you must instal an impartial tribunal for the purpose of upholding the constitution and decide all disputes between man and man. It is one of the essential features of all the Dominion constitutions that you have a judicial body set apart for the purpose, *inter alia* to decide matters of this kind. I believe, Sir, that in all the recommendations, in all the schemes, whether of the Indian States or of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, or of the European Association or of all the all-Parties Conferences, the establishment of a Supreme Court for India is a common feature. It is there provided that you must have a Supreme Court in India for the purpose of deciding these disputes. Apart from that, for a very long time past the Privy Council have been complaining that they have been converted into a court of criminal appeal, whereas they are no such court at all, and Lord Haldane pointed out, about 20 years ago, that the time had come for India to have an ultimate court of appeal. Now, Sir, we recommended that there should be a supreme court of appeal in India. There is no recommendation of that kind in the Statutory Commission's Report. But there is one line in which they say that they do not think that the matters in dispute should be the subject of litigation and that they should therefore be decided by the Executive Government. I submit that if you really want that these questions should be disposed of, you must establish an impartial tribunal. Only the other day I asked the Honourable the Finance Member as to what procedure was going to be followed in deciding a long-standing dispute involving several million pounds between India and England. He said

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

that the matter was in the course of negotiation and that he would consult this House before the machinery to be appointed by the Government of India was finally settled. I suggest, Sir, that in cases of this kind which have remained long pending and in which the existence of an impartial tribunal would speedily dispose of matters held in abeyance for want of a suitable tribunal and for other reasons, if any advance is to be made, it must be accompanied by the establishment of a supreme court in this country.

Sir, I do not wish to labour the questions dealing with the relations of British India and the Indian States. The establishment of a Privy Council to deal with questions excluded for the time being from the purview of the Government of India Act is the solution which we suggest and a solution which has partially been accepted by the Statutory Commission, who recommend the establishment of a Council for Greater India.

Sir, I submit that these are in brief the broad outlines of the Statutory Commission's Report with which we are unable to express our concurrence. May I say further that we are strongly of opinion that those who go to the Round Table Conference should emphatically and with unequivocal voice declare themselves against every one of the recommendations of the Statutory Commission regarding the future constitution of India? I think, therefore, this debate has not been in vain if the ground has been cleared and our representatives in the Round Table Conference have been charged with the duty of safeguarding the interests of India by explaining to the British representatives and to those who will confer with them the inutility of carrying out any of these recommendations. I submit, Sir, that the Round Table Conference will serve a great purpose. I am glad that the Round Table Conference has been acceded to. If there had not been a Round Table Conference, the position would have been that the recommendations of the Statutory Commission would have immediately either gone to the Parliamentary conveyancers and draftsmen for drawing up a Bill or they would have been referred to a Joint Parliamentary Committee. This intermediate stage of discussion between the representatives of India and England is a happy augury of the times, and I can only hope that the Government of India will possess a large vision which is called for on this occasion. They see around them signs of revolt and revolution; they see around them a movement intended to bring into contempt the established Government in India; they see around them a mass movement which is thirsting for a new order and a larger freedom. And if they really want that the London Conference should be representative of all interests and all classes, their primary duty is to make all available efforts to secure the co-operation and support of those who at the present moment hold the centre of the stage. I say therefore that the Government of India have sufficiently shown their might and power to quell disturbances. It is now time that they should show their clemency. Let them send for the leaders, the well-known representatives of the Congress movement, let bygones be bygones, and ask them to join this grand work of framing and fashioning the future constitution of India. I am sure that if these leaders of the Congress movement are approached in the right spirit, they will gladly respond and they will join in this grand work of reconstructing the India of tomorrow. Without them I fear that, whatever may be the

merits of the scheme agreed to by the Round Table Conference, we shall not have done with the recrudescence of unrest which will continue and which will, I am afraid, react upon the success of the future constitution of this country. I therefore appeal to the Honourable Members occupying the Treasury Benches that on this occasion they should take into confidence the leaders of the Congress movement and they should, above all, see that the representatives who go to London are representatives who will construct a scheme that will endure and be for the benefit of united India. Sir, I therefore support the motion for a supplementary grant for the Round Table Conference, but I have equally to support the cut because I feel that I shall not be justified in asking our representatives to go to that Round Table Conference unless they are charged with a definite mandate, which this House should give them, that by all means in their power they should circumvent the reactionary recommendations of the Statutory Commission ; and when any scheme is put forward in that Conference, it should be met upon the grounds which we have suggested and upon grounds which will occur to them which we have not suggested here. I feel therefore that our representatives should be doubly armed when they go to the Round Table Conference with an expression of our views and criticisms. I venture to think that even the Honourable Members of the Treasury Benches must be raising their heads up towards Heaven and asking for guidance because I do not think many of them see what the Simon Report can possibly mean, how it is workable, and how it is going to reconcile a constant antagonism between an irresponsible executive and a central Legislature not of 145 Members, but of 300 Members. This constant friction between an irresponsible executive and three hundred irresponsible Members of the Legislature will bring about a deadlock and will create a stalemate in the administration of this country, which you will very soon regret. Look back to the past. We have been told by high authority that the Government of India must either go backward or go forward. It cannot stand still. (*An Honourable Member* : "Question.") The Statutory Commission are going to send us backward ; but let me tell them that, if they go backward, they will fall into a ditch from which it would be difficult for us to rescue them. Let them take their courage in both hands and go forward. Let me in those inspiring words of the Viceroy appeal to them and let the Government of India be.....

Mr. President : What is the use of making an appeal to them ? They cannot do anything now.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : They can do a lot ; and so far as they are concerned they should voice our sentiments and our feelings and advocate our demands. Let them for the time being, irresponsible though they be, show themselves as the national Government of India (*Honourable Members* : "Oh, oh.") and as such make such recommendations as will be conducive to the welfare and happiness of the people of this country. Men come and go ; we are all birds of passage ; but remember one thing and it is this : Mr. Montagu is dead, but everybody remembers the great work he has done ; his name is enshrined in the hearts of the people of this country. I ask the occupants of the Treasury Benches to feel inspired by a similar vision and to be moved by a similar feeling. Let them show to the people of this country that, whatever may have been their irresponsibility in the past, they are going to fashion a constitution that will be for the lasting good of the people of this country. Sir, I have very great pleasure in

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

supporting the fundamental principle of the Honourable the Finance Member's motion but I regret that I have equally to support the cut (Laughter.) because I am not in a position to allow the Simon Commission's Report to remain on the agenda of the Round Table Conference without a protest from this House.

Mr. President : There are some other cuts on this motion and I think it would be better if I were to call upon the Movers of those cuts to move their cuts so that the House may be in possession of the entire subject and it may be easier for Honourable Members to cover all the points in the course of their speeches. I understand that Mr. Acharya is not very anxious to move his cuts.* Am I right ?

Mr. M. K. Acharya (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : That is so, Sir ; I am not very anxious to move the cuts standing in my name, provided the Government see that they take note of the suggestions I made yesterday in my speech.

Mr. President : Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi.

Failure to create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill for the Round Table Conference and the inadequate and unsatisfactory Recommendations made by the Simon Commission both from the point of view of the country in general and that of the Muslims in particular, which will be placed before the Round Table Conference.

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi (North Madras : Muhammadan) : Sir, I move :

" That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,66,000 in respect of ' Miscellaneous ' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

In moving this cut I beg to point out that I have three main points to bring to the notice of the Government. The first is that I feel that no genuine new attempt has been made by the Government to see that all politically minded parties in the country seek to co-operate in the Round Table Conference. The second point is that I feel that the Simon Commission's recommendations have fallen short of the demands of the country. Lastly, I also feel that the demands of the Muslim community have been ignored.

