

12th 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 QAIYUM, K.C.I.E., M.L.

Secretary.

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

Assistant of the Secretary.

RAI SAHIB D. DUTT.

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 11TH JULY, 1930—	
Member Sworn	99
Statement of Business	99
The Negotiable Instruments (Second Amendment) Bill—Presenta- tion 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 Govern- ment	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	379—427
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	427

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 12th July, 1930.

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

ELECTION OF THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY AND GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. President : I have received the following Message from His Excellency the Governor General :

(The Message was received by the Assembly standing.)

"In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 63C of the Government of India Act, I, Edward Frederick Lindley, Baron Irwin, hereby signify that I approve the election by the Legislative Assembly of Sir Hari Singh Gour as Deputy President of the said Assembly." (Cheers.)

SIMLA,
The 11th July, 1930.

(Sd.) IRWIN,
Viceroy and Governor General."

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INDIAN RESEARCH FUND ASSOCIATION.

Sir Frank Noyce (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands) : Sir, I move that this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, two Members to sit on the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association in place of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas and Dr. Moonje, who have ceased to be Members of this House.

Sir, a few words of explanation are I think due to the House in support of a Resolution which, at first sight, may seem unnecessary as the tenure of the two Members of the House who are to be elected to sit on the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association will in the nature of things be very short. As the House will doubtless remember, in February last, in the course of the debate on a Resolution moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I gave an undertaking that the Government would not proceed further with the scheme for the location of the Central Medical Research Institute at Dehra Dun until they were in receipt of the views of a conference consisting of representatives of the Medical Faculties of the different Universities, the Director General of the Indian Medical Service, the Public Health Commissioner with the Government of India, the Director

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

of the Central Research Institute, Kasauli, a representative of the All-India Medical Association, and two Members of this House and one Member of the Council of State. That conference has been fixed for the 21st of this month. It has not been possible to hold it earlier for two reasons, partly because the material to be presented to it was not complete, but mainly because Major-General Graham, the Public Health Commissioner, and Colonel Christophers, the Director of the Central Research Institute, Kasauli, have been in Europe. Colonel Christophers only returned a few days ago, and General Graham reached India yesterday. It appeared to Government that the obvious representatives of this House were the two Members it had elected to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association, which is very closely interested in this matter. Unfortunately both of them have resigned and, in these circumstances, it is necessary to fill their places in order that this House may be suitably represented at the conference which is to meet on the 21st. Sir, I move.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President : I may inform Honourable Members that for the purpose of election of members to fill the vacancies caused by the resignation of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas and Dr. Moonje on the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association the Assembly Office will be open to receive nominations up to 12 Noon on Monday, the 14th July, 1930, and that the election, if necessary, will take place in this Chamber on Tuesday the 15th July, 1930. The election will be held in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS—*concl'd.*

MISCELLANEOUS—*concl'd.*

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

Mr. President : The House will now resume the discussion on the cut moved by Mr. Shah Nawaz to the motion of the Honourable Sir George Schuster.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Farookhi, did right in trying to focus the attention of this House on the great desirability of securing a proper atmosphere for the holding of this Conference in London. I was rather distressed to note His Excellency the Viceroy's observation, when he addressed this House last, to the effect that Government were determined to prosecute their fight against the civil disobedience movement. I have no quarrel with Government in their desire to uphold law and order. Indeed my very presence here to-day ought to signify that I have nothing in common with the civil disobedience movement (Hear, hear) ; but what I maintain is that if the Government must fight, it must be a clean

fight : and I am here to-day, Sir, to tell this House from my own experience that the fight has been anything but clean so far as my experience goes. I was rather interested to hear the Honourable the Home Member while he made an interruption during the speech of my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasjee Jehangir yesterday. He said, with perfect naiveté, that he did not know that innocent persons had been assaulted.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig (Home Member) : That is not what I said, Sir.

An Honourable Member : He said that he did not know that innocent persons had been deliberately assaulted.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : The Honourable the Home Member inquired as to whether innocent persons had been deliberately assaulted. Sir, I am here to tell him that every word of the accusation that fell from my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, on this point is true, and that what is happening in Bombay is happening almost all over India. Either the Honourable Member chooses to keep his eyes shut, or he is incompetent to hold his present office. Sir, from my own experience I have found that it is nothing but the spirit of General Dyer, nothing but the spirit that prompted the Jallianwala Bagh, that is stalking this land. Jallianwala Baghs are being enacted every day all over India ; and if the Honourable the Home Member pretends ignorance about it, all I can say is that he is not fit to discharge the obligations of his office and that I do not consider that he is loyal to His Excellency the Viceroy, because I have no doubt about the sincerity of His Excellency in his desire to promote an atmosphere of peace and goodwill in this land so that this Conference may come to useful conclusions.

Sir, what I have seen with my own eyes in Bengal enables me to bear testimony to the reign of terror that has been instituted during the Haig-Emerson regime. I do not know whether the Honourable the Home Member cares to read all that appears in the newspapers. But the reports that have appeared from time to time in the various newspapers, particularly of Bengal, contain enough evidence of what I am alleging here. The Government, however, instead of taking the straightforward course of prosecuting any of these newspapers for any alleged misrepresentation of facts, have promulgated the Press Ordinance in order to gag the Press. I will not draw the attention of the Honourable the Home Member to the reports that have appeared from time to time in the daily newspapers of Bengal or in the periodical Press, but I should like to know if his attention has been drawn to the pictures that have appeared in these papers. Sir, men may lie, even Government officials may lie, but I do not think the camera lies. Here is a photo of a ten year old boy beaten senseless by the District Magistrate with his hunting crop. He is lying in the laps of three ladies. This appeared in a leading periodical on the 1st of May. Has any action been taken against this publication ? Has the District Magistrate of Midnapore sued the editor for damages ? Have the Government taken any notice of it ? Will it merely do for the Honourable the Home Member to get up in this House and say that all that appears in the Press is false ? That is hardly sufficient ; things have gone too far now.

Sir, I will now come to another story. When these allegations about the excesses of the police began to reach us in Calcutta, we held a conference of a number of responsible men, because at the present

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

moment it is not possible to hold a public meeting in Calcutta, thanks to the promulgation of section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code. The conference decided to appoint a non-official committee of inquiry to go about and see things for themselves and make a report. The Chairman of this Committee was Mr. J. N. Basu, M.L.C., President of the Indian Association, which is the leading liberal body in Bengal. I am very pleased to find the Honourable the Law Member in his seat to-day, because I want him to tell this House as to whether the testimony of Mr. Basu can be relied upon. I understand that Mr. Basu has been selected as one of the members of the Indian delegation to the Round Table Conference. It may or may not be true, but I do not think the Honourable the Law Member would question his competency to represent India at that place. Mr. J. N. Basu was the Chairman of this Committee, and the names of the other members are as follows :

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta, Senior Advocate, who was in the Bengal Legislative Council for many years. He sat there even during the Morley-Minto days. Mr. B. N. Sasmal, Barrister, an *ex*-M.L.C. Mr. P. Banerji, a present Member of the Legislative Council, who fought the Congress and defeated the Congress candidate. Dr. J. N. Maitra, another *ex*-M.L.C., who is a very eminent physician of Calcutta. Then there was myself and a Professor, Mr. P. R. Sen of the Calcutta University, who has so far taken no part in politics, myself and Professor Sen being the Secretaries of this Committee. The first place we went down to was Contai, wherefrom most of these reports had been coming. Now, what happened the very first morning when we went out to visit certain localities from which we had received certain definite allegations ? The first thing that happened to us was that we got arrested, all of us, including Mr. Basu. (*Cries of "Shame, shame" from Non-Official Benches.*) Will the Honourable Members bear with me when I give the circumstances of the arrest from the report of this Committee and may I pause and tell this House as to how effectively the present Government policy has been operating in Bengal. We have found it impossible to get this report, unanimously signed as it is, published in any newspaper, except in a garbled form, because every little thing that has a bearing on incidents of a certain kind and which is to appear in the Press has got to be submitted, first of all, to an officer whose name I find it difficult to pronounce. I am told he has been appointed as a sort of Press censor. And what is more remarkable is that there is not a single printing press in Calcutta which is prepared to undertake the printing of this report. This is the letter which I received from the Joint Secretary. It is dated the 7th July. He says :

"I have been unable up till now to find a press which is prepared to undertake the printing of it."

This is the position. The main purpose why I came here this time was that I wanted to find some place somewhere where I could put the findings of this Committee on record. Sir, now to resume my story. At about 7-30 A.M. on the 25th May, 1930, the visiting members left for a place called Pichaboni which was at a distance of about 6 miles from Contai and which was one of the localities in connection with which complaints had been made. When they were nearing Pichaboni, several villagers came up to the cars in which the visiting members were travelling and requested them to stop. Many of the villagers, who appeared to be in a state of

panic, complained that some officials and policemen had visited their houses that morning, a short time previously, and had beat them with *lathis* and had destroyed a great part of their belongings at their houses. Some of the men showed fresh marks of assault on their bodies. With a view to ascertain the truth of the statements about destruction of property, the members decided to visit the house of some of the complainants. They crossed some fields on foot and went to Subarnadighi which was the village nearest to the point where their cars had stopped. They saw at a distance some officials and some policemen passing near the village with *lathis* and guns. The visiting members went into the hut of Bhima Charan Samanta, where they found very recent signs of a raid. Most of the domestic articles were scattered about and many were broken. Parched rice and ghee were found scattered on the ground. Some gunny bags containing seed grain and other grains had been torn open and a large part of the grain had been scattered about the courtyard. They were told that policemen had entered the house that morning, and though there was no resistance or opposition of any kind from the inmates of the house, the policemen had without any cause destroyed the belongings which mean so much to a villager. (*Cries of "Shame, shame", from Non-Official Benches.*)

"While the members were thus engaged in inspecting the nature and the extent of the devastation inside the hut, an official entered it followed by police constables, who had guns and hatchets."

Mark these words. I do not know whether the Honourable the Home Member has laid down any regulations for the police to carry hatchets as arms. This official asked them as to what they were doing there. He was told that the members had come from Calcutta to make an inquiry to ascertain the proof of complaints made in connection with certain happenings at Contai, and they were inspecting the house to ascertain the truth about the complaint regarding loss of and damage to property. The official, who was the Sub-Divisional Officer, stated that the members were inciting the people. He was told that his statement was not correct and that the visiting members were only ascertaining the facts. To cut the long story short, we were arrested and taken to the police camp. Then on our way we found a large crowd near the police camp who had gathered to manufacture salt. The Sub-Divisional Officer stated: You have been inciting these people. We said that we had nothing in common with them and that we did not believe in that sort of thing. So we continued there under arrest for some time. Then after a time we were released. We said that we were going to tell those people that if they continued manufacturing salt in this way, our inquiry would be hampered, and we would try our best to induce them to go back to their villages so that we might carry on the inquiry in a peaceful and judicial atmosphere. Now, what did we see when we met these people? Some people came up to our cars and showed marks on their bodies of hurt inflicted by the police, which, they stated, had been inflicted without provocation. Some of the wounds were fresh and looked as if the same had been inflicted within a short time. One man, who was unable to move and appeared to have been severely beaten, was carried on the shoulders of the persons. An aged man said that he had been assaulted that morning by the police without provocation while he was following the Sub-Divisional Officer and the members of this Committee at a distance, as we were being marched to

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

the police camp. This man's fault was that he was following us and he had been assaulted almost in our very presence.

"They found Indra Jana's wounds fresh and his cloth had fresh stains of blood. An elderly woman named Surja also showed her arm which had been severely injured causing bleeding and swelling."

We saw all these things as we were coming back to the village from which we were arrested. The Report proceeds :

"Then they re-entered that village and went to the house of Mahendra Nath Samanta and made notes of the damage which they saw there and which was said to have been done by the police that morning. The Members found that a large number of earthenware vessels in the house had been broken, some books,"

—perhaps those primary text books belonged to some children of the house,—

"some books and papers had been scattered about in the verandah and in the courtyard, a part of the thatch of the roof with the framework had been pulled down. Some paddy bags had been cut open and part of the contents had been strewn about and some pumpkins smashed. The members next visited the house close by where they found a girl about 18 years old in an advanced stage of pregnancy. Her name was Ambu. She was lying down on the verandah apparently still suffering from shock and pain. She was breathing with difficulty. Her eyes were closed with tears trickling. She made her statement with some difficulty. She complained of her breast being twisted and of her being kicked on the hip." (Shame.)

Now, Sir, all this happened in the presence of the Sub-Divisional Officer. The Committee in another place go on to refer to this particular case and say :

"At Subarnadighi, the girl in an advanced stage of pregnancy was found to be breathing with difficulty, tears trickling down from her eyes, and she bore marks of molestation on her person. It is surprising that a case like this should have happened with a Magistrate accompanying the police party. The girl was not physically capable of creating such troubles as might lead to her being assaulted. She had also no time to concoct a story as the Members arrived at her house soon after the police left her house."

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : Is the Honourable Member aware of the communiqué issued by the Government of Bengal on 2nd June, referring to the allegations of assaults on women in Contai, which contains these words :

"Government have caused enquiries to be made and are satisfied that these statements are false and calculated misrepresentations of the facts."

An Honourable Member : It is a lie.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : It is a deliberate lie. I want an opportunity to publish my facts and my Honourable friend might prosecute me for that if he has the courage to do so. We are familiar with such communiqués emanating from that manufactory of lies known as the Bengal Secretariat.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhammadan) : Nobody believes that communiqué ; certainly not we.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Is the Honourable Member in a position to state through whose agency the Bengal Government made these enquiries ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I have no information other than the Government communiqué.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : Is that all ?

An Honourable Member : That is absolutely useless.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : I will not dwell on this part of the story any further. Now, Sir, when we were recording the statement of this girl, some officials again came up and took us away saying that the Sub-Divisional Officer wanted us. Thus we were prevented from continuing our enquiry in the way that we wanted and we told the Sub-Divisional Officer so. I read from the report :

“ The Members told him that they were being prevented from continuing the local enquiry in the village in the neighbourhood, but the Sub-Divisional Officer pressed them to accompany him to Contai which they did. The villagers were willing to place evidence before the members. But the local officers were reluctant that the visiting members should see more than what they had seen or hear more than what they had heard.”

The Committee proceed :

“ A local enquiry at that stage would have been of great help in ascertaining facts, as the assaults and raids were said to have been committed within the previous hour or thereabout and there would have been no difficulty in ascertaining the nature and extent of the injury said to have been inflicted on the villagers. The Committee were surprised that anxiety should have been shown by the local officials for stopping a careful enquiry at a time when the events had only recently happened. The presence of the visiting members led for the time being to the discontinuance of manufacture of salt. There was no ground for the unfounded statement of the Sub-Divisional Officer that the visiting members were inciting the men of the locality. They recorded statements, observed wounds and inspected damage to the property. They succeeded in dispersing a gathering of people, in order that the enquiry might proceed in a calm and judicial atmosphere. They acted with forbearance when obstructed by local officials. But though the local officials found that the presence and attitude of the visiting members led to the atmosphere becoming peaceful, with the absence of all incitement to violence, yet they tried to stifle the enquiry in the locality where evidence tendered by the villagers against the local officials and the police was fresh and the physical signs had not been obliterated.”

Now, Sir, the Committee examined a large number of witnesses, including women and as a result of the examination of the female witnesses, this is what they have recorded :

“ Seven female witnesses were examined, some of whom still bore marks of injury on their persons.”

—This was in one particular place called Kholakhali—

“ All of them complained of severe assault by canes, fists and kicks. They also said that the clothes of some of them had been torn off their bodies and they produced some such clothes. A middle aged widow Kurani Dasi stated that she had been so roughly handled and pulled about that she had fainted.”

Now, Sir, coming to another incident in that particular sub-division :

“ On 7th June, 1930, some of the members of the Committee visited Pratapdighi village,”

—Here shooting had taken place a few days previous to this,—

“ within the jurisdiction of the Patashpur Thana and examined 37 witnesses. At this place shooting by the police had taken place on the 1st of June, 1930, resulting in the death of two persons. The father of one of the two persons killed was examined by the members. A number of villagers showed marks of injury on their persons, some of them had as many as twenty or twenty-two cane marks on their backs, arms, trunk and even faces. Besides loss and destruction of household articles, grain and foodstuff, there were several complaints of loss of cash, one wealthy respectable villager complaining of loss of as much as Rs. 1,307. About ten of the witnesses complained of loss of silver and gold ornaments. Almost all the witnesses stated that their houses

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

were raided by the police and their utensils and other household articles were wantonly destroyed or damaged by the police. At Kharika-patna, a village near Pratapdighi, there is a local industry for making bangles from conchshells, the manufacture being carried on by women, some of whom deposed that a large quantity of such ornaments was destroyed in their houses. The members examined carefully the locality where the shooting had been done on the 1st June, 1930. They found no brickbats or stone anywhere near about the place or in the village where the said shooting had taken place. There is no brickbuilt house in the village at all."

This conclusively shows that the Government communiqué, in which they say that the villagers had given provocation to the police by hurling brickbats at them, is false. Now proceeds the Report :

"It will be seen that some members of the Committee visited altogether nine houses in connection with which complaints had been made that local officials and their subordinates including excise officials and peons had forcibly entered private houses and had assaulted the inmates without any provocation, and had damaged or destroyed the belongings of the villagers. They also visited six sites where general assaults by the Police were said to have been committed. Altogether 102 witnesses were examined of whom seventeen were women."

Then, the Committee go on to classify the witnesses :

"(1) Villagers on whom physical injury was inflicted or whose property was injured or destroyed while they were in their own homes employed in their ordinary avocations and were not connected with the civil disobedience movement.

(2) Passersby who were assaulted on the public roads or in *hats*.

(3) Persons who were attracted to the places where salt was being manufactured or was intended to be manufactured and who were assaulted.

(4) Villagers who were engaged in the manufacture of salt or who desired to manufacture salt, and who were assaulted.

(5) Volunteers or satyagrahis who intended to offer or offered civil disobedience and who were assaulted.

(6) Persons who had visited the localities shortly after the incidents complained of had happened or had made enquiries themselves into the incidents."

Then this Report says :

"The witnesses, both male and female, made their statements in a frank and straightforward manner. So far as the statements of the witnesses at Subarnadighi are concerned, those persons had no time or opportunity to manufacture a story as the members arrived in the village very shortly after the occurrences."

Then they go on to summarise the nature of the complaints under these heads :

"(a) Unprovoked assaults on the villagers ;

(b) Damage to and destruction or removal of property ;

(c) Threats and physical violence to extract promises and undertakings from the villagers ;

(d) Forcibly taking possession of buildings belonging to public bodies like schools."

We found that the police had actually commandeered some of these buildings belonging to certain public schools and they were in possession, I do not know under what law. Perhaps the Honourable the Home Member will enlighten us as to the law under which this is being done.

"(e) Provision of wholly inadequate accommodation in some of the places where men were kept in detention at Contai ;

(f) Detention without charge and without trial and sometimes without food."

Now, Sir, in another part of the Report the Committee observe :

" In some cases the assault was directed not only physically to hurt the person assaulted but to humiliate him in the eyes of others. Some men were made to hold their ears and to stand up and sit down several times. Some men were also made to rub their nose on the ground ",

--things reminiscent of Amritsar under General Dyer.

About damage to and destruction or removal of property, this is what the Committee say :

" The police and excise officers have the right to make house searches under certain specific circumstances. From what the visiting members saw with their own eyes, they found that in the cases in which the police and other officials had entered the houses of the villagers there was no circumstance which could lead to a house search. If the entry into the houses was meant for the purposes of search, it was strange that such entry was not peaceful and was followed not by a lawful search, but by the destruction of property and beating of the inmates. There appeared to be no justification for such violence and interference with elementary personal rights.

The Committee do not see any justification for the breaking up of the pots and pans, the destruction of domestic stores and food-stuffs, the smashing of vegetables and the scattering about of grain at the houses of the villagers. They fail to see how the smashing of conch bangles, the making of which is a local industry, or the pulling down of thatch from the huts could have been of any use.

There were also several complaints of loss of small cash."

" If the object " say the Committee, " was to terrorise the villagers, the method adopted could not and did not succeed."

Of course Government, as it is being carried on at the present moment, is Government by terrorism and nothing short of that :

" As regards the shooting at Pratapdighi on the 1st of June, 1930, the police had prior to shooting raided some houses in three or four villages one after another and had damaged or destroyed property in those houses. Having regard to the value the villagers set on their small belongings and the great labour they had to undergo to earn the same, it can be easily understood as to what exasperation they feel when they see that those belongings are wantonly destroyed or damaged or taken away. The incident at Pratapdighi is unfortunate, but the acts of the police probably created a situation to meet which resort was had to shooting men who had no arms and had not even stone or brickbats to use as missiles. It should be remembered that the villagers are ordinarily of a peaceful disposition."

This is how the Committee conclude their Report :

" The villagers who mostly suffered from the oppression and who were examined by the visiting members of the Committee were not guilty of any violence. Some of them were engaged in the manufacture of salt, but they did not offer any violence and were prepared to suffer the consequences of their action. The local officials appeared to forget what law was and what their duty was under the law. They suffered acts to be done which were in breach of law and of the elementary rights of individuals. The conduct of the local officials has led to widespread embitterment of feeling."

Sir, when I went down to Contai, the first thing that struck me was that if the people had broken the salt laws, the authorities had broken all the other laws, including the laws of morality. And His Excellency the Viceroy says that they must fight the movement. Fight with such weapons ! Sir, His Excellency said that if there is a fire, the fire-brigade when it is called in to extinguish the fire may cause some damage. We unfortunately find it very difficult in Bengal to distinguish between the incendiary and the fire-brigade.

Sir, if I have spoken strongly, I apologise to this House because, having seen what I have seen with my own eyes, it was impossible for me to control my feelings ; and the only excuse for my intervention

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

in this debate is that I wanted some place, as I said before, where I could put on record what I have seen with my own eyes, which Government by their policy have prevented so far from being published for the edification of the world.

