

Wednesday, 17th February, 1926

**THE
COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES**

(Official Report)

VOLUME VII

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

SECOND COUNCIL OF STATE, 1926



**DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1926**

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Members Sworn	1—2
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ...	2
TUESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Inauguration of the Second Council of State	3—8
WEDNESDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Member Sworn	9
Questions and Answers	10—29
Welcome to Members by the Honourable the President	29—30
Messages from His Excellency the Governor General <i>re—</i>	
(1) Panel of Chairmen	30
(2) Presentation and Discussion of the Railway Budget	30
Committee on Petitions	31
Appointment of the Honourable Mr. K. C. Roy to the Library Committee.	31
Governor General's Assent to Bills	31
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ...	32
Election of a Panel for the Standing Committee on Emigration ...	32
Resolution <i>re</i> Ratification of the Draft Convention of the International Labour Conference concerning Workmen's Compensation for Occupational Diseases—Adopted.	32—37
Resolution <i>re</i> Continuation of the Imposition of a Customs Duty on Lac—Adopted.	37—41
Statement of Business	41—42
MONDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Members Sworn	42
Questions and Answers	43—62
Election to the panel of the Standing Committee on Emigration ...	62
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ...	62
Resolution <i>re</i> the Royal Commission on Agriculture—Adopted ...	62—81
Resolution <i>re</i> Reduction of the travelling and daily allowances of the Members of the Council of State—Discussion postponed <i>sine die</i> .	81—90
Statement of Business	90
TUESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Member Sworn	103
Messages from His Excellency the Governor General	103
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ...	104
Small Cause Courts (Attachment of Immoveable Property) Bill—Passed.	104—105
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed	105
Government Trading Taxation Bill—Passed	106
Guardians and Wards (Amendment) Bill—Passed	106—107
Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill—Passed	107—108
WEDNESDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	109—111

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1926—contd.	
Private Notice Questions and Answers	111—113
Statement regarding Negotiations with the Union Government of South Africa.	113—115
Resolution <i>re</i> Leader of the Indian Delegation to the League of Nations—Adopted.	115—132
Resolution <i>re</i> Formation of a separate Kannada Province—Negatived	132—144
THURSDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Member Sworn	145
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ..	145
The Railway Budget for 1926-27	145—161
Elections to the Panel for the Standing Committees on Emigration ...	162
Resolution <i>re</i> Appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of the Indian Constitution—Negatived.	162—215
Election of Panels for Standing Committees	215
SATURDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	217—249
Nominations to the Panels for Standing Committees	220
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table ...	220
General discussion of the Railway Budget	220—254
Statement of Business	254
MONDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Members Sworn	255
Statement laid on the Table	255—257
Indian Medical Education Bill—Introduced	258
Election of a Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways ...	259
TUESDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	261—262
Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed	262
Indian Naturalization Bill—Passed	263—265
Steel Industry (Amendment) Bill—Passed	265—268
Insolvency (Amendment) Bill—Passed	268—269
Code of Criminal Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed ...	269—284
Madras Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ...	285—286
Resolution <i>re</i> Grant of Supplementary Assistance to the Tin-plate Industry—Adopted.	286—290
Nominations to the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways.	290—291
THURSDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	293—296
Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ...	296—297
Promissory Notes Stamp Bill—Passed	297—298
Indian Trade Unions Bill—Passed as amended	298—304
Election of a Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways ...	305
Nominations to the Panels for Standing Advisory Committees ...	305—306
MONDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	307—316
Result of the Election to the Central Advisory Council for Railways ...	317

MONDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1926—*contd.*

Election to the Advisory Publicity Committee of Messrs. Ramadas Pantulu and Khaparde.	317
Elections to the Panels of Departmental Standing Committees	317
General Budget for 1926-27	317-327

TUESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1926—

Result of the Elections for the Panels of the Standing Departmental Committees.	329
Contempt of Courts Bill—Passed	330-341
Indian Medical Education Bill—Motion to circulate—Adopted	341-343
Photographic group of the Members of the Council of State	343

WEDNESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1926—

Resolution <i>re</i> Import Duty on Artificial Ghee—Withdrawn	345-359
Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Passed	359

SATURDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	361-373
General Discussion of the Budget (Part II)	373-422
Statement of Business	422

MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	423-424
Resolution <i>re</i> Guarantee of Appointments on State Railways to qualified students of the Madagan Engineering College, Lahore, etc.—Negatived.	424-438
Resolution <i>re</i> Privileges and Status of Members of the Council of State—Adopted.	438-442

WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	443-450
Resolution <i>re</i> Qualifications of Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax—Withdrawn by leave of the Council.	451-458
Resolution <i>re</i> Banking Legislation—Discussion adjourned	458-466

MONDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	467-471
Resolution <i>re</i> Salaries of the two Members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council with Indian Experience—Adopted as amended.	471-488
Resolution <i>re</i> Creation of a self-governing Tamil-speaking Province—Discussion adjourned.	489-505

TUESDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1926—

Statement laid on the Table	507-543
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table	544
Resolution <i>re</i> Reduction of the Exports of Opium—Adopted	544-547
Resolution <i>re</i> Creation of a self-governing Tamil-speaking Province—Negatived.	548-562
Statement of Business	562

WEDNESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	563
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the table	564
Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ✓	564-565
Message of Gratitude from the Council of State to Their Excellencies the Earl and Countess of Reading—Motion adopted	565-579

FRIDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1926—

Members Sworn	581
Message from His Excellency the Governor General	581
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly—Laid on the Table	581—582
Message from the Legislative Assembly	582
Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed	582—583
Madras Civil Courts (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed	583—584

MONDAY, 22ND MARCH, 1926—

Members Sworn	585
Question and Answer	585
Message from H. E. the Governor General	585—586
Indian Finance Bill—Passed	586—611
Cotton Industry (Statistics) Bill—Passed	611—612
Legal Practitioners (Fees) Bill—Passed	612—613
Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed	613
Delhi Joint Water Board Bill—Passed	613—614
Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed	614—630
Indian Divorce (Amendment) Bill—Passed ✓...	630—632
Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill—Passed	632
Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill—Passed	632

TUESDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1926—

Questions and Answers	635—641
Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of Indian Unskilled Labourers to British Guiana—Adopted.	641—643
Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ✓...	643—644

THURSDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1926—

Farewell speech delivered to the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly by His Excellency the Viceroy.	645—649
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Wednesday, 17th February, 1926.

The Council met in the Council Chamber at Eleven of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DECLARATION OF THE SONTHAL PARGANAS AS A BACKWARD TRACT.

97. THE HONOURABLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if the district of Sonthal Parganas is declared backward under section 52/A, Clause 2, of the Government of India Act?

(b) If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the copy of the notification issued declaring the Sonthal Parganas to be a backward tract?

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: (a) Yes.

(b) I do not think it necessary to lay a copy of the notification which is somewhat voluminous on the table. Honourable Members who desire to refer to it will find it reproduced on pages 261 to 263 of the publication of the Government of India Act and rules, copies of which are in the Library.

APPLICATION OF SECTION 71 (1) OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT TO THE SONTHAL PARGANAS.

98. THE HONOURABLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if section 71 (1) of the Government of India Act is in force in respect of the Sonthal Parganas?

(b) If the answer to (a) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the copy of the notification by which section 71 (1) of the Government of India Act was applied to the Sonthal Parganas?

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: (a) Yes.

(b) A copy of the notification of the Government of India in the Home Department, No. 478, dated the 12th March 1872, is placed on the table. The territories referred to are those which now comprise the Sonthal Parganas.

JUDICIAL.

The 12th March 1872.