Now, Sir, in moving this cut, I should at the very outset like to point out that I am not one of those who feel that no useful purpose will be served by going to the Round Table Conference. I maintain that there is a very great force in the argument that there should be a free conference, where no party should go with any previous commitments. I do not agree with those who believe that the freedom of India could be attained, under the present circumstances, by resorting to civil disobedience. I feel that the declaration of war by the Congress at a time when much of the misunderstanding that has been created between the

* " That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,66,000 in respect of ' Miscellaneous ' be reduced by Rs. 100. (Inadequate information regarding the function of the proposed Round Table Conference and the status of Indian delegates thereto.) "

" That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,66,000 in respect of ' Miscellaneous ' be reduced by Rs. 100. (No information regarding the interests and parties that will be represented at the Round Table Conference—Failure to seek non-official advice regarding such representation.) "

people of India and the Government could be removed by a frank heart-to-heart talk at a free conference—at such a time the declaration of war by the Congress was most unwise and most inopportune. But, Sir, at the same time, I cannot resist the feeling that, in spite of the fact that His Excellency the Viceroy has got very genuine sympathy towards the aspirations of Indians, which has been admitted by his severest critics, in spite of his sympathy, no genuine effort has been made by the Government to induce those who feel that they ought not to go to the Round Table Conference to find their way to co-operate with the Conference. It cannot be gainsaid that those who have been advocating a boycott of the Conference are a very influential section of the Indian population. Such being the case, I personally feel and I have no doubt in my mind that most Members—at least elected Members—of this Assembly also feel that a conference without that influential element, which can speak on behalf of a considerable section of the Indian people, would not represent the real feelings of the Indian people. I also feel that, without the co-operation of the leaders of the Congress, it may perhaps be necessary for the Government to be holding conference after conference, and who knows what the result will be? Therefore, Sir, I feel that if an attempt is made at the very beginning, and if fortunately the Congress leaders are persuaded to co-operate with those who are in favour of going to the Round Table Conference, most of the difficulties that stand in the way of solving the political problems of India will disappear. Now, Sir, why do I say that no attempt, no renewed attempt, has been made by Government to placate the Congress leaders? The reason is this. After the conference of the Viceroy with Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru and my friend, Mr. Jinnah, the Leader of the Independent Party, broke up without achieving any fruitful results, as far as I am aware, the Government did not try as much as it was possible for them to do so—and they could have used many influences—to bring round leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru and others to their point of view and to convince them that to sit in a Round Table Conference on honourable terms would do no harm to India.....

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : What are the honourable terms ?

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : My friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, asks me what the honourable terms are. I think he values self-respect as much as I do, and if my Honourable friend thinks that the Government are not offering honourable terms to those who are going to the Round Table Conference, I think he should be the first gentleman to boycott this Conference. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, as I said, it was not beyond the resources of the Government to try and bring round the Congress leaders, because, from the reports which have appeared in the Press, before Pandit Motilal Nehru was arrested, I found while I was at Madras that he, I mean Pandit Motilal Nehru, made a gesture of peace, and though the terms and conditions contained in his gesture under which he was prepared to co-operate with the Government might not have been acceptable to Government, yet there was a clear indication on the part of the Congress leaders that they were prepared to open the door for negotiations and for co-operation. Now, Sir, the Government have regrettably failed to seize that golden opportunity. (*An Honourable Member :* "Shame.")

[Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi.]

What did the Government do on the contrary? They have launched on a policy of repression, which no Indian, whatever may be his religion, or whatever may be his political creed, would endorse. The indiscriminate *Lathi* charges by the police throughout India, very often on innocent crowds which assembled not in sympathy with the civil disobedience movement, but for the sake of mere curiosity, the ban placed on the legitimate freedom of the Press, the rule of Ordinances and the indiscriminate arrests of a large number of people, including respected leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Dr. Mahmood and others, all these, Sir, did not go to create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill, which is very necessary for the success of the Round Table Conference. Sir, I am not blind to the harm done to the cause of India by the civil disobedience movement started by the Congress leaders in a moment of indiscrete haste, without previously entering into any reasonable compromise with the minorities in general and the Muslim minority in particular. I do not also fail to appreciate the onerous responsibility that rests upon the Government of India for maintaining law and order. But, Sir, what I feel is that those responsible for the maintenance of law and order have abused their power. They did not use that minimum force which was necessary for putting down the unrest which was created either by the Congress leaders or the Congress followers, or by other people who wanted to take advantage of the opportunity and create more trouble. Well, Sir, I should like at this stage to bring to the notice of this House—my friend, Mr. Rangaswami Ayyangar, has just reminded me—about the police excesses at Madras on the innocent Madras public, but I do not want to go into details. But what I desire to point out is that, taking into consideration all these factors, it cannot be denied that the Government have failed in their duty to create that atmosphere of peace which is essential to bring about the co-operation of the people with the Government to sit and discuss in the Round Table Conference. Of course, I know that there is no use in flogging a dead horse. Let bygones be bygones. Let us not regret about the past, but let us be mindful and cautious about the future. I should like to know from the Government what action they propose to take to bring about the co-operation of all the political parties of India, so that we may sit in the Round Table Conference in an atmosphere of peace and settle matters amicably. Now, Sir, I should like to suggest to the Government that, for bringing about that atmosphere, there are some circumstances which should be regarded as conditions precedent. The first thing that I feel is that Government should declare a truce, and then all political prisoners, including the Moplahs, should be released. Now, some Honourable Members may not quite agree with me when I say that the Moplahs should be released. (*Some Honourable Members*: “No, no.”) I should like to give my reasons for that. The Moplahs, Sir, in the Moplah Rebellion of 1921.....

Mr. President : The Honourable Member need not go into the reasons.

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : I want to say only one sentence and no more. They took part in that rebellion, even as the Congressmen took part in the civil disobedience movement, actuated by feelings of patriotism, however, misguided they might have been, and therefore,

I feel that they were not guilty of any offence involving moral turpitude. Hence, I say that all political prisoners, including the Moplahs, should be unconditionally released. Then, Government should use their resources—I cannot say what those resources are—but they should use their own resources to persuade the Congress leaders and convince them that, by sitting in the Round Table Conference, they will be losing nothing. My Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, is taking note of this point and I hope he will not come out with an evasive answer.

Having said so much about the repressive policy of the Government, and having suggested means which can possibly bring about the co-operation of the Congress leaders, I now come to the next point, that the recommendations of the Simon Commission have fallen short of the demands of the country.....

Mr. President : As the Honourable Member knows, this point has been discussed so much that I think the Honourable Member need not go into the details of that point. The new point which he has mentioned in his motion for a cut has already been discussed at great length, and I hope that he will now try to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : I beg your pardon. I was not unaware of your ruling, and if you had allowed me to continue, you would have seen that I was not going into details. I was simply going to say one or two sentences about each point and nothing more. The Simon Report, as I have said, has fallen short of the demands of the country at large, because the country at large irrespective of political parties or religions, has demanded complete Dominion Status, which, much to our disappointment, we do not find in the recommendations of the Simon Commission.

Now, I come to the Muslim demands, and I hope you will allow me to say something more about them and I do not think I will take more than five or ten minutes. So far as the Muslims are concerned, though they have not concealed their appreciation of one or two recommendations contained in the Simon Report, they, on the whole, consider the Report to be retrograde and reactionary. The views of the Muslims were expressed in unambiguous and unmistakable language in the resolution passed only a few days ago, on or about the 5th instant, by the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference held at Simla. With your permission, Sir, I should like to read out that Resolution :

“(a) In the opinion of the executive board of the All-India Muslim Conference, the report of the Simon Commission, as a whole is unacceptable to the Musalmans of India because it falls short of their demands formulated by the All-India Muslim Conference in Delhi on 1st January, 1929 (*vide* page 5) and because it is retrograde and reactionary in spirit.