Mr. H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association : Indian Commerce) : Sir, it is a pity that the Report of the Simon Commission should have come up before us for discussion by a side door. If a clear-cut issue had been placed before the House, the vote of the House would have decisively reflected the feeling roused throughout the country by the publication of this document. Some two years ago when the question of boycotting the Simon Commission was before the Assembly, there was a large section which was willing to give the Commission a trial and to utilise it in the best possible way. I want to know whether there is to-day a single Member in this House, or for the matter of that, in the other House among the elder statesmen, who is prepared to stand by the Report. Sir, I regard the Simon Report as in one way or another responsible for most of our difficulties. It was foisted upon us through the insolence of Lord Birkenhead, whose tenure of office was distinguished by nothing so much as a studied contempt for every one's feelings and opinions but his own. That superior person now comes forward with warnings and advice to His Excellency the Viceroy, and one can only advise His Lordship to confine himself to the counting house, and not seek to come back to the councils of the Empire.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Ignore him entirely.

Mr. H. P. Mody : He cannot be ignored, he must be attacked on all fronts.

Sir, if the country is not seething with trouble from end to end today, it is largely because of the personality of the Viceroy, and of the confidence he has inspired in his statesmanship and sincerity. If today there are large and important sections of the people willing to grasp the hand of friendship which he has held out, and to utilise the instrument which he has forged, it is, I repeat, largely because of the Viceroy. Now, Sir, I do not propose to discuss either the principles or the details of the recommendations of the Simon Report. But there are one or two considerations arising from the Report on which I should like to dwell as briefly as possible. Before the Commission entered upon its duties, Sir John Simon thought fit to write a letter to His Excellency the Viceroy suggesting the method of a joint free conference, and among other things, he said :

" Above all, I would urge that one of the merits of the method of joint free conference is that besides securing due recognition of equal status, it provides an opportunity for that free exchange of views and mutual opinion which are best calculated to promote the largest measure of agreement that is possible."

In view of the fact that the Report of the Indian Central Committee is hardly referred to in the Report of the Commission, and the two Reports are diametrically opposed to each other, and also the known fact that there was nothing in the nature of joint consultations at the crucial stage when conclusions were reached, I wonder what value is to be attached to this statement. We have heard a good deal of the value of the clash of mind

upon mind. So far as the Indian Central Committee and the Simon Commission are concerned, the clash of mind upon mind seems to have produced very few sparks.....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City : Muhammadan Urban) : It did not take place at all.

Mr. H. P. Mody : My leader says that it did not take place at all ; I do not know how that is, but if it did, even to a limited extent, it seems to have produced precious little result.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces . Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan) : I can inform the Honourable Member that it never took place.

Mr. H. P. Mody : Then I would like to ask the Honourable Member why he continued to be a Member of the Central Committee.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : It was too late to withdraw and we published our Report eight months before the Simon Commission published their Report so as to influence their judgment.

Mr. H. P. Mody : Sir, I am afraid I cannot follow my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour.....

Dr. A. Suhrawardy (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : Nobody can follow him.

Mr. H. P. Mody : We can only make the attempt ! All that I want to say is, whether the Report was published eight months or a year before the other Report, the fact remains that a joint free conference was promised and that joint conference was not forthcoming at the crucial stage, and still my Honourable friend says that he thought it right to continue on that Committee.

There is another general consideration arising out of this Report on which I would like to dwell. At the very end of the Report the Commission say that they have not altered a single line of their Report, and that they have been absolutely unaffected by the events of the last few months. I do not know whether the Commission intend to claim something wonderful for themselves by this air of detachment, much as if, like Manu and the ancient law givers, they were concerned only with the eternal verities, and fixed their gaze with unclouded vision upon the future. This air of detachment ill suits the Commission. What after all, Sir, is not this Round Table Conference the outcome, if not of the fact that the country was roused in a manner it had never been roused before, of the way in which the Parliamentary Commission had been foisted on the country ? His Excellency the Viceroy did not sit on such a high perch as the Commission ; he saw the realities of the situation, and he thought it necessary to hold out the hand of friendship in the way in which he did ; and yet here is the Commission coming forward and saying that not a single word of their Report was altered by the fact that India was passing through a very grave crisis.

Mr. B. Das : But the fact remains that Sir John Simon was lying, as he referred to the speech of the Maharaja of Bikanir.

Mr. H. P. Mody : I am somewhat afraid of discussing Indian Princes and the like. I would rather confine myself to ordinary people.

Mr. B. Das : I am only pointing out the lie of Sir John Simon when he referred to the Maharaja of Bikanir's speech in the Simon Report, while

[Mr. B. Das.]

he was saying that he did not refer to the Indian situation after November last.

Mr. H. P. Mody : I am not concerned with these things. I was going to say that, beyond these two general considerations which arise out of the Report, I have not the slightest desire to waste any time over the findings of the Simon Commission. (Hear, hear.)

And now, Sir, I would like to say a few words with regard to the Round Table Conference. An appeal has been made by most of the previous speakers for conciliation. I heartily endorse that appeal ; and I am sure that the Government of India realise that it is not enough that an agreed solution should be reached at the Round Table Conference ; it is even more important that whatever solution is reached should carry with it the willing assent of large and powerful sections in this country. From that point of view, Sir, I am sure that the Government of India realise as fully as we do the value of a conciliatory gesture at the present moment. I would like to make this point a little more plain, and I wish not to be misunderstood in that connection. I do not want the Government of India, now that they feel sure of the support for the idea of the Round Table Conference on the part of prominent leaders of the people, to give up the attempt of conciliating the Congress and other elements as either futile or hopeless. I want them to realise that the inclusion of the Congress will certainly give the Round Table Conference a representative character and will ensure for the decisions of the Conference that calm and dispassionate judgment and willing assent which are essential if peace is to be restored.

But, Sir, if we make an appeal to Government, the appeal must be made with even more earnestness to our people. When there are two sides inspired by the conviction that right and reason are on their side, it is essential that the appeal should go out to both people. Sir, apart from the political unrest, I would like to tell this House that a very grave situation confronts the country ; that trade and industry have been completely paralysed, and unless something happens in the next few months, a very grave economic disaster threatens the country. That disaster is not merely going to inflict hardship upon millions of people : that is only one aspect of it. I would like the Government and the people to realise that, apart from that aspect, important as it is, there is also this consideration, that such a state of things would constitute one of the chief obstacles in the path of self-government. In that view of the case, a very grave responsibility rests on the shoulders both of the Government and the leaders of the people, and if they do not realise it sufficiently or in time, I say that the clock of progress will be set back in a manner which we do not seem to appreciate at the present moment.

There is just one more consideration, and it is this : that apart from the value of conciliation at this juncture, apart from the importance of taking to the Round Table Conference all the elements that count in the political progress of this country, it has to be remembered that the success of the Conference will depend not merely upon the unity of those who are asked to go to that Conference, but also in a large measure upon the attitude which the Government of India adopt towards the proposals that will be placed before the Conference. I want the Government of India to put themselves forward as the strongest allies and supporters of the progressive elements in that Conference. I want the Government of India

to lend their fullest support to whatever demands may be agreed upon between the representatives of India. We have heard a great deal.....

Mr. President : I would like the Honourable Member to close his remarks within two minutes.

Mr. H. P. Mody : I will, Sir ; in fact I was going to do so. We have heard a good deal in the last few days of the fact that the Simon Commission's Report is going to form only one of the many documents which will be considered by the Round Table Conference. Let us be under no delusion on the subject. So far as we the representatives of the people are concerned, it may be so ; but so far as the opponents of our demands are concerned, the Simon Report is going to be the most important material in their hands ; and I say that the Government of India will render a service, the magnitude of which it is difficult to over-estimate, if they put themselves forward as a national government of India, and support the progressive elements in this country. Sir, a situation has been created in this country which places only two alternatives before us : either India continues to remain a willing partner of the British Commonwealth of Nations, or she goes out of the Empire. On the attitude which the Government of India and the Government of Great Britain adopt towards our demands will rest very largely the question whether India will continue as a willing partner, or whether some day or other she may decide to go out of the British Commonwealth of Nations. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : Sir, I was waiting to hear a prominent Member from the Government Benches speak, and I thought it would be fitting to rise after he had spoken, but apparently there is no desire on the part of my Honourable friends opposite to interpose in this debate at this stage, and I thought I would not wait any longer. Sir, I am speaking as an isolated remnant of a large body of influential people on this side who have thought it proper to go away from us. But, Sir, some of us who belonged to that body, I mean my friends behind me and my Congress friends to my left, have thought it necessary to remain here in order that we might have our say from our seats in this House rather than from outside. When I came into the Legislature six years ago, I conceived my duty to be that of a watch-dog. I knew well that the Legislatures as constituted at present would be full of disappointments, disillusionments, humiliation and provocation, which a watch-dog cannot afford to be affected by. In that belief I have continued, and if today this House finds me here with some of my friends on these Benches, it is not because I am enamoured of the atmosphere of the Assembly or that I love my life here or am pleased with the results we have achieved here. The resentment which some of my friends who have gone away felt at the provoking behaviour of Government when the Cotton Tariff Bill was passed in this House in the last Delhi Session, in spite of all warnings, is none the less great in our case. We have, however, allowed ourselves to remain here, because a watch-dog cannot desert his place in resentment, especially when other watch-dogs have gone away. In that belief, we have come to attend the Session of this House, and we shall sing our swan song, if I may say so, before we go away. I see a good sign, Sir, of which there is an indication in this morning's papers, that our Congress friends are seeing the error of their decision to desert the Legislatures and are very wisely reconsidering their position. (Hear, hear.) I am glad that they are thinking of capturing the next elections. Today's *Pioneer*, Sir, which reached us this morning, reports as follows,

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

and with your permission I shall read for the benefit of my friends opposite this most interesting news which the *Pioneer* publishes :

“ Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel ”, the present Congress President, says “ that he had expressed his frank opinion that the boycott of the elections by the Congress would be a tactical error if only for the reason that Congress abstention would mean that the Legislature would lack in effective opposition and instead be filled with political non-entities, with the result that Government would be able to do much as they pleased, and yet say that they were ruling with the assistance of the representatives of political India ”.

If this report is correct, then I am glad, Sir, that no less an authority than Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel has voiced the very gospel in which I have believed during the last six years, and I have to warn Government to beware and to prepare themselves for the grim fight they will have to carry on in the next Delhi Session when my Congress friends would be sitting on these Benches. Sir, these are the few words that I wanted to say in order to justify and explain from this important platform my point of view. Sir, there is no other platform like this for the expression of public opinion. That is my faith, and I have clung to it during the last three months through all the manifestation of public disfavour. I will have my last say from this seat. I thank my friends, Sir, who have enabled me to form a strong party of opposition and to occupy this seat of great distinction which Pandit Motilal Nehru occupied only a few months ago. Sir, from this seat I shall raise my voice.

I am very glad, Sir, that you have allowed this debate. Whatever technical objections might have been raised, we now see the wisdom of your ruling in allowing this debate to take place. It has brought to light a considerable amount of public sentiment. I am very sorry that my nominated friend, Mr. Sarma, should have characterised this debate as “ mischievous ”. If I were a nominated Member, Sir, whatever I might do or not do, I would certainly be more cautious and modest in my utterances, knowing that I represented no popular constituency, and I do hope, Sir, that if Mr. Sarma is nominated again to this House, he will practise the virtue of modesty and not pronounce opinions with unseemly vigour which even Members representing popular constituencies would be chary of doing.

Sir, this debate has brought forward many points of view. It has been very useful in laying before the Government Benches several important points of view. Two issues emerge before us : first is the Round Table Conference, and the second is the Simon Commission's Report. The Simon Report, Sir, as I said in the speech which I made on the point of order two days ago, comes in only incidentally, and I propose to deal with it very briefly, in order to make clear to Government, as it is my privilege to do, a few points of view. This is necessary because I understand that the Government of India are examining the Simon Commission's Report with very great care. I am one of those, Sir, who boycotted the Simon Commission, but I recognise that the Commission's Report is there. It is an important document from the Government point of view, although it may not be so from ours. It has got to be carefully examined by the Government of India, and I understand that it is being so examined. If I can sound a word of caution, Sir, I will say, let the Government of India examine that document in the light of present conditions. That document,

Sir, was written, as my friend Mr. Mody rightly observed, without taking note of any of the conditions which exist today in the country. With a certain amount of self-satisfaction, the Commission, at page 369 of their Report, observe :

“ In writing this Report we have made no allusion to the events of the last few months in India. In fact, the whole of our principal recommendations were arrived at and unanimously agreed upon before these events occurred.”

As my friend Mr. Mody remarked, this is a detachment absolutely to be condemned, and why ? The Commissioners were reporters ; I think I am right in describing Sir John Simon and his party as “ reporters ”, and the duty of reporters is faithfully to report things as they exist at the date of their report. He and his friends forgot their most primary duty, for the omission of which they strangely take credit for themselves, that they wrote this Report without taking note of recent conditions, the great intensity of feeling that has appeared in India during the last three or four months. Sir, my views against the civil disobedience movement have already been placed before the public. But may I point out to Government that the civil disobedience movement has generated in the country a great intensity of public feeling which will have to be recognised by a wise administrator. In the city of Bombay to which I belong and my people have belonged for

several generations, the miracle has taken place that
 12 Noon. aristocratic ladies, not necessarily coming from agitating Hindu families, aristocratic ladies of wealthy, influential, and may I say without disrespect, very sane-minded families of Parsis, have taken part in leading processions. (*An Honourable Member* : “ Where ? ”) Honourable friends must have read in the newspapers that a distinguished scion of a very wealthy and influential Parsi family in Bombay, who would ordinarily never get mixed up with frantic agitation,—that lady was leading a big procession if the newspapers are to be believed.....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : That has been contradicted. It is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. M. B. Jayakar : Then my learned friend must have other avenues of information which I have not.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : It is contradicted by the Press itself and they have expressed their regret, and Lady Petit has written a letter to the *Times of India* denying that statement.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : I am sorry I did not observe that. However, my point is not affected by it. It may be that since the arrival here of newspapers which I saw up to yesterday, this statement has been withdrawn.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : It takes two days to get papers from there.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : That is so. But the fact is there and I do not think that anybody can deny it, that an intensity of political feeling has come about in the city of Bombay the like of which I have never seen in all my life. Honourable Members must have likewise read that a lady belonging to a very wealthy and influential Guzerati family has taken part in a big Poona demonstration. I am not justifying these things. My own opinion is that the civil disobedience movement is a wrong movement and I have openly said so. But any wise Government, and may I say any wise “ reporters ” of a wise Government, like the Simon Commission, would

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

have taken note of this intensity of feeling. India has rapidly advanced. During the last four months a great deal of advance in public sentiment has taken place. Even the Viceroy in his last speech very wisely remarked, "India is growing every year more conscious of national feeling". I am, therefore, sounding a note of caution that the Government of India in framing their proposals on the Report would be wise to take note of this very important fact that political opinion in this country has been rapidly advancing. If the Government of India want to be the true spokesman of political-minded India, they will have to take note of the advance in political thought which has happened during these months, although Sir John Simon and his friends might not have thought it necessary to do so.

Coming to the Report, Sir, from my place, I must lodge my emphatic protest against the insidious and mischievous propaganda which was carried by this Commission by publishing their first volume a fortnight in advance. We know what that trick was. It was a trick very much of a piece, though different in colour and intensity, with the production of a notorious lady who wrote about India, whose name I shall not soil my tongue by mentioning here—a propaganda very much alike to that, intended to create a world opinion that Indian conditions were so hopelessly bad that Britain was justified in not giving responsible Government to India. It was a most mischievous, most insensate, cunning and insidious propaganda carried against India, and my fear is all the greater when I remember, as was published a few days ago, that 32,000 copies of the first volume of the Report were sold in Great Britain alone. That was about ten days ago. Now, I understand that the whole of the first print has been completely exhausted. This is very serious mischief. But unfortunately all that we can do now is to lodge a protest against the insidious way in which propaganda has been carried on against India. Sir, it is a most dangerous propaganda, because it seems at first sight so reasonable and specious.

As regards the Report itself, I think we are justified in saying that this is a worthless document, unlookable at as one of my Honourable friends said here, and I shall tell my Honourable friends why I think so. The Commission were obsessed with two bogeys, which disfigure the whole of this Report. One is the Hindu-Muslim dissensions. We can turn to any page and we will find the appearance of this big bogey, one is almost inclined to call it a *deus ex machina*, of which the reporters take advantage whenever they are in a difficulty. "Hindu-Muslim dissensions". There are some words which the Report always avoids, like, e.g., "Dominion Status", and there are some other words which are profusely used. Hindu-Muslim dissensions are of the latter description. The second bogey is the conflict between the Legislative Assembly and the Government of India. The Commissioners are always fancying a conflict between the Legislative Assembly and the Government of India, and they are so obsessed with this fear, that in one place they go so far as to say while considering the possibility of conventions growing of transfer of power from the Secretary of State to the Government of India,—a gradual devolution of power in favour of the Government of India, from the Secretary of State—they say such conventions should not be multiplied. Why? Because they say that the Assembly of the future, the Federated

Assembly of 250 worthy men as they will be,—this Assembly will be a strong Assembly. *Vis-a-vis* this strong Assembly the Government of India would be weak and feeble. How do my friends opposite like this prospect ? What is the good of growing conventions in favour of a weak body of men ? They will not be able to resist the strong pressure of the Assembly. Therefore, forsooth, do not allow any conventions of transfer of power to the Government of India from the Secretary of State. Without taking much time, I will quote from the paragraph in which this precious sentiment is set forth. This paragraph 352, from which I am tempted to read one or two sentences to show the attitude of mind, of suspicion, distrust, and antipathy if not embitterment, in which Sir John Simon and his friends approach the important problem, namely, the relation between the Secretary of State and the Government of India. Discussing the convention which has already grown and the travesty of which we saw in the Delhi Session when the Cotton Tariff Bill was on,—the fiscal convention as it is most grandiloquently called,—discussing that convention and the possibility of such conventions growing in future, this is what the Commissioners say :

“ But the assumption underlying such delegation is that the Government of India’s approval of the course proposed is arrived at independently of the views of the Assembly ; and that it takes account of all Indian interests and not merely those for which a majority of the Assembly speak. But we regard it as inevitable ”—

--My Honourable friends will mark the following words--

“ But we regard it as inevitable that the Government of India will in the future become more and more responsive to the views of the Legislature. In so far as this is true, the Government’s approval of policies like that covered by the fiscal convention ceases to be the result of an independent examination ; and to this extent its power to resist the view of the Assembly decreases.”

A most extraordinary line of thought ! Conceptions like these colour the whole of this Report. There are two ways of looking at the Indian problem. The first and the most important one from the Indian point of view and where the Simon Commission have gone hopelessly wrong, is the transference of power from the Civil Service to the people of the country through their elected representatives. I am putting the point in a popular way. The whole problem is how to transfer the power from the Civil Service, in plain words, how to put the civil servant in his proper place—to make him a servant, to make him civil and to make him Indian. How to put him in his proper place in a constitutional scheme is the whole problem—to transfer from the civil service power into the hands of the popular representatives. And yet, this precious Report says in more places than one—I do not want to tire my Honourable friends’ patience by going through all of them—that this cannot be done. It says that the civil service in the method of its recruitment, the extent of its power, privileges and emoluments, would be left absolutely untouched. My Honourable friends may not believe it, but it is a fact that the civil service is practically left untouched by the Report. This appears at page 314 of the Report, from which I shall read one sentence. Speaking of the transference of power in paragraph 367, the Report says :

“ As regards the Civil Services of India, the security services must continue to be recruited as on all-India service by the Secretary of State and their existing rights must be maintained.”

That is the keynote of the whole Report. I, therefore, submit, Sir, that it is a most mischievous Report. It does not take note of public feeling,

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

and of what the people want. Besides, it makes here and there proposals which are absolutely unpractical. When I say that, my Honourable friends opposite, some of whom have seen the working of this Assembly for the last ten years will agree with me that the Commissioners' scheme with reference to the Central Legislature is a most unworkable plan. I am surprised, Sir, that a publicist like Sir John Simon, who has seen the working of the British Legislature, should have put his signature to a document containing a most obnoxious, unworkable and unpractical plan. What is the proposal? In future, the Report recommends, the Central Legislature will be strengthened. That means the popular element in the Assembly will be increased to 250 Members. The official bloc will be reduced to 12. The popular element goes up and the Report wants to strengthen the Central Government. But curiously enough this strengthening means raising the popular element, without giving it any increased power or responsibility. This is a very extraordinary way of "strengthening". The Commissioners raise the popular representatives to 250. They reduce the gentlemen opposite to 12. My bloc will go up a few benches behind. I may or may not be here, but there will be more benches behind me. There will be a very small bloc sitting on the benches opposite where the Leader of the House is sitting now. I hope he will look on this experiment with amusement in his retirement. My numbers will go up, but there will be not one iota of more power on our side, or of more responsibility. It is like increasing the appetite of a patient without increasing his food supply. The Governor General will select a few of us as his cabinet ministers. But in what way? He will select whomever he pleases. The moment he selects "A", "A" will have to sever his connection with his party. He is not selected *qua* member of the party. He does not remain a member of the party. After his selection there is no affinity between himself and his party. He is selected as a nominee of the Viceroy. He leaves his party. He can not retain his seat in the Assembly. He becomes a member of the Government, confabulating with brother officials. What happens to him, Sir? He may become unpopular with the rest of his colleagues, the officials. I tremble to think what will be his fate after his five years' life on the Government Benches, torn off from his party and his constituency. The result of this system will be that the future Assembly will contain people who may scramble for office. The moment they accept their office, they go out of the party and out of public life. This, Sir, is not even the beginning of responsible government but its travesty. The process is wrong. The essence of it should be that the man retains his membership of the party, retains his membership of the Assembly and yet he serves on the Government Benches as a kind of nexus between the Government and the popular Benches. The value of such a nexus is great when the Government are not popular. That important bridge, I use the word "bridge" deliberately, between popular representatives and an irresponsible executive is taken away, and the process is made one of absorption. If I may say so without exaggeration, the process will be something like this. My gardener collects and brings me every morning a large heap of flowers to select from. I select the best six or seven and put them in my drawing room, in beautiful places, and reject the rest. In like manner, our electors will elect 250 men for the Viceroy to select a few and put them into his cabinet. They are then lost to the people

and become officials. He will no doubt select the best ones but they will be lost to public life. I hope the House will not call it an exaggerated picture. This, Sir, is Sir John Simon's plan. What happens to the poor Viceroy ? I should like to ask His Excellency Lord Irwin what he believes from his experience will be the lot, under this Report, of his successor in office. A most miserable lot. He selects men who have cut themselves off from their party. He takes their advice and supposing that advice is not followed, the whole Government does not go out. Then the future Lord Irwin will say, " My dear Mr. A, you are an honest man. I value your presence at my dinners and parties, but you are not able to keep your fellows in check. You must go away ". Then Mr. A goes back to Bombay and starts his practice at the bar ! This is the system propounded in this precious Report.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : He will draw a big salary in the meantime.