No. 478.—It is hereby notified that the Secretary of State for India has, by Resolution in Council, declared the provisions of the 1st Section of an Act passed in the 33rd year of Her Majesty's reign Chap. 3, entitled an Act to make better provision

for making Laws and Regulations for certain parts of India and for certain other purposes relating thereto, to be from the 15th day of March, 1872, applicable to the following parts of the territories under the government of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, that is to say :—

THE DAMIN-I-KOH.

So much of Pergunnah Bhaugulpore and of Pergunnah Sutticare as lies east of the Gerooh Nuddee and south of a line drawn eastward from Humza Chuck to the village of Dighee.

Zillah Bhaugulpore.

Pergunnah Teleeagurhee	...	} Except such parts of them as are now or may be hereafter situate on the left bank of the main stream of the Ganges so that in any change in the course of the river the main stream shall be the boundary.
„ Jumonee	...	
„ Chetowleah	...	
„ Kankjole	...	
„ Bahadurpore	...	
„ Akbernuggur	...	
„ Inaytunnuggur	...	
„ Mukraen	...	
„ Sooltangunge	...	

Zillah Bhaugulpore.

Pergunnah UMBER	...	} Except such detached villages as lie within the general boundaries of Pergunnahs not mentioned in this Schedule.
„ Sooltanabad	...	
„ Godda	...	
„ Umloo Mootesh	...	
„ Pussye	...	
„ Hendwa	...	
Tuppeh Muneeharee	...	
„ Belputta	...	

Zillah Beerbhoom.

Pergunnah Pubbia	...	} Except such detached villages as lie within the general boundaries of Pergunnahs not mentioned in this Schedule.
Tuppeh Saruth Deoghur	...	
„ Kundit Kuraye	...	
„ Mohumdabad	...	
Such part of Pergunnah Dureen Molissur as lies north of the Chilla or Chundun Ghat	...	
Nullah	...	

Such detached portions of other Pergunnahs and Tuppehs as lie within the general boundaries of any of the above-mentioned Pergunnahs and Tuppehs.

Such portions of Pergunnahs belonging to Maldah and Purneah below the village of Khederpore in Pergunnah Teleeagurhee as are now or may hereafter be situate on the right bank of the main stream of the Ganges.

REGULATION VII OF 1925.

99. THE HONOURABLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD; (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if the Local Government of Bihar and Orissa submitted any objects and reasons for the promulgation of Regulation VII of 1925, along with the draft as required by section 71 of the Government of India Act?

(b) If the Government of India circulated the draft of Regulation VII of 1925 for eliciting public opinion before its enactment?

(c) If the answer to (a) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the said objects and reasons and any correspondence between the Bihar and Orissa Government and the Government of India relating to Regulation VII of 1925?

(d) If the answer to (b) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the opinions received from local officers and the public?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD HABIBULLAH: (a) and (c) The reasons for the Regulation which was promulgated by the Government of India as Regulation VII of 1925 were stated in the letter from the Government of Bihar and Orissa No. 1142/III-P-3-R. T., dated 28th August, 1925, copies of which and of the reply of the Government of India, No. 499/25-G., dated 21st December 1925, are placed in the Library of the House.

(b) It is not usual for the Government of India to circulate for public opinion the draft Regulations proposed by Local Governments under section 71 of the Government of India Act. A reference to paragraph 7 of the Bihar and Orissa Government's letter of 28th August 1925, referred to, will however show that that Government satisfied themselves after consultation with the principal proprietors of the district that the measure met with general approval.

(d) Does not arise.

PRIVATE NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Sir, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has been pleased to accept private notice of a question. Have I your permission to read it out, Sir?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

REPORT OF THE TERRITORIAL AND AUXILIARY FORCES COMMITTEE.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Will Government be pleased to state in regard to the Report of the Territorial and Auxiliary Forces Committee which was published nearly a year back—

- (a) if the same has been considered?
- (b) if all or any of its recommendations are approved? and
- (c) the earliest date when their decision will be made public and given effect to?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: (a) to (c) The Government of India have been actively considering the Report of the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee, but they have, so far, not reached any final conclusion. I may mention that actually the final replies of all Local Governments have not yet been received. Government expect, however, to decide in a very short time upon the course of action which they propose to take on the recommendations of the Committee. But it will then be necessary to address the Secretary of State.