(b) With reference to some of the main proposals of the Simon Commission, the Board resolved as follows :

1. While appreciating the recommendations of the Simon Commission that the future constitution of India should be on a Federal Basis, the election to the Provincial Legislatures should be by the system of separate electorates, and the provinces should have provincial autonomy, it is considered that the demands of the Muslim Community with respect to these matters as embodied in the resolution of the All-India Muslim Conference at Delhi, on January, 1st, 1929, have not been fully met by the Commission.

2. While reiterating these demands the Board is strongly of opinion that the elections to the Federal Assembly and the Council of State should be through separate

[Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi.]

electorates. While expressing no opinion at this stage whether election to either chamber of the Central Legislature should be by the direct or indirect election the Board is definitely opposed to the system of proportional representation, as suggested by the Commission. The Board is emphatically of opinion that Muslims should be guaranteed a minimum of one-third of the total number of seats both in the Federal Assembly and the Council of State.

3. If at any time the Muslims of any province decide by plebesite of two-thirds of Muslim votes to waive the right of separate electorate they should be allowed to do so. The opposition of other communities to such a course should not prevent their abolition.

4. Provincial autonomy should be real and should not be whittled down by the unlimited overriding powers of the Governors. All the ministers should be elected non-official. The ministry should be jointly responsible to the Legislature.

5. Muslims must be guaranteed a clear majority in Bengal and the Punjab. While the Simon Commission has maintained such a Hindu majority in six provinces they have deprived the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab of their majority in the only two existing provinces, viz., Bengal and the Punjab.

6. While agreeing with the Commission that there are strong reasons for the separation of Sindh from Bombay, the Board is unable to agree in their suggestion that the question of the immediate separation should be considered later. The Board is emphatically of opinion that Sindh should be separated from Bombay without further delay and constituted into an autonomous Province.

7. While realizing that the Commission have conceded the grant of reforms to the North-West Frontier Province, the Board is strongly of opinion that these proposals are entirely inadequate and the reasoning advanced by the Commission is unsound. The Board is emphatically of opinion that the North-West Frontier Province should have the same measure of reforms as the other provinces of India.

8. The Board is strongly of opinion that Baluchistan should be guaranteed full provincial autonomy, possessing the same powers as are enjoyed by other provinces of India.

9. The Simon Commission has not made adequate provision for the representation of Muslims in the public services of the country or the Cabinets of the Governments of the various provincial and the Federal Governments. In Board's opinion it is essential to the stability and success of any constitution that the Muslim Community should be guaranteed adequate and effective representation in the Cabinets and the public services of the country. A provision to this effect must be embodied in the constitution.

10. The Board has noted with regret that the demands for the representation of Muslims in all statutory self-governing bodies such as local bodies, Universities, and other bodies created by Law as also their proposals for the protection of education, culture, language, charitable and religious endowments, Muslim Law (*Shariyat*) and religion have not been discussed by the Commission. The Board feels extremely disappointed at the failure of the Commission to provide for effective guarantees for the carrying out of these safeguards. The Board is emphatically of opinion that these safeguards should be a fundamental part of the constitution.

11. The Board is unable to agree with the proposal of the Commission regarding the Army. The Board is greatly disappointed at the failure of the Commission to make effective provision for the speedy Indianisation of the Military and Naval services and the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst. The Board feels that the Commission have ignored the genuine desires and aspirations of Indians of all parties on this subject. The Board is strongly of opinion that in any scheme of the Indianisation of the military, naval and air forces that may be framed, adequate and effective representation of Muslims in all grades of these forces should be guaranteed to them by Law.

12. The Board is strongly of opinion that Finance, Commerce, Railway, Posts and Telegraphs, in short, all subjects of common concern should be entrusted to the ministers responsible to the Federal Assembly, with such safeguards as may be necessary in respect of Army, Foreign affairs and Indian States for the transitory period. The Board does not agree with the proposals of the Commission regarding the constitution of a Central Government as they confer greater powers on the Governor General than are consistent with the parliamentary form of Government."

Now, Sir, this Resolution speaks for itself. There is no necessity for either commenting upon it or explaining it. Now, Sir, only a few remarks more and I shall have done. I now come to the representation at the Round Table Conference. I am speaking with due respect to such of my friends as have served on the Central and Provincial Committees. It is my personal opinion, and I have this consolation that I am backed by my constituency in this respect. I am voicing the feelings of my constituency, that no person who has served on the Central or the Provincial Committees should be invited to the Round Table Conference. The reason for this is that these people have had their say, and if they are to be invited again to the Round Table Conference, it would mean that they would be asked to sit in judgment over themselves. Now, Sir, the other suggestion that I would like to make is that only such persons should be invited to the Round Table Conference.....

Mr. President : Order, order. I think the Honourable gentleman is tiring the patience of the House. He ought to remember that there are many Members who are anxious to speak. All these points have been brought repeatedly on record. Therefore, I would request him to bring his remarks to a close.

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : I have not even taken half an hour. I am now closing my remarks.

Mr. President : Please do.

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : The other suggestion that I should like to make is that only such persons should be invited as command the confidence of their community, and they should not be invited merely because they are favoured by the Government. In this connection, Sir, I should like to read a few sentences from a Resolution passed by the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference very recently. This Resolution says :—

“ The Board trusts that the British Government are not unaware of the fact that no constitution will be acceptable to the Mussalmans until and unless adequate safeguards are provided for their rights and interests as laid down in the Resolution unanimously adopted at the All-India Muslim Conference held at Delhi under the presidency of His Highness the Aga Khan on 1st January 1929 and they are adequately and effectively represented in the Conference by men who truly represent the community, respect the inviolability of Islamic Law, possess the confidence of their co-religionists and give true expression to their views and sentiments.”

Sir, in obedience to your ruling, I do not want to say anything more with regard to this point. I appeal to this House and to the elected Members in this House that it is their moral duty to support this cut because no elected Member can tolerate the present state of things and at the same time go to the Round Table Conference. With this appeal, I move the cut.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : While having no desire to cry over spilt milk, I venture to suggest that, had the Government in England acted on the united wishes of India and associated some Indians with the members of the Indian Royal Commission, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, would not have had the trouble of moving for a supplementary grant today. During recent years there have been two occasions on which Government have defied the united voice of India and they have rued the day. While