Mr. M. B. Jayakar : He may draw a big salary for a few months, but he will have to go into the wilderness afterwards. He has got to make a choice. I therefore ask the Government of India to be very careful of the pitfalls of this Report. I can only say, Sir, that knowing as I do Sir John Simon and his great reputation, that he did not give proper thought to the practical nature of his suggestions. Therefore the care of the Government of India becomes all the more necessary and, I am pleased to know that Government will take counsel with the representatives of the people, with those who are in a position to advise them as to the achievements of this Report from the popular point of view, which the Government of India may not be in a proper position to judge. We say therefore that the Report is not helpful from our point of view.

I now pass to the second question, more important than the Report, *viz.*, the future of the Round Table Conference. When I think of it, I almost feel as if a big tragedy was being enacted in front of us. It is as if a wise physician prescribed a sovereign remedy, and inferior quacks made a hash of it. Sir, we first talked in this Assembly about the Round Table Conference in 1924. The United Nationalist Party consisting of the Congress Party and another party led by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, made the proposal in 1924, if my memory is right. It was repeated in the year 1925. It was not given. I am reminded of a statement made by the late Mr. Gokhale, which he quoted to me times without number. He was a great optimist, a believer in British intentions and their genius for Government. He often said to me " My dear Jayakar, there is one thing which I tell you after nearly 25 years of intimate contact with Government ". His remark is as true today as it was then. He said " On every portal of the Government of India and their Secretariat are written large the words ' Too late ' ". If the Government had granted this Round Table Conference in 1924 or 1925, when public opinion demanded it, it would have been accepted. Now, it has come too late, as Mr. Gokhale said. Now, Sir, the Round Table Conference was announced on the 1st of November. Nothing was done for a long time after that. The Government went to sleep like a great pugilist, exhausted after his efforts. Some of us accorded a warm reception to the statement of the Viceroy last November. We braved public opinion, and became unpopular with our associates. Nothing happened day after day. Some publicists gave interviews and tried to draw the Government of India out from their fastresses. No. The Rip Van Winkle had gone to sleep and would not be awakened. Then came a most memorable pronouncement on the

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

25th January before the Assembly. It was a most unfortunate pronouncement. I have no doubt that the framer of that pronouncement, the high and exalted noble man who made that pronouncement before the Assembly, had no intention of conveying to India the impression which he did unfortunately convey, namely, that Dominion Status was a distant goal, it was a wearisome journey which had to be traversed step by step. I have no doubt, knowing as I do something of the mind of the great Viceroy who is now presiding over our affairs, that it was not his intention. But those who were responsible for framing that pronouncement in January last never realised, that the words would create that impression in the minds of the bulk of the Indian people. All this time we were reading in India the speeches of British statesmen in England. These were causing great mischief in India. A former Secretary of State, who had done every thing to inflame public opinion during his term of office, did not let India alone even after he had gone away from office. Decency should have taught him not to tinker with a question which he had done everything to spoil by his utter lack of sympathy with the Indian people and by the insults which he hurled at them from time to time. We were all surprised in India that this gentleman should have had the temerity now and then to return to the regions of Indian politics and pronounce opinions which no body valued here. I think, Sir, it was a misfortune that party discipline in England found no means of putting a curb upon the antics of this gentleman. All this had helped to make the situation more and more uneasy, and we have now arrived, at the stage when the Round Table Conference has come very nearly to be regarded as a pet delusion of a few, if I may say so, as it has become the pet aversion of others. Well, Sir, I shall say quite frankly that I am personally in favour of Indians going to the Round Table Conference as most of my Honourable freinds must have seen from the statement in which I joined a few days ago. But as a man who is familiar with the sentiments of a large bulk of my countrymen, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not convey to this House an accurate picture of what the popular feeling about this Round Table Conference is, in order that the Government may know what the truth is and take speedy measures to effectuate a remedy. Government today must know that the Round Table Conference is regarded by some as a myth, by some others as a trap, and by some others as a delusion. (Hear, hear.) These views may be wrong, but it is I think perfectly obvious that Government, by their inaction, by their long and foolish inactivity, have made it a weird apparition—that is my description of it. There is only one way, Sir, even now of making the Round Table Conference a great success, and that is to make it as representative, as truly representative of Indian interests as Government can. Do not regard it—if I may say so to the Government Benches—do not utilise it as an opportunity to reward loyal friends or to punish political enemies, but regard it as a power held in trust, to make proper nominations with the sole view of making it thoroughly representative. Put in only such men at the Conference—irrespective of their political hostility or loyalty to Government, irrespective of all irrelevant prepossessions or predilections,—as really represent India in all its varied interests. (Hear, hear.) I say this because it has been often said to me by men in Simla in and out of office that Government must not forget those friends of theirs who have stood by them in this fight. (Laughter.) I have heard this sentiment, I do not know how

many times, since I came to this height a few days ago. "We must not forget our friends who have stood by us in this great conflict". That is the phrase. By no means forget them. Nobody desires that Government should be ungrateful—a Great Government like this cannot afford to be ungrateful—but please do not make the Round Table Conference a congregation of all your loyal friends. That is all I have to say. This is not the place to reward them with a seat. Government can give them any number of titles and honours which they possess in abundance (Laughter), but the conference is not the place for them. This is a great trust, and I want the Government of India to remember that they must make every effort to realise that it is a high obligation which they owe to this country and which has to be discharged in a dispassionate and single-minded way. If they fail in making a proper selection, they will frustrate the purpose of the Round Table Conference. Remember, Sir, success depends upon who go there. If the right type of men go, our work is done. If on the other hand people go there who are selected from wrong considerations, then the Conference will end in failure. That leads me, Sir, to the last topic which I want to refer to, namely, the great necessity of conciliating public opinion in this country. A great deal has been done, Sir, to irritate public opinion. Coming from the city of Bombay, I may say a great deal on this question, shall I tell the Government that they have by the excesses of their over-zealous officers, irritated public opinion? I shall not go over the same topic that my Honourable friend from Bombay, Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, has traversed. Let us remember, Sir, that he is an ex-Member of the Cabinet of the Bombay Government, not an agitator all his life like some of us, but a man of great restraint and responsibility who sat on the Government Benches as I sat opposite to him in the Bombay Legislative Council. Well, then, if this ex-Member of the Bombay Government today can get up and launch such a diatribe against the Department of my Honourable friend, Mr. Haig, that is a sign of which the Government I hope will take note. Sir, I endorse every word of what he has said. Sir, men and women have been beaten. (*An Honourable Member* : "Deliberately.") Sir, I have seen them, I have seen women and children being beaten. Sir, I am not justifying what the Congress men did, but there is no doubt that the whole situation has been very badly handled. I do admit, Sir, that the Government have either to assert law and order or to quit. They must take all measures necessary for the maintenance of law and order, but I do maintain, Sir, that there ought to be tact, self-restraint, and a sense of proportion in doing all this. It is said, Sir, in Bombay that the Government of India screwed up the Government in my province. What truth there is in it those sitting opposite can only say. I shall only say what the popular feeling is. For a long time the Bombay Government went on very well. They showed commendable self-restraint in the same way as the Government of the Central Provinces has done, but the time came when all this disappeared. Public whisper has it that they were screwed up by the Government of India from this side. If this impression is wrong, I apologize. But if it is true, I hope the Government will take a lesson from these instances that have happened in Bombay. There is no doubt that a great deal of irritation has been caused by wrong police methods. And, the worst of all is that the Government have played the part of touts for British commercial interests. (*Cries of "Shame, shame."*) This House will be surprised if I say so, but this great and mighty Government have played the part of touts for putting up the interests of British commercial men.

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

I may here refer to a pamphlet which was published in the Bombay newspapers and of which I am sure my Honourable friend opposite is fully aware. It emanated from the Government Central Press in Bombay and it was published in the Bombay newspapers. And what did it contain ? I would refer to only a few extracts from that circular. It was a reply to the Congress propaganda for the boycott of British goods, a perfectly legitimate propaganda, which, even the Viceroy said, in its economic and Swadeshi aspect is perfectly justifiable. In the Ordinance which proceeded from the Viceroy it was made clear that the Ordinance was not intended to strike against genuine endeavours to develop Indian industries and Indian enterprise. I would call the attention of the Government of India to that excellent statement in the Viceroy's Ordinance, and it was directly against the spout and terms of that Ordinance that this statement was published by the Publicity Officer in Bombay. It refers to Indian Banks, Indian Insurance Companies and Indian Shipping, and its attempt is to point out that all these Indian enterprises are inferior, untrustworthy, slippery and delusive. Therefore, it asks Indians not to have anything to do with them. I quote a brief extract :

“ Is this (boycott) practicable ? Every student of economics will tell you that it is not, and that any attempt to carry it out would inevitably lead to great harm to the consumer and the average citizen. Why ? Because the proposal means that the consumer must abandon the superior products from Britain and confine himself to inferior types of articles for which he would have to pay in all probability inflated prices. It is well known that many British products are the best in the world.” (Honourable Members will mark these words “ are the best in the world.”) “ For instance, British machinery is unrivalled, British drugs hold a high place in the market. The consumer is now called upon to confine himself to commodities which in point of usefulness, durability and efficiency are much inferior to these. British Banks are the mainstay of our Banking system in India. They provide wide facility and the strongest security. Why should people ignore these security concerns in place of much less stable ones ? ”

Similar remarks are made about Indian Insurance Banks and shipping offices. I do hope that, as Publicity touts of British commercial interests, the Government of India and the Government of Bombay will send a proper bill to the producers of all these British products, charging commission for the wide publicity which they have given to them. Why not make a little money out of publicity work ? This great Government, Sir, has stooped to the contemptible methods of touts. I am using these words with full responsibility. They are using the reprehensible methods of touts in order to down Indian goods and to puff up British goods. I can only hope that they will charge a proper commission, having regard to the exalted and high office which they occupy in this country. In this way, Sir, the irritation has gone on. I do hope, Sir, that the Government will soon turn over a new leaf. I do hope, Sir, that the Government of India will realise that it is entirely in their hands to create a conciliatory atmosphere without which the Round Table Conference will be a failure.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like to warn the Government that they are going too far in their methods of dealing with the Congress propaganda. I am bound to say, however unpleasant the truth may be, that there is a desire among a certain section of the officials here to arrive at no conciliatory understanding until the national movement is crushed and its back is broken. Government have right to adopt all reasonable means to put down defiance of law; but it is wrong to take

hold of this opportunity to crush the national spirit. The desire is to *punish*, not for the sake of arriving at an armistice, but to punish so that the awakened spirit may be crushed for long. I would like to warn these officers that they should bear in mind that the idea must not be to crush and achieve a victory, so that a similar movement may not raise its head for another 40 years. Please do not be guided by that desire ; nor also wait for an honourable settlement until something more drastic is done by the civil disobedience movement. Take stock of the present circumstances and do try to find a solution, which is not impossible. It was a regrettable tragedy, Sir, that when the esteemed Leader of the Swaraj Party, who was our colleague here for many years, with whom we had free discussions, and who sat next to us at dinners, luncheons and teas, came down with his proposals, into a region of reasonableness from his talk of independence—he was clapped into Jail. After I read his last interview, I left Bombay in hopes of making it the basis of an honourable compromise, and yet when I came here I found that he was locked up in jail. I do not say that the Government might have had no justification for doing this, but may I ask what would have been lost by waiting for three or four weeks more until prospects of a compromise had ended ? If Government had any imagination, they would have said to themselves : “ Here was an approach made ; here was the leader of a hostile movement practically coming out with proposals of peace. Let us therefore leave things in *status quo ante*, and see what prospects of peace there are. Instead of acting like this, the Government have clapped him into jail, making settlement almost impossible. The solution which he offered was certainly not unreasonable, but this unwise Government have sent him to jail, with the result that there is hardly any body with whom the Government can now deal. This is not politics ; it is not state-craft ; nor is it playing the game. I submit it was a wrong step to take, whatever departmental justification there might have been for it. Nothing would have been lost by waiting until the prospects of peace were investigated. Perhaps further negotiations with the Government would have taken place, leading to fruitful results. I do maintain, Sir, that it was highly impolitic to send Pandit Motilal Nehru to jail the moment he descended into the region of a possible compromise. That is not the way to attain peace.

In conclusion, I would like to warn the Government again. It is in their hands to make this Round Table Conference a success or failure. It is still three months distant. We wish therefore to give Government every chance to make it a success. Therefore the opinion of my party is that we should let this grant go through. We do not wish to close the door on the Round Table Conference because we know there are still three months in front of us. We do not wish, as practical men, to close the door on the Round Table Conference by voting against this grant. We shall therefore let go this grant, voting for it and contenting ourselves with making our views perfectly clear, as to the great necessity of the Government taking up conciliatory measures in order that all important men may be attracted to this Round Table Conference. I may tell the Government that the men who have to work the future constitution must be made to attend the Round Table Conference unless Government wish to repeat the mistake of 1921.

Mr. E. Studd (Bengal : European) : Sir, it is with very considerable diffidence that I rise to address this House, having only been a

[Mr. E. Studd.]

Member of it for such a short time. But I feel that I should be failing in my duty if I did not take the opportunity of endorsing Sir Hugh Cocke's remarks yesterday, on behalf of the Europeans in Bengal and particularly the Calcutta commercial community, one of whose representatives I have the honour to be. During the course of a good many years in this country, most, if not all of us, have formed friendships, many friendships, with Indians which we value very highly, friendships which have stood the test of time and of adversity. We have interests which are in common, for without mutual co-operation and understanding and goodwill no business intercourse between us would be possible, and in the course of our daily relations, we have had ample opportunities of forming opinions of the high capacity of Indians with whom we have had to deal. We realise that our interests are so intermingled that we are indispensable, one to the other. It is therefore quite natural that we should have every sympathy with Indian aspirations. As my Honourable friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, said yesterday, ten years ago, there may have been die-hards, but certainly today among us there are none. We are anxious to do anything that we can to show our sympathy with those Indian aspirations, and the only thing which we ask for is reasonable safeguards for the interests which have been built up for very many years ; and I venture to remind the House that those very interests are so intermingled that it is impossible, strictly speaking, to call them purely British or purely Indian. We are, as I have already stated, fully convinced that there are plenty of Indians of the highest ability and capacity to occupy positions of responsibility. The only doubt that we have is whether the conflicting interests and parties can evolve a workable scheme acceptable to all. We sincerely hope that they will be able to. We can assure them, that, if and when they are able to evolve such a scheme, they will have all the support that we can give.

I do not propose to attempt to discuss the Report of the Simon Commission, although it appears to me to be quite a sound basis for discussion. Like my Honourable friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, it takes me a long time to form an opinion, and my political education and experience being so much less than his, it will probably take me a great deal longer than it would take him. It would be perfectly easy for me to pick out various items in the Report with which I do not agree, but it seems to me that destructive criticism is of little value unless it is supported by some constructive proposals to take its place. I cannot help feeling that continued destructive criticism, and sometimes acrid criticism will only help to create an atmosphere of distrust and doubt. I think everyone will agree that the function of the Round Table Conference is so complex and so difficult that an atmosphere of trust and friendship and goodwill is essential if they are to have any real opportunity of bringing their task to a successful conclusion. I entirely agree that the representatives who go to the Conference should be representative of all parties and all interests and that any reasonable steps which can be taken to make it so representative will have our full support. If it is agreed, as I think it is, that all parties should go to that Conference, I confess I find it a little difficult to see the necessity for this token cut, because the Simon Commission's Report is not accepted. The Conference is

not merely to deal with the Simon Commission's Report, but it has to bring all parties together and evolve a suitable and acceptable scheme. Therefore, if I may, I would suggest to the Honourable the Mover of the cut that, if he were willing to withdraw it, it would be a happy gesture, and an encouragement of that spirit of trust and goodwill which we are all so anxious to see brought about for the Round Table Conference before it sits. Sir, I support the Demand for the supplementary grant.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi (Tirhut Division : Muhammadan) : Sir, I would confine myself to only one point. I would not touch the Simon Commission's Report. I would say a few words about the propriety or the impropriety of the Round Table Conference. The situation in which the Mussalmans of India are placed to-day is a very difficult one. They have on the one hand to find fault with Mahatma Gandhi in starting a movement of civil disobedience and thwarting the London Conference, and on the other they have to criticise and record their emphatic protest against the ruthless repression that has been going on of late in the country.

While criticising the action taken by Mahatma Gandhi after the announcement of the Round Table Conference, I have to say a few words which might not please my Honourable friends, who regard Mahatma Gandhi as something more than a human being. But I have got to say it. When I look to facts which we have seen during the last one or two years, I find that, as a matter of fact, there has been communal difference of a kind which no one would like to have in India. It was certainly a matter for the two communities living together to settle between themselves. But it was not done. When we were fighting over such matters, the announcement was made by His Excellency the Viceroy on the 31st October, 1929, that there was going to be held a Round Table Conference in London. It was a happy sign that at that moment all the political leaders of India worth the name welcomed that announcement. In the first week of November, 1929, the Leaders' Conference which was held at Delhi made it clear that they were going to co-operate in this London Conference. Some conditions were of course laid down, but they were not so difficult of achievement. There was also some sign of the communal differences being adjusted between the parties. I should rather say that every one who was interested in that question believed that that was the time when Indians would make up their differences and go ahead to the London Conference for the purpose of placing unitedly a case before the Conference, which could not be resisted by any statesman howsoever sagacious he might be. But it so happened that, on the 23rd December, 1929, we heard a very amazing incident. We heard that Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru had met His Excellency the Viceroy on that day and had decided to boycott the Conference. I must assure my friends here on this side of the House that it shocked every one of my friends who were then at Lahore preparing for the Conferences and Congresses there.

Mr. President (to an Honourable Member) : Order, order. The Honourable Member knows that reading newspapers is not allowed when the House is sitting.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi : I was telling my friends here on my right that they must believe me when I say that the announcement made by Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru that they had

[Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi.]

decided to boycott the London Conference shocked us to a very great extent. We began to find out the reasons for this boycott. We tried to question our friends who were in the know of things, but to tell you the truth, no satisfactory answer could be given to our questions, and we came to the conclusion that, by avoiding the London Conference, the great Hindu leaders were avoiding a settlement and adjustment of the communal differences. Of course it might appear too much to those who are not affected by that question, but those who are intimately affected by this question have got to think out the reasons for such a course. A month and three weeks before the thing was acceptable, but it became unacceptable some time later for no apparent reason whatsoever. There must be some reason for it. However, we made it plain to Mahatma Gandhi that the boycott of the London Conference at this moment would not be favoured by the people of India. We had laboured long for the settlement of the constitutional problem and the communal differences between the several interests and communities of India, and we had not been able to solve them. Now that the opportunity was there they wanted to avoid it. There must be very solid grounds to convince those who doubted the sincerity of the boycott. Since then the differences between the two communities have grown wider and wider. We apprehended at that moment that when a struggle of this magnitude would be launched against Government and the Mussalmans as a community would keep themselves aloof, it would be bound to create ill-feeling between the two communities, which would take a long time to forget. And the same has happened.

So far I have spoken against the boycott of the London Conference by Mahatma Gandhi, but I have got to say very bitter things against Government also. The occasion for this has arisen of late. I appreciate the sincerity of purpose of His Excellency the Viceroy in not interfering with the movement which was started by Mahatma Gandhi. We thought that this non-interference would continue and the movement when not resisted would subside ; and I am sure, if that policy had been followed, the movement would not have gone to the length to which it has gone now. I have seen myself, in Patna, that the movement was going to die out, but the moment the military were brought and the poor non-violent volunteers were being trampled under by the military, the movement gathered strength to an enormous extent, and in short time, where there was no bitter feeling against Government, everybody began to feel as bitterly as the Congressmen themselves. I know personally how mercilessly Professor Abdul Bari of the *Bihar Vidyapith* was beaten by the police.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : And Babu Rajendra Prasad.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi : I have met Professor Abdul Bari myself and have learnt from him the circumstances in which he was beaten. I do not doubt his veracity. The circumstances were really such that no one but a coward would try to beat a man who was unarmed and doing no mischief. At the same time, a non-violent man, an emblem of non-violence, Babu Rajendra Prasad, could not escape the *lathi* charge of the police. These are circumstances which convince me that the method adopted by Government in suppressing the movement has been very

ruthless. But it cannot succeed. I hope Government will take my word for it that it cannot succeed.

When I look to the Frontier Province and know the facts from the witnesses who have seen the occurrences there, I forget what have happened in Bihar. It really appears that the authorities in the Frontier Province consider the people inhabiting that province as so many animals and cattle. I cannot understand how, when the 12 men who were to be arrested had surrendered of their own accord, a commotion of the kind we have heard could take place. To me it appears that the first firing as well as the second was unjustifiable. However that may be, here is a Government official of the highest position, Mr. Justice Sulaiman, who also holds the second firing to be unjustifiable. I could have understood the wisdom of Government if they had at least shown some consideration for the judgment of this Judge of theirs, but they

1 P.M. have no such consideration. Truthful and honest people have come to us from the frontier with tears in their eyes complaining and asking why they are not allowed to use their weapons. I have been telling them all the time, "If you want something substantial to come out of this struggle, you should be non-violent." I am satisfied that the mob which was fired upon at Peshawar was a non-violent mob, because otherwise you would not have so few casualties amongst the rank of the Army and of the police. After all they are Pathans of the frontier; and do you know why these Pathans came forward in such large numbers? They were told that their *Shariat* was in danger, that the Sarda Act had been passed against the injunctions of their religion.

An Honourable Member : By whom were they told?