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

passing what is commonly called the Rowlatt Act, they defied public opinion, and in the face of the strongest opposition of every party in India, that legislation was carried through. I do not desire to dwell on the results. When I heard that Indians were not going to be represented on the Royal Commission, that it was to consist entirely of Englishmen, I ventured an opinion and it was that the Government in England were making a blunder, of capital magnitude, equal to that of the Rowlatt Act. I regret that my opinion then expressed has come out to be true. If it had not been for the defiance of the united voice of India on these two occasions, we would not have had the atmosphere in which we have to live today. Sir, I readily admit that, in the case of the second defiance of public opinion, the Government in India and in England did try to make amends, but the blunder had been committed. They did appoint the Indian Central Committee to make up for the want of a few Indians on the Royal Commission, but I venture to say, in the presence of one or two Honourable Members here, who were members of the Central Committee, that that step did not have the desired effect. I do not know whose fault it was, but the Commission and the Committee did not work harmoniously. There was no consultation at the last moment between the Central Committee and the Commission as the Central Committee's Report was issued months before that of the Simon Commission. Sir, if there had been a few Indians on that Commission, there would have been a clash of minds and of opinions which I am sure would have led to a different result to the one, some of us are now here to discuss. Well, Sir, I do not desire to cry over spilt milk, but we have all to learn a lesson, and the question I ask myself is : " Have we arrived at a time when the united voice of India will no longer be defied ? " Sir, the future of India and England lies in the answer to that question, and it can only be answered by my Honourable friends opposite and their masters in England. We are told that we shall get our answer in England before this year is out. Mr. President, I have been associated with Englishmen during the whole of my life, both in England and in India and I desire to sound a note of a solemn and earnest warning, and especially to those Englishmen in India and in England who are known today as Diehards. I would tell them with all the emphasis that I possess that, if they attempt to defy the united voice of India again, it will be a disaster both for India and for England (Hear, hear.); and that the lives of many Indians and most Englishmen will be intolerable in this country. It is for them to answer. I may be told that the answer does not lie in the mouths of Englishmen alone. I may be told that there are Indians and Indians, minorities and a majority who have to decide this question. I admit that fact.

But I have the fullest confidence that the minorities, and the majority will come to terms.

An Honourable Member : When ?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir : There will be an accommodation, in the words of the Simon Report, between these communities, and I venture to say that the reply whether there is going to be peace and harmony in this country, or whether there is going to be strife and disorder is in the mouths of statesmen in England. I am quite prepared to admit,

more so, I agree, that every party should be represented at the Round Table Conference and I agree that every attempt should be made to bring all parties to this Conference. But in my humble opinion, there is an even more important matter, and that is this—a mentality both in India and in England prepared to accept a self-governing Dominion constitution with the necessary safeguards. If there is this mentality in England and in India, I venture to suggest that, however great a handicap it may be that one party should not be represented, there are possibilities of success for the Round Table Conference. But if that mentality is absent amongst statesmen in England, and if it is not encouraged from India, I see nothing but disaster. The right atmosphere is also necessary, and I venture to say to my Honourable friends opposite that in certain instances perhaps the right atmosphere has not been encouraged. No one realizes more than myself the difficulties of the police. They are working under most difficult conditions and are having the most strenuous times. But that is no excuse for exceeding the limits that are necessary for maintaining law and order. The city which I have the honour to represent is by no means a happy place just now. There have been occasions when the police have, in my opinion, overstepped the limits and have assaulted innocent people, not connected, mind you, with the passive resistance movement, nor, mind you, near the scene of defiance of police orders. There have been two such black days in Bombay. These, after all, may be small matters to bring to the notice of the Legislative Assembly, and perhaps they are better discussed in the Provincial Councils. But the important point is, not that some innocent men were unnecessarily assaulted however regrettable that may have been; the important point is, what are the consequences of those assaults? (Hear, hear.) The consequences of those assaults have been to drive thousands into the camp of those opposing the Government; to make thousands sympathise with the civil disobedience movement who had no thought of joining it. These unnecessary assaults give rise to processions in which you find men and women of all classes. They join those processions, not because they sympathise with the civil disobedience movement, not because they do not desire Government to put down lawlessness, but they express, by these processions, their strong condemnation of the excesses that, on certain occasions the police have committed.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I hope my Honourable friend does not mean to imply that any innocent persons, who may have suffered injury, were attacked deliberately.

An Honourable Member : Yes, deliberately.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir : I am sorry the Honourable Member has asked that question. I am not in a position to say whether policemen deliberately assaulted innocent men and women or not. I do not know their mentality. I can only judge from the facts, and it will be for my Honourable friend to judge from the facts. He cannot get behind the minds of any individual policeman; he will have the facts placed before him, and from these facts he will have to judge. I can judge, from such facts as where the police assaulted innocent men, namely, in what place, how, at what distance from the scene of deliberate defiance of police orders, and so on. Therefore, I regret my Honourable friend should have asked me that question. It will be for him to judge when such cases are brought to his notice.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : It is not possible for any man to know the heart of another man.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir : I am just trying to make that point. At any rate, Mr. President, what I was trying to bring to the notice of the Government was that it is not the question of an assault or two. It is not a question whether a man was assaulted while getting into a tramcar, or inside a tramcar, or when he was returning from his business. These are questions for the Local Government. It is the consequences of these actions that I want the Government to realise. The consequences are that today Bombay is more antagonistic to Government than it has ever been since it was handed over to the British administration as a dowry of the wife of a British King. And why is it so ? It is not because it refuses to acknowledge His Majesty the King, or the Government of India, or the Government of Bombay. A city that was known for its loyalty is today, I regret to say, not happy, because she has seen in her midst on two days, namely, the 16th of June and the 21st of June, actions of the police which no man can call justified. It is regrettable and the same story comes from all parts of India.

Now, Sir, there is another aspect of the case to which I would like to draw your attention. It is this. I am perfectly aware of the untruths that are spread against Government officers. I have personal experience of them. One error may have been committed, and there will be a rumour all over the city that hundreds of such cases have occurred. An officer very often may be wrongly condemned. It is the atmosphere. You cannot get away from it. One individual case may be generalised, and one of these big cities may be informed that all sorts of murders are being committed, which may be all falsehoods. But the point is that when acts have been committed in the presence of respectable men and women, acts to which they are ready to testify, and if these are denied, then everything else is believed, however wrong it may be. Let me draw the attention of my Honourable friends to this aspect. I know, as I have said, how false rumours can be spread deliberately, but inexcusable mistakes on the part of Government officers give justification for all of them.

Mr. President, I have said enough on this occasion. May I again repeat that I have done so with a sincere and honest desire that the acts of Government may not be misconstrued and that Government here and in other provinces may see that, by mistakes on the part of their officers, their good intentions and their actions are not misunderstood by millions of the people of this country and they may not play into the hands of their enemies which, I am afraid, many of their officers are doing. We are living in dangerous times. I have never been the last to express my condemnation of the civil disobedience movement. I see clearly how it is going to end. Whatever its advocates may say, it is doomed to failure, and if we did not think that it was doomed to failure, then the majority of my Honourable friends behind me would be with this movement. We realise that the movement is based on wrong foundations, that it can never succeed and it can never bring India happiness. It can never bring India nearer to the goal of her aspirations. That is why we have condemned it and we are prepared to adopt another method, namely, the Round Table Conference, which we know has chances of success. And those chances of success will depend, not upon the mentality of my Honourable friends here

who belong to the minority and majority communities, but will depend upon the mentality of the statesmen in England. All I can say is : may Providence guide them aright ; and if India's united voice is to be again defied, then God help England and God help India.

Mr. N. G. Ranga (East Godavari and West Godavari *cum* Kistna : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, it is very difficult for me now to decide what to say, and how much to say, because I do not know how much time I am going to be allowed. It is already the closing time. Anyway, I must, first of all, protest against one of the statements made by the last speaker before I proceed with my own discussion. It is said that the movement that is being carried on in the country is doomed to failure. Sir, I am not so sure about it. I do not approve of it. We must realise, as honest people, that there are two parties in the country who are fighting, one is the Government, and the other is the Congress, and we do not know who is going to win. They are willing and anxious to see that it is a fight to the finish. We are anxious that these two parties should be brought together and made to accept reason, peace and conciliation. It is really too early, and it would be disastrous and even inadvisable and unwise for us to say that one party is going to win and the other party is going to lose.