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi : That is difficult to say, but they were told by those who were interested in agitating the people, but when they saw that a highly educated man like Maulana Mohammad Ali had also resented the passing of that Act, they certainly believed that their resentment was justifiable; and if any man went to them and told them that the Government had passed this Act in the teeth of the opposition of the Mussalmans and made it applicable to them as well as to the other communities who had wanted it, certainly these Pathans could not sit idle and not help a movement by which they might feel that they were doing some service to their religion. The difficulty is this; that in spite of the fact that protests after protests, deputations after deputations, addresses after addresses had been given to His Excellency the Viceroy representing the feelings of the Mussalmans, His Excellency the Viceroy would not believe these professions: he only believed a few who went and told him that the whole thing would subside in time and that there was no use in doing away with the application of the Act to the Mussalmans. That is the difficulty. The public feeling is not gauged at its proper worth. I find the same difficulty has arisen here in this repressive policy of the Government. If the Government were properly informed of the intense feeling in the country against the Government, I think such ruthless repression would not have been adopted. I want to tell the Government that they ought to listen to the real true opinion of the people and not of those who have their own axe to grind in keeping them ill-informed of events.

[Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi.]

We are men of the type that will not sit idle and merely make speeches ; when we came to believe that the movement of civil disobedience was not conducive to the welfare of the people, we stood up against it. We have addressed monster meetings in many many places throughout India ; we have taken our courage in our own hands and told the people that the movement was not conducive to their welfare and that they should not therefore follow it. But the Government should remember that these words will fall flat when the people find that, although there may be no reason for the civil disobedience movement, still after the movement had been started, the Government were having recourse to such methods of repression that any one who had seen or had experience of those measures could not rest content. It appears to me that thousands and thousands have gone into the fold of the Congress after this ruthless repression began. If this policy had not been adopted, I firmly believe that we would have been in a different atmosphere at this time. This is what we have done outside the Chamber, addressing meetings and bringing home to Mahatma Gandhi that the boycott of the Round Table Conference would not do ; he had got to face the stern facts and realities of the situation.

But here in this House, in the presence of those who represent the Government of India, as constituted today, I avail myself of the opportunity and want to tell them equally weighty facts which in my opinion are that the great mass of people have, by reason of unemployment and poverty, begun to distrust the Government ; the great majority of them are hankering for some method by which they can change the system. No man can satisfy them unless a radical change in the system is brought about. In my opinion therefore a change is inevitable if there is to be peace again in this country. If the Government sincerely wish that the change should come and that the responsibility of governing this country should be substantially transferred to the true representatives of the different interests and communities, they should rely on the sure ground of their sincere desire. It is needless for me to tell the Government Benches that no Government can rule a country of the culture and civilisation as India has by means of brute force, however gigantic that brute force may be. I should also say that the days of edicts and ordinances have gone by. The only policy that will do good both to India and to Great Britain is the policy of conciliation. I most heartily agree with what the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Jayakar, just now said about the policy of conciliation which should be followed by the Government. I hold the firm opinion that the invitation to the London Conference should be extended, or if it has been given, it should remain extended, to Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru. If they are going to reject it, let the blame be on them ; let Government continue this attitude and remind them from time to time that their name is on the list of the Government.

The situation that has arisen in the country is very serious and seriously the remedy should be thought out. So far as my humble opinion is concerned, it is in reaffirming the policy of reconciliation that the remedy lies. How best it is to be accomplished it is not for me to say. My voice will be in the wilderness. But, Sir, there is one thing

which I cannot help saying, and it is this. Unless the Government will re-affirm their policy of reconciliation and show by their deeds that they do not mean anything but reconciliation and steadfastly go on acting on this principle, unmindful, I say, of the excesses which civil resisters may be committing, I cannot feel satisfied that the Government are on surer grounds. Let me tell them again that the way to achieve success is that the stronger must yield to the weaker, and the weaker must pause to analyse the consequences of the desperateness with which he acts. Having done this, I would like to resume my seat. I do not want to go into the question at any great length, but before I resume my seat, I must speak out what I have gathered from the speech of His Excellency the Viceroy on the 9th instant in regard to the scope of the Conference. His Excellency has made it definitely clear that the Conference is not going to be a meeting ground for discussions or debates, but it is going to be a joint assembly of the representatives of both countries on whose agreement the precise proposals of Parliament will be founded. I believe that this is what Mahatma Gandhi wanted on the 23rd of December, 1929. We however believed that if the communal differences were settled and the representatives of British India had proceeded to the Round Table Conference after that achievement, the same result would have followed. But now that the object and scope of the Round Table Conference has been made abundantly clear by His Excellency the Viceroy, I think there should be no doubt in the mind of any representative who goes to the London Conference that it is a trap. I do not for a moment think that it is a trap for those who have got a strong mind in themselves. It is of course a trap for those who are weak-minded. Those who know their business, those who know their mind, would make capital out of it if it is proved to be a trap. I have not the least doubt that it all depends upon the representatives who would go to the London Conference to present the case on behalf of India. Therefore, I would say that now that the substance has been conceded by His Excellency the Viceroy the civil disobedience movement should cease on the one hand and the political prisoners should be released on the other. With these observations, Sir, I support the cut moved by my friend, Mr. Abdul Latif Farookhi.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : Sir, I had not intended to take part in this debate, for the question primarily raised is that of the participation of India in the Round Table Conference, and on that matter the Honourable the Leader of the House will state the position and views of Government. In the earlier part of the debate it appeared to me that the House generally recognised the difficulties of Government in dealing with this civil disobedience movement as it undoubtedly regretted the starting of that movement, but in the later stages of the debate more and more stress has been laid on the inevitably unfortunate incidents which accompany the civil disobedience movement, and allegations have been made against the behaviour of the forces of Government, and the policy generally of the Home Department has been attacked. I feel, therefore, that it is necessary, in justice to the House, to say something on those points. I shall try and confine myself to general reflections, because though certain specific allegations have been made in the House, the

[Mr. H. G. Haig.]

Government of India cannot expect to be acquainted with all the incidents that have taken place all over India, and the place where, I think, specific allegations can most conveniently be made, as they can most conveniently be answered, is in the local Legislative Councils. I need hardly say that I am not prepared myself to accept some of those allegations. The Honourable Member opposite made certain specific allegations. I have no doubt that he is an excellent advocate, but I am not prepared at present to accept him as an excellent judge, and as far as I could gather from the long Report which he read out to the House this morning, he had formed his opinion on the examination of certain *ex parte* evidence.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : In spite of the opposition of the local officials, and of the personal observation.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I feel, Sir, that it is for the Bengal Government to answer those allegations. I myself am not acquainted with the details.....

Mr. C. S. Banga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Non-Muhammadian Rural) : Will the Honourable Member be prepared to investigate the statements that were made by the Leader of the Nationalist Party ? Will he put it to the Bengal Government how far those allegations are true, and will they advise the Publicity Department either of Bengal or of the Government of India to make a public statement on these facts ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I have no doubt, Sir, that the Bengal Government, when these allegations are brought to their notice, will deal with them.

Then, other statements have been made, such as those by my friend Sir Cowasji Jehangir. I do not in the least wish to dispute the general accuracy of the picture he has drawn, but as His Excellency the Viceroy in his address to this House recently said, it is inevitable that, when these clashes take place between the forces of the Congress,—and I deliberately use the words “forces of the Congress”,—and the forces of Government, the innocent or some of the innocent are likely to suffer.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : They are deliberate.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : Government deplore that as much as any Honourable Member here. But I would ask the House to remember that the only way in which these deplorable incidents can be brought to an end is by the Congress abandoning its present methods. (*An Honourable Member :* “Unconditionally ?”)

Mr. K. C. Neogy : And by the Government sticking to lawful methods.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : Well, Sir, I shall deal with the matter on more general lines. There has been.....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : Do I understand that the Government are laying down this proposition, that until the Congress stop the civil disobedience movement, however wrong an action taken by an officer of the Government, it is not to be taken notice of ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : No. That was certainly not my position. My position is, when one is dealing with large crowds, as apparently has been the case in Bombay, and when it is necessary for the police to disperse them, it is hardly to be expected that some innocent people will not suffer. I do not go beyond that.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : But when they do suffer, surely the Government should take measures to prevent a recurrence of that.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : So far as possible, I have no doubt whatever that the Bombay Government are taking all reasonable measures.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : And the other Governments too ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : The other Governments, I am glad to say, are not faced with the same situation as the Government of Bombay. (*An Honourable Member :* "You will have a similar situation in other provinces also.")

Mr. K. C. Néogy : That shows what little knowledge the Honourable Member possesses about things in Bengal. (*An Honourable Member :* "Also of things in the Madras Presidency.")

(At this stage several other Honourable Members also interrupted.)

Mr. President : I think that it will be better if Honourable Members allow the Honourable Mr. Haig to go on with his statement.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : He is making a reply. Some of us wanted to speak, and bring certain occurrences to his notice, but we cannot do so now. So, the only way is to..... (*An Honourable Member :* "Interrupt him.") try to draw him out.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I was saying, Sir, that the Government are accused in a general way of repressing this movement, and it has been suggested that that is a wrong method of dealing with it. I admit that repression is a word that has an ugly sound, but we have to consider what it is sought to repress. All Honourable Members in this House know very well that what it is sought to repress are breaches of the law, deliberate breaches of the law or incitements to taxpayers not to pay taxes. A Government that is not prepared to deal with such activities forfeits its claim to govern. A Government, any Government, the Government of the present and the Government of the future, must have authority. That is a point that is very well understood by the leaders of the civil disobedience movement. Their object has been quite definitely and plainly to undermine the authority of Government by promoting among the mass of the people a spirit of defiance. It is true that the issue has been to some extent clouded by the methods adopted,—the method, the policy of non-violence,—and I freely admit that in very many cases, in the majority of cases, that method has been followed out. The House knows very well that there are other cases in which non-violence has completely failed. But I grant that the means employed by the Congress to undermine the authority of Government have been very skilfully devised. They endeavour to place the Government in the dilemma of either acquiescing in the Congress activities, activities which cannot really be tolerated without destroying the foundations of the authority of Government, or, on the other hand, of opposing those activities by force. That is quite plainly the policy, and the very clever policy

[Mr. H. G. Haig.]

of the Congress. And they reckoned in a clear sighted way that, by placing Government in this dilemma, they would naturally rouse the sympathy of a large number of people who would not ordinarily sympathise with the Congress, by the very fact that Government were compelled to use a certain amount of force in dealing with those methods. That, Sir, is the position and I wish to make that plain to the House. Non-violence, as I have said, is merely a method. We have to look to what underlies it. The underlying conception is really that of force. It is that of applying force and coercion to Government. Another path is open, as His Excellency stated the other day, the path of argument and reason, and it seems to me a tragedy that these methods should be pursued, methods which must lead to increasing ill-will on both sides, when this other path is open. The tragedy is not, as it seems to me, one of those inevitable and relentless clashes of antagonistic forces ; it seems to me rather a tragedy of misunderstandings and suspicions. We may differ about the degree and the pace of constitutional reforms, but our faces are all set in the same direction. (*An Honourable Member : " Question."*)

Mr. K. C. Neogy : Not of the Honourable Member's.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I claim to speak for myself and to interpret my own views. The great misunderstanding, as it seems to me, —I know that Honourable Members opposite or many of them do not agree—the great misunderstanding is the belief, which is unfortunately very prevalent in this country, sedulously propagated, genuinely held, that nothing can be obtained from the British except by force. That is a view which is based on a certain reading of history. For myself I think it is misreading of history and a misreading of the real temper of the British people.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : What did you do with regard to Ireland ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : I know, that is exactly the point. But I believe that this country is being seriously misled in basing all its policy and all its views on the history of Ireland. (*An Honourable Member : " What about America ? "*)

Mr. M. B. Jayakar : Is the Honourable Member prepared to recommend to the Government some means by which such a general impression may be removed ?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig : The general impression is possibly being removed by the events of the last three months, which I think are making it plain that the path which has been adopted by the Congress, the path of coercing the Government, is not leading to any successful conclusion. Therefore, I will appeal to this House, and it needs no appeal for I know their sympathies lie in that direction, that they should follow the other path, the path which has been open all along and which continues open, the path of reason and agreement. I believe—again I do not expect to convince Honourable Members opposite—that in the whole of this constitutional question what really matters is not force but the moral issues, and that it is the moral issues in this case that appeal to the British people. The claim for self-government is in its essence a moral claim and my own firm conviction is that the progress that this

cause has achieved in the past has been largely due to the moral appeal which it has made to the British people. I trust, Sir, that India will choose the path of reason, not of force, and that the representatives of various parties and interests will go to London in a spirit of friendship and good will, with the determination to seek a solution that may be acceptable to both countries.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-five Minutes to Three of the Clock.

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

Mr. Kikabhai Premchand (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, the Report of the Simon Commission, to which we had been looking forward so long, has now appeared and has met with almost universal disapproval throughout India. It was generally expected that nothing could satisfy the extreme left wing, but it is a matter of regret to observe that it has not satisfied even those who are prepared to co-operate with Government. Personally, I am forced to share this general dissatisfaction. For instance, the so-called provincial autonomy, as recommended by the Commission, will, on closer examination, show that this is largely illusory.

Even if an advance in this direction may be admitted, it is offset by the retrogressive nature of the recommendations for the Central Government.

The whole crux of the national demand for self-government lies in the control of the country's fiscal policy, which can only be obtained through advances in the Central Government. It naturally involves the control of tariff policy, which is of paramount importance to Indian trade and commerce, and the commercial community cannot reasonably be satisfied unless the decision in all tariff matters is left to the Indian Legislature. Personally I am in favour of Imperial Preference more as an economic advantage to India than as a gesture of amity. But we must be free to work out our own ideas for the protection of those industries which need safeguarding and bring in our own measures to prevent the stifling of the growing industrial sense in India. It is futile to have any advance if the Members of the Indian Legislature are to be in effect merely onlookers and not responsible participants in the shaping of the country's destiny.

Some of the suggestions made by the Financial Adviser to the Commission are particularly unfortunate. He says that there is no room for further taxation in India, while at the same time he suggests various methods of levying taxes, which are most unsuitable to India, like the terminal tax, a suggestion bound to foment inter-provincial jealousies and interfere with the free course of trade within the country. The United States is an example of a country whose prosperity has been built up largely by reason of the fact that it has an immense area with no restrictions whatever on legitimate trade within its borders. Europe, on the other hand, is endeavouring to find some way of getting rid of the barriers to trade which have been raised on all sides.

The reforms that I urge are not the demand of thoughtless or irresponsible people. They express the feeling of the conservative element,

[Mr. Kikabhai Premchand.]

men who have an important stake in the country, educated men, who have learnt to study all the implications of a question and to consider consequences,—bankers, businessmen and landholders.

The present unrest seems, to my mind, due more to economic reasons than to anything else. The commercial community's sympathy has been alienated by the fact that Government have not taken business men into their confidence or availed themselves of their counsel, excepting as a last resort, preferring to take the advice of men whose interests are primarily political. It is vital to the interests of Government to regain the lost sympathies of business men by helping to grant a substantial measure of advance in the Central Government, of course, subject to necessary safeguards to prevent profiteering and ousting of Empire goods. It is therefore highly desirable that the legitimate demands of men who have everything at stake be satisfied and to win them over to the side of law and order. I should therefore recommend the House, to show their disapproval of the Simon Report, to vote for the cut motion of Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division : Non-Muhammalian Rural) : Sir, a perusal of the Report of the Standing Finance Committee will show that the Committee desired to point out that the Conference should be fully representative of all political parties in India. Before sanctioning the Demand in the Standing Finance Committee in which opinion was sharply divided, we had this recommendation made. Now if we are to pass the Grant that is now before us, we will have to see whether these conditions have been fulfilled. The House has to see to that. But we are in the dark about it. We do not know what the personnel of the Conference is going to be. Ample time has passed since then by which the Government could have announced the personnel of the Conference. One can well understand why the Central Government do not wish to declare the names before the Grant is passed. They are not forthcoming. And why ? It is lest the personnel be disapproved by even those who do not approve of the civil disobedience movement. And what is the reason ? I was informed a few minutes before by an Honourable Member of this House how the Government of the Honourable Mr. Haig and his subordinates is administering law and order. At Calcutta, when there was no picketing Ordinance, a small boy was picketing near a shop. I was told that this boy of 10 was caught by two European Sergeants and a revolver was pointed at his head.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca Division : Muhammadan Rural) : Mention the name of the gentleman who gave you the information, otherwise it is very difficult to believe the story.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : I am not going to do that. I know it is very difficult for certain Members in this House to believe things which go against some Members of the Government. I know that my Honourable friend is not one of those Members, but if he turns out to be one of those Members, then I regret it very much. I can only tell him that he is a highly respected citizen of Calcutta and a moderate in politics. Then they began to beat the boy mercilessly, so much so that an old woman, who saw him from her house, ran down to save the child. That old woman was also going to be beaten, but fortunately she was protected

by her people. This is the way in which they create lawlessness and disorder in the country.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi : Where did it happen ?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : It happened at Calcutta. Sir, I charge the Government with creating lawlessness and disorder in order to make a case against the Indian people getting responsible government. If this be the mentality of the Government of India, do they expect that we can vote for this Demand ? Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the House, who is universally loved and respected, should know all these for he sees through other's eyes. Sir, the Executive Government have, to our great regret, turned His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, into a Publicity Bureau to whitewash all the misdeeds of their subordinates. They swallow every statement that comes to them from the subordinate officers. It is in the interests of these subordinate officials to have lawlessness and disorder in the country ; they provoke it and use *lathis* mercilessly. I know the Honourable Member on the side of the Government will say in reply that they have other versions of the case. They will always have other versions of the case, but they can take it from me that we do not believe that they have really made an inquiry about these matters and have really taken a judicial view of these facts. But as they think that it is in their interest to support their subordinate officials, they do what they have done and say that they do not believe the other side of the version which is laid before them. Sir, we had this morning from our friend Mr. Neogy a detailed account of what was happening at Midnapore. What reply has the Honourable the Home Member given to the charge that was made in this House about the conduct of the Sub-Divisional Officer of Cantai ? This Sub-Divisional Officer did not hesitate in arresting even Mr. J. N. Basu, the President of the Indian Association, a position which was previously held by such eminent men as Mr. Anand Mohan Bose, Sir Surendra Nath Banerjee and others, and in company with him our friend Mr. Neogy was also arrested. Can high-handedness go further than that ? And you still ask us to co-operate with you and to join you in this Round Table Conference. What has made people sympathise with this civil disobedience movement ? It is such misdeeds and misrule on the part of your subordinates that have caused such unrest in the country. I know India is not your motherland ; I know that you are interested in exploiting India ; I know that you will try to continue your rule with the help of your bayonets and arms ; and I know that you have no stake in this country. You can go away immediately in your boats when it is unsafe. But we, who are the children of the soil, who have permanent stakes in this country, want to have ordered progress through ordered Government. You come with all sorts of sweet words, but in practice you do otherwise. Your profession and your action is not the same, and I very much regret that this is so. I also wonder how an administrator of the type of Mr. Haig can overlook the real significance of what is happening. He was very unkind to me the other day when he said that I disclaimed all acquaintance with him. I did not mean that at all. What I said was that he was new to this House. I know of his reputation as a just, good and sympathetic administrator. But what has brought about this change in his outlook, I fail to see. Sir, look at that Mr. Haig, and look at this Mr. Haig. (Laughter.) How has he changed ? I submit

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

that it is probably the atmosphere, the vicious atmosphere, which is created by not listening to the advice of the representatives of the people. Sir, it is regrettable that a sympathetic Viceroy of His Excellency Lord Irwin's type should be misled into thinking that the excesses are unavoidable. His Excellency said the other day that there is no doubt on which side the blame lies. His Excellency himself, of course, did not inquire nor did the men who advise him about all these things inquire. Wherefrom has all this information come? I know how this information of the Government is collected, when the Government of India ask for any information from the Provincial Government, the Provincial Government asks for that information from the Divisional Commissioner, who, in his turn, asks for it from the District Magistrate. The District Magistrate asks for that information from his Sub-Divisional Officer who in his turn asks for the information from the Circle Officers, or the President of the Panchayat. Ultimately the Chaukidar supplies the information and then it is communicated to Government. That is the evidence upon which the Government charges the people who are carrying on a non-violent war against the Government with violence. Violence there has been. But violence on whose side? On the side of the officials. It is a fact that at Midnapore, the police officials were rescued by the Congress volunteers. You provoked the mob and entered their houses and the shameful story of attacking a girl of 18 years of age has been read out by my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy. Do you mean to say that any human being can stand and look at it with indifference? They are bound to protect the honour of their women. Unfortunately in the communiqué issued by His Excellency for promulgating the Ordinance we find reference to Midnapore, where it has been said that a Sub-Inspector of Police was murdered. I do not know whether really a Sub-Inspector of Police was murdered or not. But if you want to hear the doings of this Sub-Inspector, I think my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy can tell you that and your blood will boil if you are a human being. Why should even Indian women who are generally behind the purdah come out? Because your oppression has been such that no decent man who calls himself an Indian, so long as life runs in him, can allow such atrocities to continue. Sir, I warn the Government to take lessons from the fate of Ravana, the Rakshas King of Lanka. If you persist in this way, if you go on insulting our mothers and our daughters, then there will not be a single Indian left who will be on your side.

Sir, the Round Table Conference should be fully representative of all political parties in India. Which political party really represents the people? It is the Congress and Congress alone. We may be here, several of us, a minority not believing in a particular portion of the Congress programme, but I think every Indian, whether he be a Nationalist or an Independent or a Swarajist or be he, of any other party, I believe all of them support the Congress in its demand for Dominion Status. Do you find anywhere in the second volume of the Simon Report the word "Dominion Status"? His Excellency the Viceroy in October last proclaimed that Dominion Status was the goal. If you declare that we are going to have Dominion Status automatically after passing through a certain transitory period, I think political India will accept that.

Mr. President : Order, order. I hope the Honourable Member will try to conclude his remarks. He has already exceeded his time limit.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : I will, Sir. I was saying, that you ought to have representatives of the Congress, you should declare their names before you can ask us to vote for this grant. Then again you ought to grant a general amnesty to all political prisoners. That was done in the case of Ireland.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi : Then call off the civil disobedience movement.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : I think my Honourable friend knows that even Dr. Ansari, an ex-President of the Congress, does not approve of the civil disobedience movement. In fact if you grant a political amnesty, they on their side will cease to pursue their civil disobedience campaign.

One other thing you will allow me to state. I was very much disappointed in finding the following words in His Excellency's speech :

“ The Conference will approach greatly assisted by the Report.”

As I said the other day, this Simon Commission's Report should be treated as non-existing, because the Report of Sir John Simon is nothing but the report of an advocate who was briefed by Members of British Imperialism to support the case for perpetual domination of India, and Sir John Simon, as a clever advocate, has put his case and has not acted as a judge.

Sir, an appeal has been made by the Honourable Mr. Studd that there should be an atmosphere of peace and goodwill. I say certainly there ought to be peace and goodwill, but it must be reciprocal for the well-being of the country and the better advancement of our people.

3 P.M.

You will please lay aside your arrogance, that arrogance which permits of the Honourable Mr. Haig to disbelieve all that is said by Honourable Members on this side of the House and to believe and accept the version of his own chaukidar as the more correct. That arrogance.....

Mr. President : I hope the Honourable Member will now conclude his observations.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : That arrogance which has been at the root of so much misunderstanding and ill-will between the British people and ourselves should be put aside, and I appeal to them once more to be more conciliatory and show a change of heart for we are destined for many a long and weary year to work side by side in this country for our common good.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Mr. President, I must confess that I was greatly amazed at the first part of the speech of the Honourable the Home Member this morning. Both on the floor of this House and in the country outside, serious allegations have been made against the excesses of the police officials and the indiscriminate attacks made by them upon innocent mobs, and we, on this side, expected that the Honourable the Home Member would give some convincing reply to these

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

allegations made at least on the floor of this House ; and instead of doing that what has he done ? He has taken up the amazing position that the Government of India are not expected to know the details of all the incidents that are going on in the provinces and that Provincial Governments must be referred to for a detailed explanation of these things. When my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, challenged him with a report that he, along with certain other respectable citizens, had produced, the Honourable the Home Member had nothing more to say in reply, but that it was for the Bengal Government to answer these allegations. I thought, Sir, that though the subject of law and order was primarily the concern of Local Governments, it was the Government of India in this country that was ultimately responsible for the maintenance of law and order. If in normal times, it is the duty of the Government of India to maintain law and order, the duty becomes much more important in a time of crisis like the one through which we are passing. I would like to ask the Honourable the Home Member to say, on behalf of the Government of India, whether, when they were faced with this serious crisis three months back, they gave any definite instructions to the various Local Governments as to the methods to be pursued in suppressing the movement of civil disobedience, or whether they gave a free hand to the Local Governments to deal with the movement as they liked in their own provinces. We came to know from the Press that the Honourable the Home Member himself very rightly paid a visit to Bombay, the centre of the great agitation, and conferred with the Local Government in the matter. Now, are we not entitled to ask whether the Government of India have a definite policy in this matter ? Or, is the handling of the situation left to the various Local Governments in their respective areas ? That is certainly not an unreasonable question to ask of the Home Member in a time of crisis like this. As my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy said, the very presence of some of us in this House is convincing proof, if proof were needed, that we entirely dissociate ourselves from the civil disobedience movement. But, Sir, if the civil disobedience movement has resulted in creating a feeling of intense bitterness throughout the country and if it has gained a momentum which none of us expected that it would gain, during the last three months, it is to be ascribed in a very large measure to the methods pursued by Government in handling the movement. Sir, Government should not be blind to the facts of the situation. What is it that they see in Bombay today ? It is not merely the professional agitators that have created trouble. It is to some extent the sympathy and the passive acquiescence of the great commercial communities of Bombay that have resulted in that city being plunged in disaster and ruin. Men of sobriety, men of judgment, men who have got an immense stake in the country, have come to look with horror upon the methods pursued by some of the over-zealous officials in the various provinces in dealing with the civil disobedience movement. Surely it is up to the Government of India to convince at least those who do not associate themselves with this movement that, in suppressing this movement, Government will follow methods which will commend themselves to citizens who value liberty and the maintenance of law and order. Sir, it seems to me that the mentality of Government is something like this : They are faced with a serious situation and they evidently feel that even

if the police officials commit certain acts of excess and if the Government of India or the Local Governments take the respective officials to task, it will be a sort of indirect encouragement to the civil disobedience movement. That seems to be the mentality of the Government of India and the Provincial Governments, which makes them shut their eyes entirely to the various allegations that have been made about the police excesses and the indiscriminate attacks by police officials on the mob. I for one would stand on the side of Government in all the legitimate methods employed for suppressing the movement, which is the very negation of orderly and peaceful Government. But surely Government cannot expect law-abiding citizens to come to their rescue when they pursue methods which cannot commend themselves to such citizens. In the city of Madras itself, which underwent some amount of trouble, not of course comparable to the extent to which Bombay was subjected, such a sober body as the Corporation of Madras thought it their duty to pass a resolution condemning the excesses of the police officials on a certain occasion and asking Government to institute an impartial inquiry into the allegations. The members of the Corporation of Madras are not professional agitators. They are interested in maintaining the civil tranquility of the province for the purpose of local administration itself. And what was the answer given by Government to this very reasonable demand of a body like the Municipal Corporation of Madras? Government gave no heed to it; and subsequently when the Report of the Police Commissioner of Madras City was published, the Government of Madras, without instituting any sort of an impartial inquiry, commended the Report of the Police Commissioner to the public and endorsed all that the Police Commissioner had said. That, Sir, would certainly enrage a man who would otherwise be on the side of law and order. I would ask the Honourable the Home Member to realise that he must face the situation boldly and pursue a policy of conciliation because the atmosphere in which the Round Table Conference is to be held must be one of mutual goodwill if the result of that Conference is to be a success.

Sir, while I was surprised at the first part of the speech of the Honourable the Home Member I welcome the conciliatory spirit of the second part of his speech. He pointed out that we are passing through a period of tragedy and misunderstanding and suspicion on both sides, and he said that the present national movement is merely an appeal to the moral sense of the British people and he felt confident that that appeal would not be in vain. The Honourable the Home Member ventured to think that this suspicion and misunderstanding was the result of our reading or misreading of the Irish history. But let me tell him, Sir, that it is not merely the Irish parallel but what took place in our own country in recent times that has created this suspicion and misunderstanding. I am one of those who are of opinion that it was a great pity that, in December, last, the Congress should have rejected the offer of His Excellency the Viceroy to go to the Round Table Conference. Sir, when the historic pronouncement of the Viceroy was made in October, last it gave encouragement and hope to many of us, but what are the incidents that subsequently followed that historic announcement? The speech of the Noble Earl, the Under Secretary of State for India, the fulminations and the outbursts of Lords

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

Birkenhead and Reading and Mr. Lloyd George in the British Press and in the House of Lords.....

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Member for Commerce and Railways) : Sir, the Noble Earl whom the Honourable Member refers to was not, I think, at that time the Under-Secretary of State for India.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty : I am referring to the period subsequent to the making of the October announcement by the Viceroy and I referred to Earl Russell who was at that time the Under-Secretary of State for India and who, when his dog died or was dying, made that speech which dispelled the hopes created in us by that announcement.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy : The Honourable Member is quite right ; I am sorry I misunderstood.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty : These incidents shattered to some extent the hopes that some of us entertained as a result of the great pronouncement of the Viceroy made in October last ; and to crown all these disappointments, came the Report of the Simon Commission. Sir, the members of the Royal Commission, in the concluding part of their Report, make a fervent appeal to their Indian fellow-subjects to do them the courtesy of studying their Report. I am sure many of us have already shown that courtesy or are engaged in showing that courtesy, and as a result of the study that we have made, we have no hesitation in saying that the recommendations contained in this Report are wholly unacceptable to any section of Indian public opinion. The fundamental defect of the Simon Report is, in my opinion, a lack of appreciation on the part of the Commissioners of the true scope and function of their work. In paragraph 363 they reiterate what they stated in the first paragraph of their Report. They say :

“ We will venture to repeat words which we used in the first paragraph of our former volume when we wrote that we were entering upon our task upon the basis and assumption that the goal defined by Mr. Montagu represents the accepted policy to be pursued and that the only proposals worthy to be considered are proposals conceived in the spirit of the announcement of 20th August, 1917 and inspired with the honest purpose of giving to it its due effect.”

Sir, in laying emphasis on the pronouncement of 20th August, 1917, and in conceiving their duty to be to frame recommendations within the spirit of those proposals, the Commissioners have failed to take note of a great event that happened subsequently—the famous pronouncement of the Viceroy in October last. The Viceroy, speaking on behalf of His Majesty's Government, assured us that the logical sequence of the policy contained in the declaration of August, 1917, was the establishment of a Dominion Status constitution in India ; but to our utter amazement, the Commissioners have entirely failed to take note of this great pronouncement of the Viceroy. Sir, I went through the various papers that the Commissioners have published, and so far as I have been able to look through the volumes, even the text of the Viceroy's pronouncement does not find a place in the various appendices published by the Simon Commission. That shows, and to me it is an evidence, that the Commissioners, when they wrote their Report, were not fully alive to the implications of the task to which they had been called. If only they had interpreted the announcement of 1917 in the

light of the pronouncement made by His Excellency the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the Report and its recommendations would probably have been very different from what they are. But fortunately for us, we have been assured by His Excellency the Viceroy the other day that the Statutory Commission's Report, however important it might be, will not be the last word, neither would it be the sole basis of discussion at the Round Table Conference, and it is because of that assurance that I joined with some of my friends on this side in issuing an appeal to my countrymen to participate in the Round Table Conference and not to miss this great opportunity of coming to a settlement with the British Government. Sir, many who are keeping aloof from this Conference are doing so in a spirit of despair and some in fear. Some are afraid that it is a trap, but I am actuated by a feeling of hope rather than of fear; for I remember a saying that if hopes are dupes, fears may be liars; and we have ventured to advise our countrymen to participate in this Conference in the confident hope that His Majesty's Government and the British people have now come to realise the strength that lies behind India's national demand, and that the time has now come for them to realise, once for all, that if a settlement is not arrived at at the Round Table Conference, it will be a bad day both for England and for India.

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar (Madras : Indian Commerce) : Sir, it is my duty to oppose totally this grant, and in doing so I believe I shall be a member of a solitary party—probably the leader and the follower as well. But I shall give some reasons as to why I decided to speak on this point, though when I came here this morning I had no idea of taking part in the discussion or in the voting. I represent the Indian Commerce of the Madras Presidency, and I am sorry to see that all the speakers so far, more or less, suggested that the civil disobedience movement is entirely due to the Congress and that the Congress Party and its followers alone are responsible for the civil disobedience movement. But thanks to the gross and serious mistakes committed by the Government, in the economic as well as in other public spheres, all the traders, manufacturers and bankers of this country have been driven out of co-operation and have joined in sympathy with civil disobedience. It has been very well said that they have done so because for the last ten years the Government have been ruining them, ruining every vested interest in this country, by their actions and therefore having no hope of getting any remedy at the hand of this Government, these men have simply run into the hands of the civil disobedience people in the hope that they might have some chance of thereby getting out of their troubles. Look at these ten years and it is enough to convince you, Sir, how these business men have been ruined. During these ten years shares have fallen down to 25 per cent. of their former value; the money has flown out of the country and the prices of foodgrains have gone down to pre-war levels. That is the reason why the business men of the country have practically revolted against this Government. In my opinion, to say now that the Round Table Conference will be of any use whatsoever to us is only imaginary.

Let us first of all see whether this is the time when we should go to the Round Table Conference and examine the place where it is going to be held and also the conditions under which we are asked to go as well as the persons who are to be invited. We were originally told that, so

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar.]

far as the Indian leaders were concerned, if there were any agreed proposals, the Government in England would give effect to them. That was the understanding on which the Round Table Conference was originally proposed. We had our own doubts and our doubts have now been strengthened. We were originally told that there should be agreement among ourselves ; but now we are told that we should take the parties in England also with us ; and if there is one thing which is most retrograde and reactionary—if I may speak with submission—in His Excellency's speech, it is this, that it says clearly that if all the parties in England and India come to some understanding, then they will use that as the basis of some legislation which will be placed before Parliament. What are the parties that we have to meet there ? We have not so far been told as to who will be the members of the Conference from England, but we have no doubt whatever that people like Sir John Simon will be there, people like the ex-Secretary of State, Lord Birkenhead, will be there and that people like Sir Michael O'Dwyer will also be there. No doubt my friend, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar relies upon the justice of his case. Probably he thinks this is one of his cases where he has to deal with impartial judges, and after winning the case he can put into his elastic pocket currency notes and cheques of large values. But I ask him, is the condition of having an impartial judge fulfilled in this matter ? The Viceroy has warned us that there should be an agreed arrangement between the parties, including the English parties as well as Indian parties—that is very clearly hinted at, though not clearly said, and that dashes all our hopes of getting anything at all in the Conference. So far as we are concerned, these proposals are absolutely useless. Today we read in the papers that the Labour Party escaped a narrow defeat by a majority of three ; and the statement that was expected to be issued by the Labour Premier on the 9th has been postponed, evidently because he could not come to any terms with the other two parties, and I am sure they will never come to an agreement unless he agrees with what they say. The Labour Party will have to go to the other parties for the sake of their pockets and their position and power and agree to their terms.

In these circumstances, what can we expect ? Can we expect anything from a Labour Ministry in which two members recently have been promoted to Ministers, members who unreservedly agreed to the unanimous Report of the Simon Commission ?

I expected that some suggestions would be made here in this House as to how we could take Congressmen and others into this Conference. By a clever strategic move, the Honourable the Leader of the House included the Simon Report within the scope of this proposition. If the Government had been fair and honest, they should have placed the Simon Report before this House. The money for this Commission was paid by this Government, and therefore, in all fairness and honesty, they should have presented the Report to this House and invited a discussion. But they are cowards and they do not want to take that course because they know what the result would be ; they know that this House would unanimously throw out the Report. But unfortunately, our leaders were side-tracked into the question of the Simon Report. We all shunned the Commission and we now see it contains nothing but scorpions. We wanted bread and they gave not even a stone but scorpions. Every page of this Simon Report is full of stings ; touch it where you will, a sting is there. All our leaders

have unanimously condemned it ; and by the course now followed, we are simply playing into the hands of the Honourable the Leader of the House who has laid a trap for us. I go further now, Sir, and throw out some definite suggestions which I place before the Government and before this House as to what should be done to bring Congressmen into this Conference.....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : But why not smash the Report by a direct vote against the Demand ?

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar : They do not care a copper pie for your vote. Can Mr. Jinnah assure me that, by voting for this cut, he can bring the Government round to agree with him ?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : My interruption meant that we can destroy this trap by supporting the cut and recording our verdict that we condemn the Simon Commission's recommendations.

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar : I do not agree with the first portion of my Honourable friend's statement. He says he can destroy this Report by the cut. How ? How can you do it ? The Report is there. Our learned Deputy President had so many hopes of getting something from the Simon Committee, but all his hopes have been shattered to pieces. What I want to say, Sir, is that we should not have touched the Simon Report at all, and but for the interruption of my Honourable Leader, I wanted to say, let the Government give us an assurance that at least on one point they are at one with us on the Simon recommendations if we carry a resolution about it in this House. His Excellency told us the other day most clearly that this Report will form an important basis. Whether this will form an important or unimportant basis, and if I can prophesy, Sir,—I do not claim to be prophet—I am sure that the Simon recommendations will become the only outcome of the Round Table Conference with some crossing of the "t's" here and dotting the "i's" there. I must warn this Government, as some of my leaders have already done, that it is futile for them to believe that they can crush the present civil disobedience movement. His Excellency the Viceroy has been unfortunately advised that there are two roads to peace, either we should crush the movement or we should abdicate. No, Sir, there is a third alternative which all sensible men should adopt and that is conciliation because the more you press the spring the more is the material ready to jump up. An attempt has been made to describe the civil resisters as mercenary people, but it is absolutely incorrect. People have gone to jail in very large numbers, and I must confess that at least a very large majority of them belong to very respectable families. Old and young, male and female, rich and poor, employed and employers, have all gone to jail, and more are ready to go. And what is the primary cause of that ? It is the repressive policy of the Government. Now, Sir, it was pointed out by the Honourable the Home Member that the Congressmen are defying the law and that law and order must be maintained. May I ask the Honourable the Law Member to tell me under what provisions of the law a policeman is authorised to beat a person who disobeys the law ? Sir, the Allahabad High Court has recently held that no policeman has got a right to beat anybody who disobeys the law, unless he threatens his life or causes some grievous assault. Therefore, Sir, I may tell this House that the doings of the police in using the *lathis*, etc., have all been illegal. The High Court of Allahabad has recently upheld the conviction of a police constable and a fine of Rs. 2

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar.]

for beating a non-violent person. By all means you can pass Ordinances signed by the Viceroy and say that any policeman can beat any person, and tell us that it is the law, it is an Ordinance. You have passed so many Ordinances recently, but you have not dared to put even one of them before this House, though a pigmy House as it is called.

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

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar : Thank you, Sir. Now, I shall make a few suggestions to bring about a better and more satisfactory state of affairs. It has been said by His Excellency the Viceroy and by everybody else in the world that there is no use of holding this Round Table Conference unless it consists of all parties. It is also admitted, Sir, that the Congress Party is a very important party. It is also feared, Sir, that unless the Congress members take part in the Round Table Conference, any decisions that might be arrived at by the Conference will share the same fate as the Simon recommendations have shared in the country. Therefore, Sir, I want this Government to have some imagination. If the Government are wise, if they have learnt anything during the last three or four months, let them at once release all political prisoners. They are not people who will do any violence. If they do not come to any terms, whatever they may be, then you have the power and the right to put them in jail again. But the invitation in this case should come, as it had come in the case of Ireland, from His Majesty the King, who is the only person, I think, who can at present command the respect and confidence of all parties in this matter. It is he who should extend the invitation, because judging from his speech which was made at the opening of the India House the other day, it was as clear as daylight that, though he has been made silent regarding details, by his advisers, still every word of his speech breathes sympathy and a desire to do good for India, both future and present. Therefore, Sir, my appeal to the Government and to those who are to go to the Round Table Conference is that they must insist upon the invitation being issued to the Congress leaders by His Majesty. We know who Mr. Gandhi is. Only the other day I was reading an extract from a New York paper which regretted that the most civilized Government in the world should not have been able to come to terms with such a good and fair-minded person as Mahatma Gandhi, and instances were given to show that, when the plague broke out in South Africa, he recalled the civil disobedience movement. Then again when the Boer war broke out in South Africa, he recalled this movement, and again when the great German war broke out, he did not want to do anything which was calculated to hamper the Government. Therefore, Sir, Mahatma Gandhi is a man with whom you can safely and confidently deal in bringing about an amicable settlement in this matter. First of all, let us have a Round Table Conference in India itself, and the only person who can preside over it is His Excellency the Viceroy. If the Viceroy of India can get together a few people from all parties and discuss the matter thoroughly with them, I am sure there will be unanimity of opinion on some of the complex problems so far as this country is concerned, and then it will be time, as was done in the case of Ireland, for the representatives of India and the representatives in England to meet at a Round Table Conference and discuss the various issues, and I am sure, if this is done, even the diehards and others

will look into the reasonableness of our demand and agree to a satisfactory settlement. As I said, you cannot crush any people. Even supposing you succeed in arresting the progress of the movement for a time by some of your barbarous methods, it will again revive with greater vigour and greater force. I say it is quite impossible to crush or stop the present civil disobedience movement, because partly you are yourself responsible to spread it by adopting some of the barbarous methods. Look at Poland. Look at Egypt. Look at Ireland. Look at Alsace Lorraine. No one could crush the internal movements there. Therefore, I say, grant a general amnesty to all people, and unconditionally release all political prisoners. Let the invitation go to leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru, and if you follow this course, I am sure that something can be done. Sir, just before the arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru, we had fond hopes that something on the lines of what Mr. Jayakar said this morning was going to be done ; we heard from private sources that something by way of co-operation by the Congress people was in contemplation. In fact, Sir, some of us Congressmen in Madras sent an appeal to Pandit Motilal Nehru to pass a resolution in the Congress Working Committee on the lines that have just been adumbrated by Mr. Patel. Sir, there is no hurry about the Round Table Conference. This is a moment when it is impossible to convene a Round Table Conference if you want to achieve any fruitful results, and therefore I appeal to all those who have been invited to the Round Table Conference, and to those who have just now issued a statement to the Press, to ask His Excellency the Viceroy to postpone the idea of the Conference for some time to come, to grant a general amnesty to all political prisoners so as to create a favourable atmosphere, to invite Mahatma Gandhi and other respected leaders to the Round Table Conference, and then to appeal to His Majesty himself to extend his invitation to the people here. Unless and until this is done, I can assure the Government here that there can be no hope of achieving any fruitful results in any conference.

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

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Aiyangar : Thank you, Sir. I have nothing more to say.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I think I must say a few words on the subject before the House in connection with the Simon Report and the Round Table Conference, because reference has been so often made to the North West Frontier Province in the course of this debate. But at the very outset I must confess that I have not thoroughly studied the whole Report and I cannot pass judgment on the Report as a whole. It may be a good Report or it may be a bad Report ! Perhaps it is a bad Report, because it has been generally if not universally disapproved, but possibly it is a good Report because it has not pleased or fully satisfied anybody in the country. It has criticised every thing and has exposed the difficulties that stand in the way of the further constitutional progress of the country as a whole. It has thereby pleased neither one section nor the other, and if the old saying is true that an impartial judgment is not pleasing to both parties in a case, then perhaps the Report is a good one. But as far as I can see, it has certainly done some good in one way, and it is that some of the leaders of the majority community were waiting for the issue of that Report before they should meet

[Nawab Sir Sanibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

and settle their differences with the minority communities. They perhaps thought that, if something better came out of the Report for them, they would escape the recognition of some of the rights and privileges of the other communities or meeting their wishes. But the Report must have disillusioned them of a good many things, because it says that the question of India is really the question of the minorities or of the settlement of the disputes of the various communities inhabiting India. If that is so, and I believe that it is really a question of the minorities, then, there is still time for the leaders to put their heads together and settle those differences before they go to the Round Table Conference. There is plenty of time to do that, if they have been disillusioned that there can be no Dominion Status, no Independence and that nothing extraordinary is coming to this country except what is given in that Report, unless and until these difficulties, these obstacles and these differences have been removed from the way. If that is so, the Commission have done us a good turn in that respect. They have told us practically, "Do not expect anything unless you settle these differences". Sir, it is in that light that I consider the Report a good one !