Now, Sir, coming to the question of the Round Table Conference, I am one of those who have welcomed the great Viceregal announcement of 31st October, last. I am one of those who really thought that India stood to gain by not opposing the Simon Commission ; but what has happened till now since then ? In spite of the support that has been given to the Simon Commission by many people, who have been accused as being traitors to their own country, the Simon Commission to-day have hurled upon India a Report which is unjustifiable from whatever point of view we may look at it. Now, so far as the Round Table Conference is concerned, everyone of us expected much from it. Everyone of us was convinced, or felt at the time when the great Viceregal announcement was made, that here was a chance by which India was going to attain Dominion Status. More than six months have elapsed, and yet to-day we are no nearer to Dominion Status than we were before the 31st October. We were expecting great messages from His Excellency the Viceroy, as well as the Secretary of State for India, and only the other day His Excellency the Viceroy made a sincere appeal for co-operation between Indians and the English. At the same time, he made a very ineffective appeal, because he was not able to satisfy a large majority of the people of this country as to the *bonâ fides* of his Government and the Government in England. Sir, what are we going to do in the Round Table Conference ? Are we going to set up the future constitution for India ? If so, is it not necessary that both the parties in this Conference, Indians on the one side and the English on the other, should be prepared to co-operate with one another on terms of equality, goodwill and good humour ? Where is the good humour that is absolutely necessary ? Where is the idea of equality or concession of equality from the English to the Indians ? In India to-day we are faced with a nation-wide agitation with which most of us, I dare say, are not in sympathy, and we have made it clear on the floor of this House. At the same time there is that movement in this country, and this movement has had the support of the people, not to the small extent that has been put by one of the leaders of my own party, but it has the support of a large majority of the people of this country, although it may be they have been misguided. Well, Sir, what have the Government been doing till now ? Instead of giving a

[Mr. N. G. Ranga.]

chance for the Round Table Conference to decide the future constitution of India, the English Government have chosen, Sir, to give wide publicity to this disastrous and mischievous Report, the Simon Commission's Report, by advertising it and by selling it cheaply. To-day it has been stated that the first edition has run out and the second reprint is coming out shortly and is expected to sell out. In addition to that, as my Honourable friend behind me just reminds me, the Secretary of State, Mr. Benn, has announced in the House of Commons that he is considering seriously the possibility and the necessity for getting this Report translated into as many languages as possible, so that England can carry on as much mischievous, disastrous and useless propaganda against India on behalf of England not only in England, but also in all the countries of the world to justify the position of England and to justify the diehardism of England. Sir, is this the atmosphere in which the Round Table Conference should meet? Is this the time when a Conference called the Round Table Conference should meet in England, where the future constitution of India can be discussed?

What is the part that is being played by the Government of India itself? Is the Government of India trying its best to see that the number of friends for itself and for the ideal of the Round Table Conference is increasing? Instead of that, as my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir put it, they have attempted to try to increase their enemies. All their actions have resulted in increasing the number of their own enemies in this country, although these enemies are as anxious as my Honourable friends on the opposite side of the House to have a strongly organised Government to maintain law and order in this country. If you go anywhere in the country from which I come, the Andhra country, you will find that there is not even one important person who is prepared today to stake all his property and all his position in supporting the Government. Why is it so, Sir? Only till the other day there were a number of people who called themselves co-operators, who called themselves Justicites and who came forth willingly and gladly to support the Simon Commission. And why should it be that all these millions of people should today be ranged on the side of anarchism, on the side of those people who are against the Government? What is the cause? It is all very well, it is all very easy for my Honourable friends on the other side to say that they are not responsible for this state of things, but that it is civil disobedience and its adherents who really are the cause for this uprising of anarchy and for this atmosphere of anarchy. On the other hand, let them have some patience and let me say to them that in none of the important cities in the Northern Circars on the Coromandel Coast, is it possible for any one to organise a meeting, whether it be for the peaceful purpose of co-operative movement, or for anarchical purposes, or for the purpose of the civil disobedience movement. Only the other day, when a co-operative conference was about to be held in Guntur, the police authorities prevented its being held on the plea that there was section 144 in force. This demon of section 144 is visiting every place. It is a contagious disease, which is spreading from place to place. The whole of the country which I represent is now subject to the virulent attack of this demon of section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, as I would put it. In addition to that, you have what is known as a ban on the Gandhi cap. I can wear a Gandhi cap here, but I cannot wear it in Guntur. If I go there tomorrow, though I am a Member of this august Assembly, with this cap, I would be clapped in jail. Do you think that

that is a thing which any self-respecting Government, which any civilised Government, a Government which is really anxious that Indians should come to terms with it, that Indians should co-operate with it, that Indians should accept the olive branch as it now says it is offering, should do ?

Again today we are told that there is local self-government in this country. We are told, "Look here, the Simon Commission have recommended provincial autonomy. You are going to get it. Why don't you go to the Round Table Conference ?" Well, Sir, what are we having in that part of the country from which I come ? In Guntur, the Collector issued a mandate to the Municipality of Guntur, stating clearly that, unless each and every member of that house voted in favour of the removal of the National Flag by a particular date—that was the 21st of last month—unless this was done, each and every member was liable to be arrested. It is a statutory body. It is a public body and that body has already taken that particular decision, namely, to hoist the National Flag on the Municipal Office. Now here are the members who are threatened with arrest. Do you want to convert all of them into anarchists ? Or do you want them to remain loyalists, moderates and co-operators ? This has happened in my district. If they decided to keep the flag flying, they would have been clapped in jail, and you would have accused them as being irresponsible people, as being mad people. On the other hand, they have, except for two courageous people, rescinded their own past Resolution and they have passed another Resolution saying that they are prepared to remove it. You are prepared to applaud them, I suppose. Sir, no self-respecting Indian in this country, who has got one decent drop of blood in him, can congratulate them. At the same time I sympathise with them. I do not expect them, I do not want to advise them to become unwise, to become mad people. Sir, there were police excesses everywhere. I went to several places myself. I have seen broken heads, I have seen broken limbs of several people. I have seen many people lying down in the hospitals in villages like Angalur, Gudlavalleru, Kantaram, Gudivada, Ellore and other places. In addition to that, I have seen doors broken, windows broken, houses broken into, and women insulted. It does not stop there. There were *dhobies* who were threatened with imprisonment if they washed *khaddar* cloths. All people were beaten there, whether they were *khaddar* clad people or foreign cloth clad people, wherever they were found. Look at the humour of the police action. They simply go to a gathering of five or six people and ask them to disperse. When they start dispersing, the police begin to beat them. To avoid this beating, if they run, they are still beaten until they are able to get into their houses. I know of cases where people were taken by their pig-tails out of their homes into the streets and insulted as being cowards for having run away from the police. Is this the kind of action, is this the kind of behaviour that a civilised Government should exhibit in this country, if the Government of India expect to establish a proper atmosphere for the Round Table Conference ?

Again there were police excesses in Rajahmundry. As my Honourable friend Sir Cowasji Jehangir has put it, certainly there might have been exaggerations, and to some of the responsible and authorised exponents of British law formed themselves into a body of inquiry to inquire into the police excesses and stop the exaggerations, if any. And what did the local authorities do ? They simply sent them an order informing them that they should not form themselves into a committee of inquiry. When they refused to abide by this police decision, the great demon of section 144

[Mr. N. G. Ranga.]

was hurled upon them, and so they had to stop their inquiry. Is this the atmosphere that you are creating ?

As my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir has put it, it is not the number of people who have been hurt, killed or insulted which is the most important thing, but it is the kind of atmosphere that is being created in this country which really matters. Can any one of the Honourable Members of this Assembly, however proud, however aristocratic, and however great he may be, go to any place in the Andhra country today and tell them to go to the Round Table Conference where they will get all kinds of reforms and more power for their own country ? Can you talk sense to them ? Can you make them realise the benefits that they are deriving from this peaceful Government ? Can you make them see the necessity for law and order ? Not at all, because the people have gone almost mad ; mad, because they have been asking for freedom and they have been denied it ; they have been asking for constitutional advance, and they have been denied it. They have been expecting more improvement, and what has been offered today is nothing. This Commission's Report is a regular insult to the self-respect, to the manhood and also to the hopes and desires of Indians. Sir, we cannot go on at this rate.

I really want a Round Table Conference, I want it at once. I want peace and goodwill to reign between England and India. I know that England, of all the Imperialistic countries, is the best. I was in England for six years, and I can claim to have as many English friends as my English friends in this House can claim to have Indian friends for themselves, friends for whom I have got great regard, friends with whom I have moved for years. And yet, Sir, I cannot understand the attitude of Government here and their supporters in England in bringing about the kind of atmosphere that we are now having in this country. If we are to have peace and goodwill to reign between these two great countries and nations, what we should try to do is somehow or other to get hold of these people who are today making a mad and desperate attempt to grasp at the fruit of freedom and liberty. Government may say, " How are we to get hold of these people, when you yourselves say that they are mad and will refuse to grasp the hand of fellowship which we offered in October 31 ? " Sir, what did the British Government do in Ireland ? They asked the professed Irish rebels, some of them condemned to death, to come and meet their responsible officers and Ministers. You can ask the Congress to do the same thing. You can ask them to stop this agitation and say that you are prepared to offer this particular promise of implementing the scheme of Dominion Status at the forthcoming Round Table Conference. Is that more indecent and undignified than the offer which was made by the mighty British Government to the professed rebels of Ireland ?

Again, Sir, I wish to put another question. How are you going to end this impasse which, as you say, these civil disobedience people have brought about ? Is it by the breaking of heads, or is it by conciliation, by bringing them round to follow the path of wisdom and responsibility in their actions ? We have got Dr. Ansari, one of the greatest of Congressmen, an *ex-President* of the Congress, ready to help as far as possible and mediate between the Government of India and Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal. If again Government wish to take that course, a glorious opportunity has been given by Mr. Slocombe, the special representative

of the *Daily Herald*, by his interviews with Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal. He showed to the British Government and also to the Indian Government that these people, who are supposed to be mad, have got some sense in them and are prepared to come to terms with the British Government. Are not the Liberal leaders, men like my leader here, Mr. Jayakar, anxious that Dominion Status should be achieved for India? They have asked for it time and again. What more is being asked today by Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal? Nothing more than the "Substance of Independence". What else is it but Dominion Status as it is understood in the Dominions and also in England by responsible politicians and statesmen? Every one is anxious to have the same thing. Why is it so difficult for Government somehow or other to assure the people that they can go to the Round Table Conference without any injury to their ideas or to their conception of self-respect? Why do they not take this initiative? Is it beneath their dignity? Is it not their duty somehow or other to bring back the people who are going mad? Bring them back again into your fold and see that these people are able to enjoy the peaceful, progressive, civilised and respectable form of Government which they desire. In these circumstances, since the British Government and the Government of India have failed to implement a scheme of Dominion Status, since the British Government and the Government of India have failed to bring about conciliation in this country amongst the different sections of the people and themselves, I think it is really beneath the dignity of any self-respecting Indian to go to the Round Table Conference. It is not proper for us to go to that Conference, however beneficial, however useful and however tempting it may be. I know the Honourable the leader of the Independent Party, Mr. Jinnah, is very very confident of his own powers of advocacy and his ability to go to the British people and convince them of the reasonableness, the sacredness and the justice of his own case for Dominion Status. But, Sir, I wish to tell him most respectfully and humbly that if the whole of the civil disobedience movement is not able to reason with the British Government and the Government of India, although it is supposed to be a mad movement, would it be possible for one Mr. Jinnah, however intellectually great he may be, to convince the British Government who have already made up their minds about the Round Table Conference and also about the Simon Report? Would it not be better for him, intellectually eminent as he is, to stand by the side of the people and say, "Do not go on in that mad rush, but come and let us fight with this Government. It may be the Government is Satanic, but it has still a bit of reasoning capacity in it. Let us go and attack it." Of course, up till now, there have been very few signs of reasoning powers in the Government of India. At the same time, of course you should not take my expression "Satanic form of Government" to be absolutely and literally true, because it consists of human beings who are agents of the Satanic Government, and it may be possible for us to convince these human beings, in some sub-conscious way, to change the very character of this form of Government. That is why I am extremely anxious that my leader, Mr. Jayakar, and also Mr. Jinnah should remain here on the floor of the House and say it is beneath their dignity to go to the Round Table Conference.

There is yet another point. In the Viceregal announcement that has been made, it is stated that the representatives of India should go to England to confer with—not the representatives of the British Government—but the

[Mr. N. G. Ranga.]

representatives of the British people. This is a new expression ; and it jars on my ears. Hitherto we have been given to understand that our people are to go into that conference with the representatives of the British Government and we were not given to understand, or even to guess, that the conference was to be between the people of India and the people of England. Sir, if it is going to be the latter conference, I can assure you, if it were to be given to me to forecast events, that nothing more than the Simon Commission recommendations will be got for India in its future constitution.

Secondly, Sir, the Viceroy, in his announcement, said that people of all different parties will be welcomed and invited, but he did not state that the leaders of these different parties in the country are going to be consulted in a responsible manner before the representatives for the Round Table Conference are selected. The Honourable Mr. Jinnah gave the warning to the Government, that Government should try its best to see that it did not get into a mess and that it selected proper representatives of the people who could deliver the goods. Sir, I wish to address a question to him as to how far he can feel confident that Government will show reason and sense in selecting responsible people to represent India, even if we are to ignore, for the time being, the followers of the civil disobedience movement and Gandhiji himself ? Can he feel confident, taking the Government's past into consideration, that the Government have got that much of wisdom or sense as to invite only such men as can really deliver the goods on behalf of the different communities of which this country is composed ? Can he feel sure about it ? I do not ; and that is another reason why I oppose this particular motion. I would like to oppose the whole of this motion. If that is not permitted, I should like to support the cut. There is a mischievous suggestion on the floor of this House by one responsible speaker that this cut should be withdrawn. I protest against that ; I do not approve of it ; it is the sacred duty of every one of the elected Members of this House, as was indicated by Mr. Jinnah, to vote for this cut in order to show in an emphatic manner our indignation, our dissatisfaction and our disillusionment against the past as well as the present policy of the Government.

Mr. President : Anxious as I am that as many Honourable Members as possible should get an opportunity to speak in this important debate, under the powers which are vested in the Chair, I prescribe a time limit of fifteen minutes for each Honourable Member to speak.

Sir Hugh Cocke (Bombay : European) : Sir, I have listened with very great interest to the speeches.....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : May I rise to a point of order ? I thought when I raised the point you said you had no power at all.

Mr. President : What I meant was that no time limit was prescribed by law. But the President, I suppose, has the power to prescribe a time limit if he wants to do so.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : What is the time limit you have prescribed now ?

Mr. President : Fifteen minutes.