Well, Sir, as I have said before, I cannot pass judgment on the Report as a whole, but I will confine myself to that part of it which concerns my province, the unfortunate North West Frontier Province. I have gone through that part of the Report very carefully and I have studied it well, because it affects me and my province. Sir, I must confess that I find it most disappointing, and I assure the House, both sides of the House, that it has created a great discontent in our province, a discontent which is likely to aggravate the already serious position in that province. When I say that it has disappointed us, I do not mean that we have not got all that we expected. What I mean is this, that the Report has put us in a worse condition than at present we are in. That is my reading of the Report, because instead of securing the co-operation of the people, it has tried to strengthen the hands of the administration. At present we are linked with this House in some ways, and if I am not in a position to defend the rights of my province effectively, there are others who generally take up our cause and defend it on the floor of this House, though very often the reply to their interpellations and questions is "that the information is being collected and will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course ! But, under the proposed conditions, the position will be worse, because, if that nominal Council is set up in our province, the reply to such questions will be that these are local matters and must be brought before the local Council. The money part of our relations with this House will, perhaps, by some statute, be solved and the House will not have that control over it that it has to some extent now. So, reading the Report in that light, I think our position will be worse under that Council than it is at present. No doubt the province will be represented in this House, but only by men of my type, that is, nominated, and not elected. I do not think that will be a very great improvement.

Well, Sir, the difficulty of the Simon Commission in the way of giving equal rights to that unfortunate province is put in a funny sentence which they have penned in their Report. It is something to the effect that it is the inherent right of a man to smoke, but he must be

careful when he is lighting a match anywhere near a gunpowder magazine. That is quite right, but I should like to know something more definite about the meaning of that sentence. There is a gentleman, an Honourable Member in this House who had some connection with the compilation of that Report, and I hope he will throw more light on the meaning of that sentence. Let it be granted that the North West Frontier Province is a gunpowder magazine and that we, the unfortunate inhabitants of that province, have the inherent right to smoke, and that we must be careful not to use a lighted match, then do I understand that these reforms are like lighted matches and will set the North West Frontier on fire if extended to that province? I thought they were going to civilise us. I thought they were going to improve our position and to bring us out from barbarism to civilisation. Perhaps the Government have got some experience of these reforms in the rest of India, where they have proved to be lighted matches, I mean in Madras, Bengal, Bombay, etc., and they perhaps think that, if they were to apply them to our province, they would result in a conflagration in the country. If that is the position, let them say so and we shall not be sorry for losing these reforms, but we shall expect them to be withdrawn from the rest of India too. Sir, we are just as good or bad citizens of India as others are. We have no horns, no tails, nothing else different from the rest of India. We are quite robust and good looking people; and when I see all sorts of civilising institutions, from high class university colleges down to the lowest primary schools existing in our country and when I see that many of our boys in the all-India competitive examinations come out successful as debaters and scholars, and when we can produce 66 per cent. success in the M. A. examination of the Punjab University in Mathematics, I cannot bring myself to believe that we are in any way backward as compared with the rest of India. The Government have got figures and they can compare them and see whether we are backward in education as compared with the rest of India or at least with western Punjab; whether we are worse in criminality even than certain other parts of India, for example, Bengal, and whether we have ever committed any political dacoities, such as are prevailing in Bengal, etc. If there are any dacoities in our country, they are simply for gain, but not for political purposes. Sir, we are very practical people and can well run the reforms.

Well, I know that my time is limited and I must be brief. But I must ask once more why this difference is being made between us and the rest of India. I must ask the Government whether the introduction of reforms in our province will render us more turbulent, whether it will affect the foreign and Imperial policy of the Government of India, the forward or backward policy of the Government of India or whether this will affect any Imperial issues like fiscal autonomy and so on. Will not the Foreign and Political Department and the Army be still reserved subjects throughout India? Suppose the Government of India were to punish one of the frontier tribes, as they have been doing in the past, will they be prevented from doing so by us? Have we not always helped them against our own brethren? Have we not got decorations for such services? Have we not taken part in the three Kabul wars, and have we not got high class appreciation for our services during those wars? Have we ever sided with our kinsmen on the border, or across the border in Afghanistan, whenever there was trouble

[Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

in those parts ? On the other hand you can see the Indian mentality of the frontier Pathan. He is always taking an active part in any movement which comes from the south, like the monsoon. Look at the Rowlatt Bill movement. Look at the Hijrat, the non-co-operation movement of 1920 and now this unfortunate and ill-advised Congress movement. Our sympathies have always been with the Indians, and for the last 80 years we have proved ourselves true Indians with Indian mentality. We were part and parcel of the Punjab even under the Sikh rule. Can you say that we were not part and parcel of the Punjab during the Sikh and the Durani rules ? Who has changed his mother tongue in the matter of elementary education except the frontier Pathan ? We get our elementary education in Hindustani instead of in Pushtu. So I do not know what difference there is between us and the rest of India, and why the poor Pathan should be fighting for his ordinary rights of Indian citizenship, rights which are given to the Bhils in Central India and the depressed classes and the untouchables in the south of India without their even asking for them. Why should we have to shed our blood for those ordinary rights ? Suppose there is a forward policy and the Government of India were to take an expedition against some frontier tribes or Afghanistan shall we stand in their way, if we are given a reformed Council ? Shall we say that we will not allow you to cross the Indus and take your troops across the border ? Shall we stop you at the Attock bridge and say, " No, you must not go " even if the rest of India are to supply you the men and the money for such expeditions ? Will that be the difficulty you anticipate ? Can we stop you from opening new roads and communications in the province or force you to remove your cantonments ? Suppose the rest of India refuses to supply you with the men and money for such expeditions, will you be able to carry out these expeditions even if you were to commandeer and force the whole population of the North West Frontier Province under martial law to help you ? No, Sir, the introduction of reforms will not harm the Government in the least. On the other hand they will make us contented and more Indian than we are at present and we may prove more useful to the Government of India. But on the other hand, if you are showing us a step-motherly treatment, I do not know what will happen. I do not know if we deserve this step-motherly treatment ! Sir, a reference was made by my friend, Maulvi Shafi Daoodi, in his speech to the effect that the present troubles on the frontier were due to the Sarda Act. (*An Honourable Member* : " Immediate cause.") I can assure him that the Sarda Act is very little heard of in the North West Frontier Province. Whether the Congress or the Khilafat people have excited the people of that province over the Sarda Act or not I cannot say, but I can assure the House that it was one of the subsidiary causes, and a very minor issue, if an issue it was, and that the main cause was the great disappointment of our people in the matter of constitutional advance. The Sarda Act reminds me again of the sentence used by the Simon Commission. Did the Government of India, before applying the Sarda Act to the North West Frontier Province ever think that the lighting of that match would set the gunpowder magazine ablaze ? If they had these scruples and fears of gunpowder magazines in their minds, they would not have applied that Act to the North West Frontier Province. The application of reforms to that province is not really so dangerous to

the safety of that province as the application of the Sarda Act or the Income-tax Act or the Land Revenue Act, or various other laws of taxation, which really touch the people. Why do not they think twice before applying these taxing enactments to that province? If those people can bear all these taxes and all those enactments, including the Sarda Act, surely they can put up with this evil of reforms also.

Well, Sir, I will not deal with the actual composition of the proposed Council in detail. It is to be half elected and half nominated, presided over by the Honourable the Chief Commissioner. But elected from among whom and by whom? Well, from and by the people, who will themselves be nominated to a great extent if not wholly. Have we gone down lower in our fitness for reforms since 1922, when the Bray Committee, with a more elaborate inquiry, suggested a better Council for us? Moreover, a new element will be brought into our Council and that is the *ex*-soldier. I remember how that happened. On the 18th November, 1928, I saw a coupe of *ex*-soldiers coming up with their old uniforms anxious to appear before the Simon Commission. We thought that these people must be making a request for a share in the grant of the Punjab colony lands, which is their general request or grievance. But I did not then know that the *ex*-soldier was going to be a great factor in the future constitution of the North West Frontier Province, and that these soldiers were going to have a separate constituency. Well, Sir, the Simon Commission have perhaps copied *in toto* some memorandum which was handed over to them by some one on the spot and their Report about the North West Frontier Province does not seem to be based on the result of the inquiry made by them, so much so that their Report quotes an incident which happened a year later. They refer to the unsatisfactory results of some elections which took place in a certain municipality, the year after their visit to the North West Frontier Province and quote that in support of their point. That information must have been supplied to them by somebody else! (Laughter.) Well, they did not even perhaps change a comma in the memorandum that was handed over to them. Sir, to tell you the truth, the Simon Report has created a great discontent among our people, who feel that they are deprived of the ordinary rights of Indian citizenship, rights, as I have said before, that are being enjoyed in the rest of India even by the depressed classes and the untouchables, and it is this that has brought about the trouble on us. Sir, up to the time the elections in the municipalities were postponed in November, 1929, very few people had joined the Congress. It was after the elections were stopped, that several people joined the Congress at Lahore in December, 1929, because the Congress happened to be the only organization in India, which, according to the Nehru Report, had held out hopes of equality to the frontier people with the rest of India. I do not know whether they will be really given that equality when the time comes or whether it would prove a mere scrap of paper when the Swaraj comes. but still it was a great allurements to them and that is why some of them joined the Congress. Of course, some of them have now adopted civil disobedience and various other Congress methods and must suffer for them. But we are very sorry that they should have been driven to that extreme. As regards the consequences, they have nothing to grumble about. Well, some of the frontier people might have been under the impression that perhaps they were treated rather differently from the rest of India in the matter of punishment for their civil disobedience. But from what I have heard

[Nawab Sir-Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

this morning from other speakers they cannot have much grievance on that account. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps, the law is the same, and men who follow the cult of disobedience must be punished in the way which such disobedience deserves.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : So equality is maintained in this respect.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum : Yes, we have been allowed equal rights with the rest of India in this respect if not a little more. Well, Sir, these are the remarks with which I shall now close, but I must say once more that my friend, Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi was not quite correct when he said that the chief cause of the trouble on the frontier was the Sarda Act ; the chief cause of the trouble was the disappointment of the people over the reforms, and nothing will satisfy them unless they are put on terms of equality with the rest of India with respect to the reforms. (Applause.)

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : Sir, I rise on a point of correction with reference to the interruption which was made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, when I was speaking in the morning, in which he said, with reference to my statement, that a number of very aristocratic families in Bombay had taken part in a certain procession, that my information was wrong. Here I have in my hand a copy of the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 7th July. In its editorial article under the heading " United Front ", this is what it writes (after referring to an important meeting held in Bombay under the presidentship of Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel) :

" It was a largely attended meeting and was followed by a procession which, significantly enough, included, among other prominent Parsis, Lady Petit, Lady Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, Mrs. H. P. Mody and Mrs. Talyarkhan. The processionists marched to Dadabhai Naoroji's statue and laid a wreath at its feet."

So my information was not incorrect.

Mr. H. P. Mody : May I tell you, Sir, and Mr. Jayakar that Mrs. Mody was *not* in the procession. For one thing, she dislikes walking.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : May I also point out to my Honourable friend that, when I made the correction of his statement, his statement was very different. He referred to what had appeared in the newspapers and he relied upon that. All that I said was that that information was given to the papers by somebody without an authority and that Lady Petit had actually contradicted it in the next issue of the *Times of India*, and the latter paper expressed its regret that the information supplied to them was false.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : I was referring, Sir, to political intensity of feeling, and.....

Mr. President : Order, order. I think what has been said is enough.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : The point, Sir, of my remark was that ladies of very aristocratic families, who would not have otherwise joined any political procession, had taken part in a procession.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : But that is untrue.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : This shows it, Sir, unless this Bombay paper lied....

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : There are many papers that lie.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar :....or was wrongly informed. It clearly shows that the procession did take place, and in that procession the persons I referred to took part.

An Honourable Member : What is the paper ?

Mr. M. R. Jayakar : The *Bombay Chronicle*.

Dr. A. Suhrawardy : That shows what reliance can be placed on the *Bombay Chronicle*.

Mr. President : Colonel Gidney.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated : Anglo-Indians) : Sir, after this domestic quarrel has been settled it seems to me that I may be permitted to proceed with my speech. The main purpose of this Demand and of this Motion for a cut of Rs. 100 is to afford this House an opportunity to give form and reality to the Round Table Conference.

(At this stage, Mr. President vacated the Chair, which was taken by Mr. Deputy President.) (Applause.)

I also take it, Sir, as accepted that the Round Table Conference was the outcome of a proposal made by Sir John Simon. I can quite understand Members of the opposite side not being desirous of discussing the Simon Report on the floor of this House. Indeed, I think they are right in refusing to do so, because, we have His Excellency the Viceroy's assurance that the Simon Report will form one of the items on the agenda or terms of reference of the Round Table Conference, and I submit that that Conference is a more suitable place for the discussion of the Simon Report than the floor of this House. But the Simon Report, Sir, is before the world and occupies the centre of India's political stage and, as such, it cannot be brushed aside and scrapped nor can it be discounted or overlooked. I think that a discussion on this Report would be much better conducted among the various communities, or Parties or Associations. Any criticism now is inopportune and untimely. Let us reserve it for the Round Table Conference, along with other Reports. And so, Sir, I do not propose to deal with the Simon Report in my speech today, except to refer to the remarks that fell from Mr. Jayakar about Sir John Simon stating in his Report that when it was drafted he was uninfluenced by the present political situation in India. Mr. Jayakar tried to imply that this admission had reference to the present state of lawlessness and the political condition in Bombay and which Sir John Simon should have considered in his Report. My reading of the Report is that Mr. Jayakar's interpretation is wholly wrong and that paragraph was written with the express purpose of showing to those diehards who consider that the handing over of law and order to the provinces was a dangerous recommendation that the Simon Commission were prepared to do so despite the present day political unrest and lawlessness in India, the inference being that had the present unsettled condition of India been considered by the Commission, it would not have made such drastic proposals and recommended the handing over to provinces of law and order. Sir, speaking on behalf of the Anglo-Indian Community, one of the minority communities,—and I feel sure I have the support of my Honourable friends, Mr. Raja, and the Reverend J. C. Chatterjee, representatives of the depressed classes and Indian Christians—I can assure the House that we are desirous of taking an

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

honourable part in the Round Table Conference should we be asked to participate. We are also desirous of stating here, in clear and unequivocal terms, at least I am, that we are not prepared to agree to any Pact which has not got as one of its primary and main objects the permanent safeguarding of the interests of the minorities—economic, social and political. We demand honourable terms, otherwise we shall refuse to accept any agreement at the Round Table Conference. When I use the term minorities in its constricted sense, I do not include the majority of the minority communities, the Muslims, because being about 70 millions strong they are really a majority in themselves and therefore can guard their own interests very well. We, however, earnestly hope we shall not be left the dregs of any settlement that may be arrived at at the Round Table Conference. In your desire to emulate Ireland, I hope you will learn from her lessons and not create any Ulsters. Sir, my conception of the Round Table Conference is a collection of genuine representatives from India, men who are fired with the enthusiasm of coming to an amicable settlement and are imbued with the spirit of give and take, and are not wedded or tied down to inflexible ideas. Further, the representatives of that Round Table Conference must have a true conception of their powers and their status. After all, it must not be forgotten that the British Parliament is above all and has not abdicated, and that it still functions. We are not to look upon ourselves as plenipotentiaries going to the Round Table Conference to demand terms nor are we to look upon the Round Table Conference as a Second Versailles. His Excellency the Viceroy made it abundantly clear that we would participate in the deliberations of the Conference as equals. Unfortunately the view is held by some sections of political thought in India that the Government of India is beaten and must submit to terms and they will participate in the Conference only if these terms are accepted. Sir, one has to remember always that the British Parliament is the final authority and that it is willing to listen to and be guided by the consensus of opinion of those who appear with it before the Round Table Conference, I go further and assert that if we are able conclusively to prove to them that the unanimous demand of India is for Dominion Status, the demand will not fall on deaf ears. It requires very little political acumen to realise how hopeless will be our fate if we appear before the Round Table Conference as dictators and make impossible demands. It must be remembered that the Round Table Conference is not an executive or a legislative body; it is entirely a deliberative and advisory body. Unfortunately, Sir, the refusal of Indian politicians to realise this fact is, in my opinion, the *raison d'être* of the present political unrest and I would add that in no statement or utterance is such a conception to be found. By their non-co-operation it is true we are deprived of the assistance of the Congress Party and I feel sure everyone in this House would be glad if it could send representatives to the Round Table Conference. Though they have denied us their co-operation one is prevented from accusing them as they are in jail and unable to defend themselves. But, what have the other leaders in India done to solve this deadlock—this *impasse*? What have the Liberal leaders in India done? Their inability to deliver the goods was the means of the very ignominious death of the All-Parties Conference. They were absolutely unable to deliver the goods and admitted their impotency. The minority communities were prepared to enter into a pact with these leaders, but they fought shy and yet, in this House, these

same leaders claim to represent the masses and peoples of India and are ready to blame and warn Government and issue manifestos demanding terms which amount to an abdication of Government. If these leaders desire to do a service to India, let them stop issuing manifestos, form themselves into a committee and, together, visit the members of the Congress Party in jail and try and persuade them to call off civil disobedience and attend the Round Table Conference. If my friends, Mr. Jayakar, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. Jinnah and others, made up their minds to visit these Congress leaders, Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru, and persuade them to call a halt and join us in a settlement at the Round Table Conference, they would not only establish their claims to be called leaders, but make the Conference thoroughly representative. Believe me, one such visit would be worth more than hundreds of manifestos.

Now, Sir, what is the origin of this Round Table Conference? We all know that when the Simon Commission was originally constituted and announced, His Excellency the Viceroy in his speech said that together with the Simon Commission would sit as equals, the Indian wing, i.e., the Indian Central Committee. Both would work conjointly and when the Simon Commission had submitted its Report, it would cease to exist but the Indian wing would continue to function and would represent the Indian case before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. In place of the Joint Parliamentary Committee we have been today given this Round Table Conference which will afford to those sections of Indian thought who refused to co-operate with the Commission an opportunity of placing their views before it and the British Parliament and thus help us to shape the future destiny of our country, India. Sir John Simon, in my opinion, deserves our thanks for suggesting this opportunity. And it is for this Round Table Conference that the Government are now making a demand for financial support and for the opinion of this House. Viewed in all its aspects and implications, in my opinion, Sir, there are only two issues before us in regard to the motion before the House. Firstly, do we seriously desire to support the Round Table Conference? Secondly, if we do, are we prepared to foot the bill? If we are prepared to foot the bill, then we cannot support the cut. On the other hand if we are not prepared to foot the bill, then we stultify our support to the Round Table Conference by supporting a cut of Rs. 100 not on account of the Round Table Conference but on the Simon Report and for which no grant has been asked. In short, we stultify our approval of the Round Table Conference because we are asked to support the Mover of this cut in his views that the Simon Commission's Report does not meet with his approval. Now, Sir, I submit, with all respect to the President's ruling on this matter, that the Simon Report constitutes no part of this demand and a cut on this is, in my humble opinion, *ultra vires*. The Round Table Conference is the only thing to which this demand relates, and, as such, any Member who supports the Round Table Conference will stultify himself if he also supports this cut, for in so doing he censures Government and in this manner rejects the Round Table Conference. Apart from this, we will, in supporting this cut, be strengthening the hands of those hie-hards in England who are today waiting for every opportunity to kill the Montford Reforms and all that has been added to them since 1919.

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

Various demands have been made on the Government from the opposite Benches. I join with you in all you want to effect a healthy and peaceful atmosphere for the Round Table Conference, but I ask how has India responded to the many appeals made by His Excellency the Viceroy, the greatest Viceroy that India ever had, and here I wish to pause and endorse every word that my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, had to say in this speech about His Excellency. His sincerity is unquestionable, his faith in India is great and his desire to serve India is incomparable. How often have you not spurned his proffered hand of friendship? How often have you not rejected and ignored his appeals for co-operation and trust? How can you in the face of this ask Government to do more? It is up to us to do more. The Government have done everything that is compatible with the situation. Government have to function and, if in functioning, they do things that are unpleasant, they cannot be blamed. Indeed, if law and order and the lives of hundreds of thousands were in your hands and keeping, you would do the same thing if you were in power. I ask my Honourable friends on the opposite side to address this question to themselves. Do not blame the Government or the Congress or the civil disobedience movement. Secure the co-operation and help of the Congress Party, by all the means at your command and I am sure every one on this side of the House would help you in this achievement but, above all, I ask those of my Honourable friends, the leaders of the Liberal Party, strong as they are individually, but weak as they are without a following (Laughter), being leaders or more appropriately "leaderettes" without any following and unable to deliver the goods to organise, each one of them, for theirs are some of the cleverest brains in India. I repeat organise yourselves and get a party for you will then be able to deliver the goods. Take all steps to counter this civil disobedience movement. But do stop issuing any more manifestos. Remember "while the Liberals are manifestoing" "Nehru is rotting (to use an ordinary parlance) in jail". I ask you one and all to give up your present attitude of advisors and warners even though it be given as did my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, in a monosyllabic staccato style peculiarly native to him. I ask you to give that up without any further delay and do something more practical and tangible and then you will be rendering substantial service to India and you will make the Round Table Conference truly representative of every party in India; for, I do believe, without the Congress, that "Board of Conciliation" which is nothing else but a synonym for "the Round Table Conference" will be imperfect and incomplete.

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

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney : In conclusion, I would ask the Honourable Member who moved this cut to reconsider the position carefully and in refusing him my support for his cut, I would ask if he would be good enough to see his way to withdrawing it for it has nothing to commend itself. It has everything to condemn itself.

Sardar Gulab Singh (West Punjab : Sikh) : Sir, I rise to support the cut motion made by my Honourable friend on the agenda.