Sir Hugh Cocke : I have listened, Sir, with very great interest to the speeches which have been made today and yesterday. I do not propose to follow the course which has been taken by many Honourable Members of discussing in detail or even in a general way the recommendations of the Statutory Commission. I should like to remind the House once more that that Commission was appointed for a definite purpose, namely, to inform Parliament of the state of progress in India and to make recommendations for a future constitution. It is not surprising that Indians should not agree, in the first place, with the composition of that Commission, or, in the second place, with its findings. I think that there is very good material in that Report, but I do not for a moment suggest that we agree on these Benches with every part of it ; it has to be taken more as a guide or a basis for discussion, and it is a Report which, I venture to think, will be found to be extremely useful when we get round the table. One reason why I do not desire to go into particular recommendations is that I am very slow myself, not having a quick legal brain, to come to conclusions on the recommendations. The morning they were published I had a Press representative in my office at about 12 o'clock wanting my opinion on the Report. When I told him that I had not even completely read a summary but only the headlines, he suggested that it was quite enough and that he had already got several opinions. But I said that I was not following that course. The Report is being examined by the Associations which represent European interests in this country and by their various branches, and it will take time to digest the Report and to decide what particular recommendations they agree with and what they are opposed to. It is often said—I do not know whether it has been said in this debate—that Europeans in this country are diehards and are not prepared to work with Indians to secure a more responsible constitution. If that has been true at any time, it is not true today. I can safely say, on behalf of the European interests, from such opinions as we have been able to gather up here from Calcutta, Madras and other places, that there is no diehard spirit today among the Europeans. (Hear, hear.) Our object is to assist India to get a constitution which is suitable and acceptable ; and if any degree of unanimity can be reached at the Round Table Conference, to which our representatives will go, you can rely on us to press those recommendations home with the authorities in England. I see no reason why, in spite of the fact that many conferences have been held and have failed to reach any degree of unanimity, I see no reason why, having regard to the spirit which exists, we should not reach agreement on many many points when we get round the table ; and the diehards in England, who have never been to India or perhaps only visited it many years ago, are not going to dictate to India, provided we can all come to a reasonable solution of the various problems.

Sir, many points have been touched on in this debate with reference to the Commission's recommendations, and I have already said that I do not wish to enter into them ; but those who consider that the Report is not worthy of being read and that it should not even be taken to the Round Table Conference are, I think, being unjust to the Commission.

5 P.M.

It is perfectly true that the Commission consisted of seven British gentlemen. It is also perfectly true that they had not a lifelong knowledge of India, which gentlemen in this

[Sir Hugh Cocke.]

House have. But the fact remains that they made a very exhaustive study of the constitutions in the other Dominions and of the conditions prevailing in India today, and I think that when their recommendations are carefully examined, it will be found that many of them are probably the most useful which can be obtained. It is all very well to condemn the recommendations which appear in the Report. It is quite another matter to substitute others which are more satisfactory and which are more likely to meet with general acceptance. I should like to join with those Honourable Members of this House who have spoken today in expressing the hope that it will still be possible, although the time is very short, to get the representatives of the Congress to the Conference. It has been suggested today that the initiative for this must come from the Government. I think, Sir, that the first move must come from those who started the movement, and I hope Honourable Members who have spoken about the importance of the co-operation of the Congress leaders will try and get into touch with those who started and who are carrying on the non-co-operation movement and the civil disobedience movement with a view to getting them to the Round Table Conference, because I feel quite sure that Government will not be able to resist any approach from them. Nor do I think that Government will be able to resist any desire from responsible men to get into touch with the leaders of the Congress who are now in jail. I trust, therefore, that the Members of this House will use all their influence, in the short time that remains, to get into touch with the Congress representatives with a view to getting them to the Round Table Conference. If the Congress representatives do not go to the Round Table Conference, it will be said afterwards that the decisions which have been arrived at at the Conference will not be acceptable to Indians, because representatives of a large section of Indians were not present at the Conference. I think it is very desirable that that should be avoided if possible. I know the difficulties are very great, and it remains for those who have influence with the Congress Party to get into touch with them and to do their best to induce them to come to the Round Table Conference.

Mr. Adit Prasad Singh (Darbhanga *cum* Saran : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I beg to rise to press one point which is by far the novel point and which deserves the most serious consideration of this Honourable House. Sir, in paragraph 296, at page 257 of Volume II of the Commissioners' Report, they speak about new provincial taxes, among which that on agricultural incomes is conspicuous by its high figure. Sir, the Honourable Members of this House are well aware that India is mostly an agricultural country. The poor rayat population of India are already heavily burdened, or rather overburdened with so many taxes that they can hardly meet their requirements in spite of their hard struggle for bare existence and the necessities of life. Take the case of the zemindars and other landlords. In almost every case they pay at a very high rate to the utmost capacity land revenue to Government. It is so hard in their case that several old and ancient zemindaries have been sold for arrears of revenue. Be he the poor rayat or the rich zemindar, every one will be hard hit by this oppressive tax. Moreover Sir, this will be quite contrary to and against the existing laws of the land. This will be not only against engagements and declarations of Government at the

time of the Permanent Settlement, but against all the existing laws and Acts for imposing income tax from the year 1818 till 1930.

There is another matter in the Report which seriously affects the zemindars. The very meagre representation which the zemindars enjoyed under the Montford reforms is proposed to be taken away. If the Honourable Members will be pleased to analyse the reasons given by the Commissioners for the abolition of the existing separate landholders' constituency, they will at once see the fallacy of the arguments advanced by the Commissioners in support of their views. The Commissioners say that the landlords predominate in the Councils and Legislative Assembly, as they manage to get in through other constituencies, ignoring the fact that such landlords do not get in as landlords, but say as Swarajists or on other tickets abandoning the landlords' interests. It would not be correct to say that they are the representatives of the zemindars. Moreover, as Honourable Members are aware, every professional man or man of business owns some land and is called a zemindar, whereas his main interest is in something else. It would not be fair to classify them as representatives of the zemindars, as the Commissioners have done.

Sir, with these words, I, on behalf of agriculturists and landholders, condemn the Simon Commission's Report. Therefore, with all the force at my command, I hope this House will pay a very serious attention to this aspect of the question.

Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda (Ajmer-Merwara : General) : Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz, proposing a cut of Rs. 100 in demand No. 75. Though the policy and the general merits of the Round Table Conference are under discussion in this House, we have heard very little about the Round Table Conference itself, while we have heard a great deal about the Simon Commission. Is this not a sure indication, Sir, does it not clearly show, that the chief work before the Round Table Conference will be the consideration and the discussion of the Simon Commission's Report. That Report, Sir, is a very vicious document. It is a Report based partly on one-sided evidence which Government has laid before the Commission, and partly on the evidence produced before it by persons who have openly and clearly advocated their own sectional interest ; but apart from all this, there are many recommendations in the Report which are not based on any evidence or any facts and thus reveal the Commission's reactionary designs. To illustrate this latter—recommendations based on no evidence—I will give the House one instance. While dealing with the Minor Administrations, the Commission, in the first Volume of their Report, say that Ajmer-Merwara is a Non-Regulation province, administered by a Chief Commissioner, but that the people of Ajmer-Merwara enjoy the privilege of electing a Member to the Central Legislature. In the second Volume, containing their recommendations, the Commission, without proposing any political advance in the province, say the administration should remain as it is, that the Chief Commissioner, should continue to administer the province, but they go further and recommend that the privilege enjoyed by the people of Ajmer-Merwara to elect a Member to the Legislative Assembly should be taken away from them and the Local Government should be empowered to nominate a Member to the Central Legislature. Now, Sir, no evidence has been produced before

[Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda.]

the Commission advocating this view. Neither the Hindus nor the Muhammadans have asked for it. The Commission have given no reasons whatever in support of their recommendations as to why the people of Ajmer-Merwara should be deprived of their right of representation by election, and why nomination should be substituted for election. Sir, does this not clearly show the hostile attitude of the Commission towards India, her rights and her claims and does it not show the reactionary policy of the Commission ?

This Report, Sir, is an unmitigated evil except for one good suggestion—the enfranchisement of women. It unfolds in reality a scheme of dark designs, the darkness of which is unrelieved by any ray of sympathy, goodwill or justice. If the Simon Commission's Report is at all allowed to come for consideration before the Round Table Conference, what guarantee is there that the dominant party in the Conference will not make the misleading case, presented by it, the basis of their recommendations for the future constitution of this country ?

The Report, Sir, should be banned ; it should be thrown on to the scrap heap.

A learned and Honourable colleague of mine on these Benches declared yesterday that he was not afraid to go before the Conference and put his case before an impartial tribunal. An eminent advocate that he is, convinced of the justice of his case as he is, he is prepared to go and put his case before any impartial tribunal. But is he satisfied that the conditions which he envisages to exist do actually exist ? Is there any impartial and disinterested tribunal which will judge his case ? Is he quite sure that the tribunal before which he will put his case, prejudiced as it must be by the Report submitted by a Commission containing people representing all the parties in Parliament and some of whom are members of the present British Cabinet,—that they will be so disinterested as not to be influenced by the misleading facts that have been placed before the public in that Report ? And, then, is he quite sure that that tribunal is disinterested ? The first qualification of an impartial judge is that he has no interest whatever in the case that is before him. Is he quite sure that that tribunal, which is the custodian of the interests of Britain, is merely a disinterested observer of events in India, and is not interested at all whether the domination of a foreign power over this country is maintained or loosened, whether the power which the constituents of that tribunal have over the resources of this country is retained by those constituents or given up by them ? Sir, it is no use talking of impartiality and disinterestedness. It is time that this camouflage about impartiality, about the white man's burden, about disinterested service rendered by Englishmen to India was given up.

Sir, some people lay the unction to their disturbed souls, hoping against hope, that the Simon Commission's Report will be only one item amongst several other items before the Conference. Deluded are they who think so. What guarantee is there that the party whose interests lie that way will not base its decision on that one item ? Can you prevent a judge from basing his decision on any piece of relevant evidence which is placed before him ? It is therefore absolutely hopeless to expect

fair play before any tribunal when the opposite party holds loaded dice in its hands. The dice are loaded in their favour by this Report and fair play can not be expected. Therefore, this Simon Commission's Report must be thrown on to the scrap heap. It should in fact be buried deep on the English shore, a cable's length from the sea. It is only then that you can expect to have fair play in the Round Table Conference.

Sir, I am not against going to the Round Table Conference at all. I am not against meeting any opponents or others anywhere. But when we do meet and have a game, let there be a fair game. If this be secured, I would have no objection to going to the Conference, I would not only advocate going to the Round Table Conference, but I would, speaking for myself, vote not only the amount which is claimed in Demands Nos. 75 and 85, but would gladly vote four times that amount, if I could be sure that there would be fair play in that Conference and that all those who do really represent the people and the interests of this country will participate in that Conference.

Pandit Chuni Lal (Jullundur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I will oppose this cut and support the original motion for the grant with the following remark, that the vote of this House should not be pressed to a division on this cut. If we vote in favour of the cut and carry the motion, it means that we are not in favour of the Simon Commission's Report. But that is not the case. The Honourable the Mover of this cut motion, I mean Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz, has said that it does secure an advance on the present state of the constitution in India, and many other Honourable Members are also of the same opinion. Again, if we reject this motion of my Honourable friend, that means that we endorse the Simon Commission's Report, which again is not the case, I suppose, because nobody wishes that it should be the guiding principle of our constitutional destiny. I beg to submit that it will place us in a wrong position altogether. I therefore submit to the House that we should not go to a division on this motion.

The other question which I wanted to place before the House is this. Directly or indirectly, this motion means, if it is carried, that we stand for the boycott of the Round Table Conference.

Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz : Nothing of the kind, if you will read my motion.

Pandit Chuni Lal :

“ This is required for expenditure in India in connection with the Round Table Conference to be held in London in October next for the purpose of considering the forthcoming general constitutional revision.”

The Demand states that the amount is required for the expenses that are to be incurred in connection with the Round Table Conference. If this cut motion is carried, it will mean that we stand for the boycott of the Round Table Conference. My submission is that that is not the view that I have been able to gather from the various speeches that have been made in this House by so many Honourable Members since yesterday. I therefore say that this motion should not be supported.

Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz : How do you say that my motion will have that effect ?

Pandit Chuni Lal : Because the Demand is directly connected with the expenses that are to be incurred in connection with the Round Table Conference that is coming off. It has got nothing to do directly with the Simon Commission's Report or the recommendations made in that Report. On the other hand, it has everything to do with the expenses that are to be incurred in connection with the Conference. It has got two portions ; one portion to be spent in India, and the other portion in London. I therefore submit that it will not be to the credit of this House if we pass this vote of censure against the Government by voting for this cut, and at the same time say that we are in favour of the Round Table Conference.

Now, Sir, I come to the subject matter of the present discussion. So far as that point is concerned, my submission is that the idea of holding a Round Table Conference is no doubt an unique triumph of this Honourable House. It was in 1924, as was remarked by Mr. M. K. Acharya, that this demand was unanimously made by all the elected Members of this House, and the appointment of the Round Table Conference is a success and a triumph for this House. Whatever detractors on both sides may say, it is, of course, a great opportunity. I say, Sir, with all the force that I can command, that we should not lose this opportunity, because, if we lose this opportunity and boycott, or do not take advantage of this Round Table Conference, we will be told that we were judged and found wanting. If the opportunity is lost, I do not mean to say that we will be hopelessly lost for ever, but it will mean another period of trial and suffering for the country. True statesmanship lies in taking hold of the psychological moment, and that is the reason why, in my opinion, we must take advantage of this and do our best for the betterment of the country. The Round Table Conference will mean that the leaders of both the nations will have to sit together round a table—whether it is round or otherwise—and put their shoulders to the wheel in order to make constitutional progress that is acceptable to this country possible. Now, Sir, knowing what are the duties of the elected Members of this House, I also say that the Government have got a very clear duty to perform. They must know that the movement that is going on in the country at the present day is not a temporary phase. This movement, I would submit, is an expression of a deep malady, a malady which is the outcome of economic and social unrest. My submission is that the Round Table Conference that is going to be held will not be a success, it will not serve the purpose for which it is meant, if it is not representative. The best of India—I mean the greatest son of India, Mahatma Gandhi—with all his followers, both men and women, is behind the prison walls. With about 20,000 of them in jail, we cannot talk of negotiations for peace. I therefore wish to join hands with the Honourable Mr. Sen, when he appealed strongly to the Government to find out some way of reconciliation with the Congress leaders. I read from the papers that a section of the Congress are thinking of revising their old policy. If we can get a genuine gesture for these Congress people from the Government, then I am confident that the people will take up that gesture and then we can very well ignore the revolutionary portion of the Congress. If that can be possible, then of course we shall be successful in arriving at a settlement which will give us peace, so that India and England may go on together for some time at least. Otherwise the Round Table Conference will be a mere formal ceremony.

Now, Sir, if we are in favour of going to the Round Table Conference, we should not carry this cut. In that view there is no reason to oppose this Demand of Rs. 2,66,000. On the contrary we must oppose this cut which has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Shah Nawaz. Almost all the parties in the House have supported the idea of going to the Round Table Conference. Some of them have been saying that they are very anxious to go to the Round Table Conference. Therefore it does not stand to reason that we should oppose this Demand, which represents the sum which is meant for the expenses of the Round Table Conference, which they are all very anxious to join.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 12th July, 1930.