I would say only a few words merely to take part in this important debate, for enough has been said by way of general observation by the previous speakers to condemn the Statutory Commission's Report, which is entirely unacceptable and extremely disappointing. As events have shown, the Commission was rightly boycotted by the Indian Nationalists and others. Sir, there were others who had still hopes for further reforms, for which the Commission was mainly intended, in accordance with the great declaration of 20th August, 1917. But their hopes were disappointed and they were rather upset by the conclusions of the Commission. Reading the situation, I am reminded of a story of a *Mirasi* belonging to a class of people known for their merry pursuits. He, Sir, being greatly tired and distressed in a long journey, sat down on the roadside and prayed to God for a conveyance. In the meanwhile a landlord came who asked him to carry his load. Seeing the circumstances of the offer of help, he cried out that the great God often misunderstands things. He had prayed for a conveyance, but was given a load on the head instead. Likewise our hopes have been upset. Suggestions and efforts have been made to curtail even the existing reforms. For instance, a suggestion is made for indirect election to the Assembly in which the franchise of direct election of the people would be taken away and further disabilities put on candidates for the Council of State. India would be the only unfortunate country where the reforms once granted would be snatched away in the guise of a further instalment of reforms.

As for the Round Table Conference, nothing can be said definitely unless we know more about it, and we would welcome it if it is managed properly in points of the personnel, functions, calm atmosphere and participation of leaders who are in jail. At present, we are attracted to this Round Table Conference by the encouraging words of His Excellency, who is anxious to secure for us another alternative and opportunity to support our cause.

With these few remarks, I close.

Rao Bahadur D. R. Patil (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : I am glad, Sir, that I, a back bencher, who got up many a time, has ultimately caught the eye of the President, for which I thank you very much. To my mind one thing is clear, that those who occupy front benches are easily heard, and those who are in the back benches scarcely receive any notice of the Chair.

Mr. President, I have to bring to the notice of the Government of India especially one fact, that in the Bombay Presidency there is a Non-Brahmin Party like the Nationalist Party or the Independent Party here. The Non-Brahmin Party in that Presidency represents the interests of agricultural classes which form a majority of the population there. In the same way, there is the Justice Party in Madras. Similarly, there is the Non-Brahmin Party in Berar and the Central Provinces. The Round Table Conference ought to safeguard the interests of all the parties. Therefore, it is but legitimate for me to appeal to the Government of India that there ought to be an adequate representation of Non-Brahmin parties in the above-mentioned three Provinces on the Round Table Conference. I specially make this appeal, Sir, because there are very few non-Brahmins here who are advocating the cause of non-Brahmins so far as their representation on the Round Table Conference is concerned. Sir, this is the time when all the communities ought to co-operate and put their claims on

[Rao Bahadur D. R. Patil.]

a proper basis and follow a policy of mutual goodwill, a policy of give and take, and unless and until we follow such a policy, I do not think that the Round Table Conference will be a real success. Sir, I am reminded of a story. There were two brothers, "A" and "B". There was some dispute over property. "A" said, "I have got eleven points, very strong indeed and I have considered them very properly and I am very anxious for a compromise, but kindly accept my eleven points and then the compromise is possible". In the same way "B" says, he has got fourteen points and he says, "I have considered them very properly and I am equally anxious like you for a compromise, but accept my fourteen points". In such circumstances, is it possible that a compromise will be effected? Of course not. Therefore, all the various communities in India ought to follow a policy of mutual goodwill and must not press their claims with obstinacy. Possibly, one community's claims might be reasonable, but other parties might not be willing to accept them. In such a case by mutual co-operation and toleration anyhow a compromise should be effected. Unless and until a compromise is effected in that way, I do not think the Round Table Conference will bring good results. But human nature being what it is, every party will try to safeguard its own interests without any regard to other party's interests. Therefore, if that fortunate day will come when all the parties will be united in their demands, so much the better, but if that time is not to come, it is but proper that all the parties, as I have stated, must have an adequate representation in the Round Table Conference in their own interests.

Now, Sir, I come to the Report of the Simon Commission. Sir, I was a member of the Bombay Provincial Committee, elected by the Bombay Legislative Council to co-operate with the Simon Commission. But I am surprised to find that the recommendations made by the Statutory Commission, headed by Sir John Simon, a legal luminary and an ornament of the British Bar, have not come up to the expectations of all parties in India. They have not satisfied our national aspirations; they have not led us to the goal of self-determination. Therefore, the recommendations made by the Simon Commission are very unsatisfactory. I may again tell you, Sir, that unless and until we have got fiscal autonomy, national progress is impossible.

Now take the case of expenditure on defence. It has been admitted by Sir John Simon himself that the expenditure on defence is very excessive so far as India is concerned. This expenditure in India has no parallel in the history of the world. That is a clear admission on the part of Sir John Simon.

Sir, I should like to conclude by saying again that the interest of the non-Brahmins ought to be adequately safeguarded and represented at the Round Table Conference. They are a very important body, and I urge very strongly that the interest of the non-Brahmins, the agriculturists who are the pillars of the country, should be adequately represented at the Round Table Conference. Sir, with these words, after thanking you for having allowed me to catch your eye, I beg to resume my seat.

Lala Brij Kishore (Lucknow Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) :
Sir, in rising to speak upon this cut motion, I propose to confine myself

only to the interests of the landholders to the extent to which they are affected by the reactionary recommendations of the Statutory Commission. The landed aristocracy which has separate electorates both for the Provincial and Central Legislatures is to be deprived of them under the new scheme. They have been a great source of support to Government in various ways. The taluqdars of Oudh, who received the Statutory Commission in an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion prevailing throughout the country, expected much from the Commission, but to their great disappointment what little they had, in the shape of special electorates, is taken away.

As regards the Round Table Conference, I am one of those who believe in the potentialities of it. We should therefore organise all the available constitutional forces in the country so as to make the London Conference a success. We live in a period when great national forces are working around us. It is therefore necessary that we should grasp the helping hand of Government, and it is equally incumbent upon Government to take recourse to such measures as may go to make the impending Conference a reality in spirit and letter and ensure success.

Mr. Saradindu Mukerjee (Calcutta Suburbs : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, in rising to support this cut, I want to deal very briefly with the Simon Report. I want to deal with the sins of its omission and not of commission. A proposal has been made for an extraordinary amount of power to be handed over to the Governors of Provinces, but nowhere is it mentioned who will be the Governors of the future, *i.e.*, whether they will be the European element of the heaven-born services or whether the men of the country will ever be allowed to occupy these places.

The second point is, we expected an old and experienced lawyer like Sir John Simon to say something about the separation of the Judicial from the Executive. Nothing has been said on this point. We know, Sir, that the administration of criminal law is one of most important subjects in this country. It is in the hands of an irresponsible executive, and the prosecutor is the judge in most cases. Not a word has been said on this subject, but it has been allowed to remain where it was all along.

Coming next to the Round Table Conference, I will deal very briefly with the personnel of this Conference. When I heard the Viceroy only three days ago, my impression was that he was very anxious to have the Ruling Princes in this Round Table Conference. Sir, I submit that even according to Sir John Simon, the Native States are quite separate from British India. I do not see any reason why the Ruling Princes should have anything to say in a Conference that is going to frame a constitution that would govern us and not the Ruling Princes. The Ruling Princes might come into the Federation of States a long time after and there would be time enough, when that occasion arises, to invite them to submit their views. As it is, the Ruling Princes would be an element of about 12 in a body of about 60 and it is likely that they would lend their solid weight to the die-hard element of British Imperialism in England. Besides, the Ruling Princes are accustomed to a rule of autocracy in their own States. There are only a few States in which a little amount of democracy has been allowed, and they would never be able to understand the aspirations of democratic India. So

[Mr. Saradindu Mukerjee.]

I should like to invite the attention of His Excellency to the fact that the Ruling Princes have no *locus standi* so far as the framing of a constitution for British India is concerned.

Then, Sir, we, as the representatives of the people, have been asked to vote for this grant. We are asked to pay the piper, but we are not allowed to call the tune. If we are at all taken as the representatives of the people,—otherwise there is no justification for our existence—we should be allowed to elect at least a small proportion, say 25 per cent. of the members who would constitute the Round Table Conference. In this connection my submission to His Excellency the Viceroy would be that he should allow us to elect at least 16 members, 12 Hindus and 4 Muhammadans, as representing this House, to take part in the Round Table Conference.

Now, we come to the most important proposition with regard to the personnel, namely, the Congressmen. It is admitted on all hands that, without Mahatma Gandhi, whatever be the outcome of the Conference in London, the people of India, I mean at least the 220 millions of the Hindus in India, would have no confidence in it. And I respectfully remind His Excellency the Viceroy that he should not fail to come to a decision to invite Mahatma Gandhi to join the Conference. He would lose nothing by sending an invitation to him to join the Conference, and if Mahatma Gandhi ever accedes to his request, then the Conference would be fully representative. Otherwise, it will be practically a loss of time, energy and money.

Then, Sir, I come to the next question, *viz.*, the atmosphere that is necessary for this Round Table Conference. My idea is, that an atmosphere of peace and goodwill ought to prevail before the delegates actually leave India and join the other delegates in England. I regret to say Sir, that "times are out of joint" with us at present. It has been said, Sir, that the responsibility for the present loss of life and limbs is on the head of the Congress. I say that the whole responsibility lies on the head of Government and on no one else. What did Mahatma Gandhi say? Mahatma Gandhi said that he was openly going to disobey some of the laws which had been enacted in this country and he asked that he and his followers might be arrested and put into jail. He did never think that Government would not play the game and arrest him and his followers, but Government *did not* play the game. Instead of arresting the crowd of law breakers who might have been carried away by their sentiment—and these persons would never have resisted as they were vowed not to resist—Government used the other alternative of dispersing them by *lathi* charges and resorted to the use of firearms. Thus the whole responsibility is not on the head of the Congress at all, but on Government alone.

Now, Sir, the Government of India have shown bankruptcy so far as statesmanship is concerned. The Government of India are going to rule us only by Ordinances and special powers. We know that under the Government of India Act, Ordinances can be enforced for six months only and not more. Do Government think that, after six months, the country would be so pacified that the use of these Ordinances would not be required? Then what happens? The Government of India

cannot extend these Ordinances. It would be *ultra vires* under the Government of India Act and then they would have to come to this House to get the support of the elected Members to have these Ordinances passed into laws. I may say that there is no son of India, either Hindu or Muslim, who will ever lend his support in passing any penal legislation which would convert these Ordinances into laws for all times to come. I would therefore request the Viceroy to call a halt and release all those political prisoners who have not been convicted for any offence involving "moral turpitude". I use these words deliberately because some offences, not only have been newly created by these Ordinances, but also some minor sections of the Penal Code and other Acts which were meant to deal with frivolous offences, have been made use of for other purposes. For example, there is a section which says that obstruction to traffic is illegal. It is a very minor matter and is usually punished with a fine of a rupee or so ; but in the case of the Congress people it has been converted into a very serious offence, and sentences of rigorous imprisonment have been passed on those people who were destructing the traffic by picketing. I would once again request His Excellency the Viceroy to grant an amnesty to all political prisoners, not convicted for moral turpitude and to do away with these repressive enactments, and hold out the olive branch of peace to the people of this country. Government may say, "If you stop civil disobedience, we will take away all the repressive measures." I would say that this answer would be begging the question ; because if there was no civil disobedience there would not be any necessity for any repressive measures. Thus no attempt would be made by Government to show any generosity to the people of this country at this time of stress and strain, unless Government withdraw these measures at once.

I would also point out that there is another danger which is the usual effect of this lawlessness that is now prevalent in this country. Now we find that people are resorting to *open* violence of law. It can be compared to an open wound that can be healed with sympathy ; but if more repression is allowed to be used, the result would be that it would form into a sinus : numerous secret societies would be formed and Government would then find it extremely difficult to ward off a stab in the dark. We have seen all these things happening in Czarist Russia, and we know that on account of repression there, numerous Nihilist societies were formed, and the result was that the whole of Czardom was overthrown and the rule of the people came in its place. I warn the Government that they should not allow this country to go to that length, so that this country, instead of enjoying peace and tranquillity, might be hurled into the turmoil of internecine secret war.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir and others have pointed out that perfectly law-abiding people have joined this movement, not from love of the movement, but because they have been exasperated by the action of the police in various parts of the country. I do not want to take up any further time by going into the details of these cases. I can give you hundreds of instances which I know of personally, where the police have entered the houses of respectable citizens, assaulted them, used *lathis* and insulted them most grossly, but that is not my point now ; my point rather is that if this present repressive policy is continued, the natural result will be that people of all shades of opinion will all join and give a tremendous impetus to the boycott movement, which the

[Mr. Saradindu Mukerjee.]

British Government will not be able, with the greatest effort, to combat. The result will be unemployment in England and the Labour Government will go out of power, and whatever chances we have of getting any success at the Round Table Conference would be practically negatived at the time when the recommendations of the Conference come to be enacted into an Act, if any party other than the Labour Party came into office.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal : Landholders) : Sir, I am really thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak after getting up so many times. I am glad that I have at last caught your eye. As a representative of the Bengal landholders, I would be failing in my duty if I did not express my view here that this Commission has ruthlessly trampled down the interests of the landlords in India. I would also be failing in my duty if I did not express the feelings in my mind in regard to these repressive measures which the Government have now adopted as a policy. I was surprised to hear the Honourable the Home Member, in the course of his speech, say that Mr. Neogy was not the right judge, and that at least some of the allegations made on the floor of the House today could not be supported. I do not think it is expedient to express such feelings in such a way, and I think I must say at this juncture that the policy pursued by Government is one which will have a very disastrous effect. I can give a practical example on the floor of this House : if it is proved *sub-judice* you can rule me out of order, but I must mention one case, concerning volunteers. The Honourable Member for the Bengal Government here must know of it and must have studied the case, and I do not think he himself can deny the facts that I am going to state.

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

The volunteers were very quiet, and absolutely non-violent. The police brutally treated the volunteers, marched over their abdomens when they lay on the ground, mercilessly beat them with *lathis* and batons, which caused a great sensation amongst the spectators who were restless and the police fired on the unarmed mob, but then their ammunition was exhausted and in the meantime about ten thousand people arrived there and were about to crush down the police, and it was those volunteers who were so beastly treated who stood in the way and prevented the mob from attacking the police. That is the case, and still you say volunteers are violent in the name of non-violence.

Mr. G. S. Dutt (Bengal : Nominated Official) : On a point of order, Mr. President. I think the incident to which the Honourable Member is referring is *sub-judice* and I do not think he is in order in referring to it. I am afraid I am not in a position to say anything in this matter as the matter is *sub-judice*.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I am not talking of any matter that is *sub-judice*. I am talking of the policy which the police are following in treating the absolutely non-violent volunteers....

Mr. President : The Honourable Member should not refer to matters which are *sub-judice*.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I am not mentioning matters which are *sub-judice*.

I am simply mentioning what I know to be the real facts. Did he not himself cheer the volunteers for asking the crowd to keep quiet and for trying to protect the police ?

Mr. G. S. Dutt : Sir, the case is still pending in the courts, and I do not think any reference can be made to it here.

Mr. President : Will the Honourable Member please avoid any reference to this case which is pending in the courts ?

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I am only mentioning facts, because I know them to be true and I myself visited the hospital to see those wounded volunteers.

Mr. President : No facts connected with the case can be mentioned as long as the case is *sub-judice*.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I am not mentioning any facts of the case which is *sub-judice*. I am only mentioning an incident.....

Mr. President : That case is *sub-judice*, and no incidents or facts connected with it can be mentioned in the House.

Dr. A. Suhrawardy : Was the Honourable Member in Benares or in Mymensingh at the time ?

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I was in Mymensingh, and I found that a boy of seven years was severely beaten, and he fell down senseless, but when I asked him in the hospital about his injury ; with a smiling face he said, " I will again join the civil disobedience movement ". I say that people have been brutally beaten and have been trampled down under foot ; I say people have been belaboured and kicked about in a most merciless manner, which would put to shame any civilized nation, and it is a pity that the action of the police has been endorsed by the higher authorities. Sir, as an Indian I feel it my duty to state all these most disgraceful actions of the police in this House.

Then, Sir, it was mentioned by the Honourable the Home Member that there is an impression in this country that nothing could be expected from the British without force. Now I challenge that statement, Sir. What have the Government done all these years ? So long as the landholders and zemindars supported them with their hard earned money, they patted them on their backs, they were told that they formed the backbone of the Government and so on. But now look at what the Commissioners have done. They have ruthlessly trampled under foot all claims and all interests of the landholding classes. Those who pay a large amount of land revenue, by which the national coffers are filled, have been entirely and woefully neglected ; no mention has been made in the Report about the zemindars and landholders. Sir, here I feel that it is my duty to record my protest against the policy which has been adopted by the Commission by completely ignoring the landed interests altogether by not making any mention of them in the Report. At the same time, I must not fail to mention the attitude adopted by His Excellency the Viceroy by keeping the door open by calling a Round Table Conference, and I believe that the omission made by the Simon Commission will be redressed and rectified at the Conference. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details of the arguments for I know this is not the proper place, and I hope, when the proper time comes, we will see what can be done.

[Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury.]

One thing I want to impress upon the Government, and I warn them with all the emphasis I can command, that if they lose their friends by ignoring their interests altogether in this manner, friends on whom they have always relied in the past, and will have to rely upon in the future, if their interests are trampled under foot, I say that a time will soon come when these landlords and zemindars, who were very loyal at one time, will become revolutionaries and will try to crush the Government itself.

Now, Sir, I must quote an instance which I read in the *Modern Review*. I am quoting from an article in the *Modern Review* by Miss J. Ganguli, M.A. It shows how ruthlessly all civilized laws have been trampled under foot. It was the evening of the day of Christ's crucifixion, a day for the Christians to remember the qualities of mercy and love and to understand pain. On that auspicious day what happened? I am quoting from the *Modern Review* :

"The District Magistrate had with his hunter beaten a small boy of ten in such a way that he had fallen senseless on the ground and was bleeding profusely from a deep cut on the forehead and from the nose."

This is not the boy of Calcutta, but this is another instance. I think if Honourable Members doubt the accuracy of my statement, I can show them the photograph of the injured boy. The District Magistrate of the place had beaten a small boy of seven on the head in such a way that he fell down senseless and was bleeding. The photograph of this boy lying senseless on the laps of Miss. Ganguli and two of her companions is published in the *Modern Review* :

"About ten others were hurt—some slightly and some with grave injuries on their body—and we removed them all to the camp and brought the boy to our own hospital under the Ramkrishna Mission at Tamluk. On our way there the boy regained consciousness and when told that he would soon get better, replied, 'Yes, and then I will come again when our soldiers prepare salt, and if the Sahib comes to beat me once more, I will say 'Sahib, I have come and so if you will, beat me again'."

This was the answer given by a boy of only ten, who was beaten when he was absolutely non-violent. Sir, I condemn, in the strongest language possible, the attitude adopted by the Honourable the Home Member when he gave such a callous reply to my friend, Mr. Neogy, this morning. When I heard his reply, my blood began to boil, because he had not even a word of sympathy to express for those who are suffering in the non-violent struggle. Even His Excellency the Viceroy the other day expressed his sympathy for those who have suffered in this civil disobedience campaign, but the Honourable the Home Member had the cheek to sit in the House and listen to all the horrible deeds perpetrated by his policemen on innocent and unarmed people and yet not to express even a word of sympathy for them.

Then, Sir, I must say a word about the landholder class, to which I have the honour to belong. Sir, agricultural income is going to be taxed. Over and above that, there are strong rumours that there is going to be imposed additional taxation, and I can assure the House, if all these additional taxes are imposed, they will soon lose their friends in India. This reminds me of what Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru once said, that if this policy of repression is pursued and a policy of conciliation is not adopted, it will lead to disastrous results, and the Government will lose their friends in India day by day.

Mr. G. S. Dutt : Sir, I find myself in a very unfortunate position as a nominated Member, who had no intention of speaking but is compelled to take part in the discussion in order to explain a matter which I regard it my duty to do. Sir, the last speaker referred to an incident which he says took place in the district of Mymensingh to which he belongs and of which I happened to be in charge before I came to the Assembly. I understood him to say that there was an incident in the course of which volunteers were assaulted by the police in my presence....

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : I did not say that the volunteers were assaulted in your presence. I showed how they were brutally assaulted and how they were treated by the police.

Mr. G. S. Dutt : Well, Sir, I must have misunderstood him, but I gathered from what he said that the assault on the volunteers took place in my presence. On the other hand, as I pointed out, and as another Honourable Member coming from the same district pointed out, the incident referred to by the Honourable Member is *sub-judice* as it apparently relates to the riot at the Excise Warehouse.

Mr. President (to Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury) : The Honourable Member can only offer a personal explanation and he cannot make a speech.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury : Does not the Honourable Member admit that the volunteers were non-violent? Is it not a fact that he himself contributed Rs. 100 to the hospital to show his sympathy for the cause?

Mr. G. S. Dutt : Sir, there is no relevancy between the two questions but all I need say is that the Honourable Member has been entirely misinformed in this matter, and I do not exactly know what cause he is referring to.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member can only speak on a point of personal explanation about any fact which refers to him, and he cannot refer to any other matter which does not concern him.

Mr. G. S. Dutt : Sir, I personally know of no instance in which non-violent volunteers were assaulted by the police.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : Will the Honourable Member tell us why he was transferred from Mymensingh? That has certainly some relevancy to the present topic. (Laughter.)

***Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind : Muhammadan Rural) :** Sir, I do not want to speak lengthily because many Members of this House have already given their opinions on the Simon Commission's Report and the Round Table Conference. Now, Sir, there are many who have objected to the policy of the Government, the repression by it and so on. As a layman, I am always asking myself what the Government should do and what advice I should give to Government.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : Will they listen to your advice?

Haji Abdoola Haroon : Whether they listen or not, that is a different matter. I want to give one instance on the floor of this House. I left Karachi on the 4th instant. Two days before that, there was some difference between the Satyagraha Committee and the piece-goods merchants there and the Satyagrahis started picketing of their shops. I saw with my own eyes 200 volunteers picketing there and thousands of spectators standing by. There was such a crowd that the roads were

* Speech not revised by the Honourable Member.

[Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

completely blocked. The merchants were compelled to close their shops as a result and the market was deserted. Not only that, but the Satyagraha Committee decided that not a single bale should be despatched by railway from Karachi and they commenced picketing at the railway station. Till I left Karachi, for three days continuously not a European or Indian could despatch a bale of piece-goods by railway, because at the gate of the railway station the volunteers stood, and if any cart wanted to enter, they objected and stopped it. If the cart did not stop, they lay down before the cart, and if the cartman went on to the bodies of the volunteers, there was the fear that he might be prosecuted. Under these conditions, if any citizen went to the police or the Government to protect peaceful trade, what would the police do? I ask the House what the police will do in those circumstances? If they ask the volunteers to go away, they refuse to do so; if they handle them with *lathis* we object to it, and so on. Honourable Members must consider all these things and then come to a conclusion.

I join with other Honourable Members who have condemned the Simon Commission's Report, and in doing so, I shall deal with only one subject, and that is the separation of Sind, which constituency I represent here. The separation of Sind has been asked for by the Sindhi people since 1913. On account of their agitation, they have aroused the sympathies of other people and it has become an all-India question. Now, this question has been taken up seriously by the Muslim League, and the All-India Muslim Conference and they have passed from year to year many resolutions advocating the separation of Sind. Not only this, but in 1927 and 1928 the Congress also took up this question and tried its level best to satisfy the demands of the people of Sind, of the evidence of which the Nehru Report is a living example. Although they agreed that Sind should be separated, they suggested a committee to be appointed to enquire whether Sind could be separated on account of the financial difficulty. They said that if the Sind people agreed to further taxes on themselves, then they were in favour of the separation of Sind. That was the verdict of the Nehru Report. We were not satisfied with that decision. Then we hoped that the Royal Commission, the Simon Commission, which was coming from the Seven Seas, might do something to satisfy our demand. But, unfortunately, as many Members of this House have already stated, their hopes were shattered, in the same way our hopes also have been shattered. What do the Simon Commission say? I must say that, on this question, the Simon Commission have not given a very clear verdict. They agree that Sind should be separated because geographically, linguistically, socially, religiously and administratively Sind can be a separate province,—so far so good. But further on, they do not say clearly that Sind must be separated, but they recommend that a

5 P.M.

Boundaries Commission should be appointed and that that Commission should go into details as regards separation. Just as the Nehru Report put in some hitches, in the same way the Simon Commission also put in some hitches. In my humble opinion, this vague verdict of the Simon Commission has left our hope again hanging in the air. I want to make clear in this House as to why we are agitating for the separation of Sind. It is because we have suffered

heavily since 1843, that means, for the last 87 years. When Sind was conquered by the British troops in 1842, it was a separate province, and its first and last Governor was Sir Charles Napier. On account of its luck, or whatever you might say, in 1847 this province was amalgamated with the Bombay Presidency. And what is the condition of the province today? What have the Bombay Government done for Bombay during the last 87 years? In fairness to the Bombay Government, I must say that our province is too far from the seat of the Bombay Government. It will take three days by the sea route and if anybody comes by the narrow gauge railway, he can come in 48 hours, but this railway also was started only 25 years back. Before that there was no road-way or railway connection with Sind. Take education. Till now, the Bombay Government have not established a single college in Sind. There is one private college which is aided by the Government. Lately, another college has been started in Hyderabad, which is also aided by the Government, but Government themselves have not started a single college. Take the case of roads. Up till now, the Bombay Government have not built a single *pucca* road, except lately one between Sukker and Shikarpur, a distance of 20 miles, and another road, which has a length of 12 miles. This is what the Bombay Government have done for Sind in the last 87 years.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : What about the crores that have been spent on irrigation?

Haji Abdoola Haroon : My friend asks, "What about irrigation?" If we go through the accounts connected with irrigation and the Sukker Barrage, I can assure you that, although Government have spent some money on irrigation, they have recovered 8 or 12 per cent. income from that irrigation. As regards the Sukker Barrage, it is a big project and it was started in the time of Sir Cowasji Jehangir, and I cannot say what the future of it will be. Besides that, I can give you one more example. The Honourable Mr. Jinnah lately came to Sind on some business and remained there for about one month. He himself saw the condition of the administration, the condition of education, sanitation, roads, etc., and he was shocked to see that this province was the most backward in the whole of India.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum : Excepting the North-West Frontier Province?

Haji Abdoola Haroon : No. The North-West Frontier Province is more advanced.

Dr. Nand Lal (West Punjab : Non-Muhammadan) : Is it permissible to introduce private conversation between one Honourable Member and another on the floor of the House?

Mr. President : Interruptions are allowed.

Haji Abdoola Haroon : I appeal to Government and those who are attending the Round Table Conference that in the name of humanity and justice, Sind must be separated as soon as possible. There is some argument that Sind should not be separated because its revenue is so small and a separate administration for Sind is not possible. Sir, I am a layman but I can say one thing. According to the figures, Sind is paying taxes to the Bombay Government at the rate of Rs. 6 per head. Although I have not got proper figures before me, I remember it is

[Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

Rs. 4 per head in the case of Assam and Travancore. If you take the figures for Bengal, Bihar and Madras, they are paying hardly more than Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 3 per head. In Punjab it is Rs. 4 per head. If these provinces can be administered with so small an income, why cannot Sind be administered when its population pays Rs. 6 per head? The people in Sind are an oppressed people. We in Sind are not like people in other provinces, always clamouring and fighting. We are very good, very loyal and very honest and therefore we have suffered so long. With these remarks, I support the cut.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy : I find myself today, Mr. President, in a position in which previous Leaders of the House did not very often find themselves, namely, that the main proposal placed before the House by Government has received, I will not say unanimous, but a very preponderant expression of opinion in its favour. The main question before the House is that a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,66,000 be provided for the expenses of the Round Table Conference. It is quite true that there have been two or three speakers who have expressed the view that the Conference will do no good and that the money ought not therefore to be provided. Yet all of us who have listened to the three days' debate which is now coming to its close will agree that a very great preponderance of opinion has been expressed in favour of granting the money. That, Sir, I think is a result which is satisfactory from all points of view, because it means that this Assembly has expressed its opinion decisively as between the two paths to which His Excellency the Governor General referred when he addressed the two Houses, and has expressed its view distinctly for adopting the path of agreement and argument, in the belief and in the hope that that is the right path which will lead to a prosperous and contented India. It is not only, Sir, that this result must be gratifying to Government. Something far more important is at stake, namely, the interests of the people of India. I do not doubt that the decision which the House will reach on this question will have a very important influence for good on the course of the history of India during the next few years. I would fain take it as an augury that the infection may spread and that others who for the present cannot see their way to adopt this path, or to attend the Conference will eventually find themselves there. His Excellency the Governor General made it plain that the door has not been closed on our side, nor will it be closed. The door is open, and undoubtedly what we desire is—in the words which His Excellency used :

“ That wiser counsels will prevail by which all the political thought of India might be harnessed to the task of welding into unity the elements that compose her life.”

Now, Sir, I do not know whether others who have listened to many debates in this House have been struck, as I have been, with the note of responsibility which has characterised most of the speeches in this debate. Naturally, in any deliberative Assembly, all men do not attain to the same standard in a matter of that kind ; certainly in the House of Commons in England if a similar debate was taking place, I have no doubt that there would be speeches which no one would characterize

as very responsible speeches. But, listening to the debate, I have been impressed, if I may be allowed to say so,—and I hope it is not an impertinence to the House,—with admiration of the manner in which speaker after speaker, obviously speaking under a sense of responsibility, stated his case temperately and carefully, and has refrained from comment which might have embittered or exacerbated the situation and so defeated the objects which we all have in view. I think, Sir, we have reason to congratulate ourselves on that point. Now, Sir, I am a nominated Member and therefore must be careful what I say (Laughter) (*An Honourable Member* : “ And a salaried Member ”) or I may share the fate which befell my Honourable friend, Mr. Sarma. But I do not agree with him on one point. He said it was a mischievous debate. I can only say that I do not agree. It seems to me that it would have been very strange indeed if, when this vote was placed before the House, a large number of Members had not a good deal to say about the Report of the Royal Commission, and it has always seemed to me to be inevitable that the debate should take the form it has actually assumed. It is far too soon after the publication of the Report for either the Government of India or Members on the opposite side of the House to formulate considered and final conclusions about that document. As His Excellency the Governor General put it, we have only been able, so far, to give preliminary and tentative examination to the Report—although I may say that, if it be a crime to study the Royal Commission's Report, my colleagues and I are the most guilty men in India ; and I believe that, before the date of the Conference in London, a good many Members of this House will have made themselves even more criminal than we are now (Laughter),—because, whatever view one may hold on the recommendations contained in the Report, it is certainly a document which those who attend the Conference will have to study. There is an old latin tag which says : “ It is lawful to learn even from an enemy,” and there is much to be learned from the Report. I have little doubt that, as I say, Members of this House, who are likely to attend the Conference will find it necessary to study what the Report has to say in detail. I have, however, diverged a little from the line I had intended to follow and I must get back to my main theme. It must be useful to Government to hear at first hand from the Members of this House what they think on an important question of this character. There are of course other means of ascertaining opinion ; but when the Assembly is sitting, I personally have always found it—and I am sure my Honourable colleagues also find it—a great advantage to hear at first hand from responsible public men what they think on the questions of the day. Certainly on an important matter of this kind, on which the Government of India will have to express its own opinion at an early date I should have regretted very much indeed had I not had an opportunity of listening to the very varied comments which we have heard during the course of the debate. I can assure the House that all of them will receive the attention of Government, and that the Members of this Assembly are entitled to expect that what they say will have weight with Government and will not be brushed aside as valueless.

Now, Sir, while I adhere to what I have said as to the value of this debate, I am not sure that I can go on to say that I think it was a good thing to move the particular cut moved by my Honourable friend, Mian

[Sir George Rainy.]

Muhammad Shah Nawaz. I see one of the daily papers has suggested that there was some conspiracy between my Honourable friend and me to induce this House, by some subtle manoeuvre to express an opinion in favour of the Simon Commission's Report. When I read the paragraph, I murmured to myself the single word "optimist", because I must indeed have been sanguine if I had entertained that idea. And as regards the conspiracy, it amounted to this that on my request my Honourable friend very kindly came to talk to me, and I spent 20 minutes unsuccessfully in trying to persuade him not to move his cut.

Now, Sir, there are several reasons why it seems to me that it is impossible in this form to put on record an opinion about the Royal Commission's Report which would be of real value and which would be worthy of the dignity of this House. For one thing, it must necessarily be very vague what the House has in fact decided. Some may be dissatisfied with that Report on some points, others on others, and the net result merely is a general expression of disapproval, which does not carry us very far. What is required at the present moment is not general expressions of approval or disapproval but constructive work involving the closest possible attention to detail. When India's representatives attend the Conference in London, it is most desirable, as far as possible, that they should have agreed amongst themselves as to the views they are to express, and that they should have studied and mastered their case, in all its details. Indeed, if this debate serves the purpose of permitting Honourable Members to give expression, once for all, to their general disapproval and thus enabling them to sit down with a clear conscience to the constructive work, then I think in that respect it will have served a useful purpose. But I have a more fundamental objection. To move a token cut in a matter of this kind, seems to me a wholly inappropriate method of raising the question. The underlying idea of a token cut is to refuse supply as a means of expressing disapproval of the policy of Government, the action of Government or the action of those whom Government controls. Now, Government do not and never have controlled the Royal Commission, nor are the recommendations of the Royal Commission an expression of a policy for which the Government of India are responsible. Therefore, it is impossible in this form to censure the Government of India for a matter over which, as I said, they had no control whatever. Surely it is a very strange procedure in order to express dissatisfaction with the Royal Commission's Report to refuse supply for attending the Conference in London. The logic of it seems to me extremely imperfect. Had there been any proposal to restrict the Conference to this report as the sole material of its deliberations, then, indeed, the cut could perfectly appropriately be moved.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah : It would then have been totally refused.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy : Or, again, had it been the intention of the Mover to suggest that this Report was so dangerous that it ought not to be placed before the Conference at all, then I would have understood the necessity of the cut.

Several Honourable Members : That is the idea.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy : I do not think any speaker raised this point until I raised it myself. In effect, what the Honourable the Mover is asking us to do is to refuse supply on the ground that part of the material which the Conference will consider is not as good as it might have been. Now, surely that is a very strange proceeding. In effect, the House will say to those who attend the Conference in London that if we had a good Report, we would have provided Rs. 2,66,000 for your expenses, but as the material is considered imperfect we have only supplied Rs. 2,65,900. Now, Sir, I ask, is that quite consistent with the dignity of this House ? (Laughter). And have Honourable Members considered the unintended effect, if they pass this cut, which their action may have on public opinion in other countries, because surely it is the most remarkable compliment that has ever been paid to the report of a Royal Commission ? It is so important that, even in this form the Assembly feels that it must express an opinion about it. I do not know whether anything I have said will have any influence with my Honourable friend or with other Members of the House. If it has no influence with them, then clearly Government cannot be a party to the action proposed. We express no opinion whatever at this stage as to the merits or demerits of the Reports of the Royal Commission. Quite clearly we must give that document all the study and all the labour which is required before the Government of India can formulate opinions. But it is incumbent upon Government to do all in their power to prevent the House from taking up an attitude which is not, in our view, consistent with its own dignity and does nothing whatever to assist a satisfactory settlement of the constitutional problem.

Before I sit down, Mr. President, there are only two or three things more I should wish to say. In the first place, I should like to refer to what fell from my Honourable friend, Mr. Acharya, about the importance of securing the most representative delegations to the Conference on behalf of India. It was not only my Honourable friend who referred to that matter but also my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and other Members also. Now, Sir, what did His Excellency the Viceroy say in his published letter to the Prime Minister on the 13th of May ? He said :

“ It is important that the representation of India at the Conference should be fairly distributed amongst those sections of thought who desire and have a title to be heard.”

It is a matter, Sir, which has engaged for weeks past, nay for months past, the constant attention of the highest authority in India. In so far as any of his colleagues has taken part in the matter, I am sure I can say this, that the only object we have set before us was to see how the most representative delegation could be constituted. And I personally never felt the temptation to be influenced by any other consideration. Previous speakers have pointed out that, for practical reasons no method of election seemed to provide a satisfactory method of constituting the delegation. But quite clearly the Government can have no reason for desiring to have any other sort of delegation than that of a delegation which India would accept as representative of herself.

A little while ago, I referred to probability that Honourable Members may, between now and October next, devote a good deal of time

[Sir George Rainy.]

to the study of the Royal Commission's Report but I did not at that time mention one particular reason why the study might be valuable. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, yesterday mentioned how much must depend upon the English mentality, whether of those who were serving in India or of men in positions of authority in England, and how all the future of India might depend on their being wisely inspired in their dealings with this great question. I would suggest that, if the representatives of India are going to the Conference, English mentality may be worth their study. It has already been important for some time, and every day it is becoming more important that a breach should not be allowed to develop between the feeling and thinking of India about the constitutional question and feeling and thinking in Great Britain. On our side, we fully recognise the necessity of understanding sympathetically India's aspirations, but I think there is a counter-obligation resting on those who will speak for India, that is, to try to understand sympathetically English feeling and English sentiments. Now, that is not an easy matter. I fully recognise it but it seems to me essential that, if the Conference is to succeed, this aspect of the case should not be neglected or ignored. After all, the report of the Statutory Commission is the report of seven men drawn from different Parliamentary Parties with very different histories and origins, and if for a moment those who sit on the other side would put aside the controversial aspect of the question and examine the Report from the point of view of trying to understand what underlies the English thought and English feeling expressed in it, I am perfectly certain that it will be an effort which will repay itself over and over again and will not be thrown away because it will mean that at the Conference there will be far more mutual understanding than otherwise would be possible.

Now, Sir, many speakers have spoken of the obligation resting on the Government of India to create an atmosphere in which the Conference can sit with some real hope of success. I should be the last to deny that an obligation does rest upon Government to do all in their power to produce peace and harmony, and especially at a time like this. But when Honourable Members speak as if it was a very simple and easy matter, and that all that the Government had to do was to make a magic gesture and the thing would be done, I am afraid they are deceiving themselves. With every year that passes, it is less possible for Government to control political feeling or to regulate the public mind. Just because we are moving along the path of constitutional reform, greater and greater influence and power must be exercised by the representatives of the people, and, as that progress continue, a larger and larger contribution of goodwill must be made from the popular side, if we are to carry on at all. I do not wish, Sir, after these three days debate to develop this point at length, but a few things must be said. After all, if we adopted the plan of some speakers and, while the civil disobedience movement is still in full swing, granted a general political amnesty, would not that amount to the abdication of the Government? So long, Sir, as we are here, we have to perform the primary function of all Governments, and when Honourable Members say that the whole responsibility rests upon Government, and on no one

else, surely they cannot have reflected upon what they were saying. That Government has a responsibility and always must have because it is the Government; I frankly admit, but in this case, surely it is other influences which have brought about the state of affairs which we all deplore. What is the civil disobedience movement except an organised attempt to make Government impossible. If that movement were once discontinued, a new situation would be created with which it would be far more easy for Government to deal, and I do not believe that any one who knows the personality of the head of Government could have any doubt as to the spirit in which the matter would be handled. But surely in this matter, until the leaders of the movement are prepared to discontinue it, the power of Government to contribute towards creating the atmosphere that we all want to see is almost paralysed. I am not saying one word to disclaim the responsibility which rests on the Government of India. It is a very heavy burden to me personally, at a time when a mistake made by any one of us might have the most serious effect upon the interests of a country which contains one-fourth or one-third of the human race. But nevertheless how is it possible for Government by any magic gesture to bring about peace and harmony and an atmosphere in which these great and most difficult problems might be discussed temperately and without heat? I would appeal to my Honourable friends on the other side, that if they have any influence with the leaders of the movement, which we all deplore, to exert that influence, because it is there that for the moment the power rests, to give India the peace and the harmony that she needs. I can only hope and pray that these leaders on their part will allow better counsel to prevail, and will not inflict upon their country the irreparable injury which it is in their power to inflict. (Applause.)

Mr. President : The original motion was :

“ That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,66,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1931, in respect of ‘ Miscellaneous ’.”

Since which two amendments have been moved, one by Mian Muhammad Shah Nawaz and the other by Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi. I will first take the motion of Mian Muhammad Shah Nawaz and the question I put is :

“ 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.”

The Assembly divided :

AYES—60.

Abdoola Haroon, Haji.

Abdul Haye, Mr.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury Maulvi.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.

Abdullah Haji Kasim, Khan Bahadur Haji.

Aiyangar, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana.

Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.

Ayyar, Mr. N. A. Natesa.

Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.

Badri Narain, Mr.

Bhattacharya, Pandit B. P.

Brij Kishore, Lala.

Budh Perakash, Mr.

Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.

Das, Mr. B.

Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.

AYES—60—*contd.*

Dutta, Rai Bahadur S. C.	Patil, Rao Bahadur D. R.
Dwe, U.	Raghuber Singh, Mr.
Farookhi, Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb.	Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makh-
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.	dum Syed.
Gour, Sir Hari Singh.	Ramji, Rao Sahib B.
Hyder, Dr. L. K.	Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ismail Khan, Mr. Muhammad.	Ranga, Mr. N. G.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.	Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.	Reddi, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.	Sahi, Mr. Lal Narendra Pratap.
Kartar Singh, Sardar.	Sarda, Rai Sahib Harbilas.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.	Sen, Mr. S. C.
Mama, Khan Bahadur A. H.	Shafce Daoodi, Maulvi Mohammad.
Misra, Mr. B. N.	Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
Mitra, Mr. S. C.	Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
Mody, Mr. H. P.	Singh, Mr. Adit Prasad.
Mukerjee, Mr. Saradindu.	Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Munshi, Mr. Jehangir K.	Sitaramaraju, Mr. B.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi Sayyid.	Tirloki Nath, Lala.
Nand Lal, Dr.	Venkatakrishnayya Chowdry, Mr. P.
Nehal Singh, Mr.	Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.	Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.
Patil, Rao Bahadur B. L.	

NOES—48.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.	Lamb, Mr. W. S.
Alexander, Mr. W.	Mitchell, Mr. D. G.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.	Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Bajpai, Mr. R. S.	Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
Banerji, Mr. Rajnarayan.	Noyce, Sir Frank.
Baum, Mr. E. F.	Panna Lal, Rai Bahadur Lala.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.	Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Buss, Mr. L. C.	Pillai, Mr. A. A.
Chatterjee, The Revd. J. C.	Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
Chuni Lal, Pandit.	Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Cocke, Sir Hugh.	Rau, Mr. H. Shankar.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.	Sahi, Mr. Ram Prashad Narayan.
Dutt, Mr. G. S.	Sams, Mr. H. A.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.	Sarma, Mr. B. S.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.	Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
Gwynne, Mr. C. W.	Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Haig, The Honourable Mr. H. G.	Sen, Mr. U. N.
Hamilton, Mr. K. L. B.	Sorley, Mr. H. T.
Heathcote, Mr. L. V.	Stodart, Mr. J. C.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Honorary Captain.	Studd, Mr. E.
Howell, Mr. E. B.	Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Koreishi, Mr. A. O.	Tin Tüt, Mr.
	Turner, Mr. A. C.
	Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President : I will now take up the second amendment moved by Mr. Farookhi. The question I have to put is..... (*Honourable Members:* "Withdraw, withdraw.") Does Mr. Farookhi want to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb Farookhi : Sir, I feel that my object has been served by the speeches that have been made in the light of what my Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, has said, I hope that good sense will prevail on both sides and in that hope I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. President : The question is that leave be granted to Mr. Farookhi to withdraw his amendment.

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

Mr. President : I shall now put the original Demand. The question is :

"That a reduced supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,65,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1931, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster : Sir, I beg to move :

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,78,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1931, in respect of 'Expenditure in England under the control of the Secretary of State for India'."

Mr. President : There are two cuts on this motion ; but as all the questions raised in those cuts have already been debated, I rule both those amendments out of order, and I shall put the original Demand to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,78,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1931, in respect of 'Expenditure in England under the control of the Secretary of State for India'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 14th July, 1930.