PURCHASE OF FOREIGN RAILS BY COMPANY-MANAGED RAILWAYS.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: (1) Is it a fact that the Indian Railways not under Government management are at present contemplating the purchase of foreign rails?

(2) In view of the recommendation of the Tariff Board in their original and supplementary reports as to the price which should be obtained by

the Indian manufacturer for rails, and the fact that the scheme of protection accepted by Government and the Assembly has in this respect failed, will Government consider the advisability of immediately imposing a duty similar to the duties imposed on other classes of steel on foreign rails in order to protect the Indian manufacturer against such foreign imports?

(3) Are Government aware that recently the London and North Eastern Railway in England passed orders to the effect that no steel other than that of British manufacture was to be used for certain articles on their Railway, and have Government brought this expression of policy on the part of this English Railway to the notice of the Indian Railways who contemplate ordering foreign steel?

(4) Is it a fact that the Indian Railways in question are contemplating the order for immediate delivery of a sufficient quantity of foreign rails to meet their requirements for several years with the object of evading any protective duties that may be imposed as a result of the further inquiry into protection for steel promised by Government?

(5) If so, are Government taking any steps to prevent such evasion of their professed policy?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Before the reply is given by the Government to the Honourable Member's question, I think I should point out to the House and to the Honourable Mr. Sethna, in particular, that there are considerable portions of his question which, if notice had been given in the ordinary way, I should probably have found myself obliged to disallow. The greater portion of part (2) of the question, more than the first half of it, is argumentative, and would probably have to be omitted, and the last portion of part (4) of the question contains an inference, that is to say, it is purely the Honourable Member's own opinion as to the object of the action taken by certain Railways. I understand, however, that the Honourable Member (Mr. Chadwick) is perfectly prepared to answer the question and therefore I do not propose to take any formal steps to have the question amended.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: (1) No. The position is that certain of the Company-managed Railways contemplate calling for tenders for the supply of rails for next year. In preparing their tenders Indian manufacturers of rails will have the advantage of the protection and bounties afforded to them by the Steel Industry (Protection) Act and by the recent Resolution passed in the Legislature.

(2) The Indian manufacturer already receives in regard to rails by way of duty *plus* bounty the same assistance as he receives in regard to other articles he manufactures. It is not understood that the Honourable Member suggests that a greater degree of protection should be given to rails than to other steel articles manufactured in India. The Government cannot accept the assumption that the mere fact that some of the Railways propose to call for tenders connotes that the scheme of protection has failed.

(3) Yes.

(4) The answer is in the negative.

(5) Does not arise.

THE HONOURABLE SIR ARTHUR FROOM: Are the Government aware whether the action of the North Eastern Railway at home of the issue of an order to purchase rails of British manufactured steel was based on a question of quality?

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I am not aware of all the considerations which influenced the North Eastern Railway Company to issue that order.

THE HONOURABLE SIR ARTHUR FROOM: Are Government aware that recently Japan placed large orders for British rails on account of quality?

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I am aware that Japanese Railway Administrations recently published a report that they found that of all their purchases of rails those from Great Britain had proved to be the most satisfactory in actual use.

STATEMENT REGARDING NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNION GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD HABIBULLAH (Member for Education, Health and Lands): Sir, in his speech at the opening of the Legislative Assembly, His Excellency the Viceroy outlined the general course which the negotiations with South Africa regarding the Asiatic question have taken, and appealed to the House to continue to trust the Government while the negotiations were still proceeding. The Government of India and the Union Government of South Africa have now agreed that a stage has been reached at which the correspondence that has passed between the two Governments during the last year can suitably be made public. I am therefore placing in the Library of the House copies of the communications that have passed between the two Governments on the subject of the position of Indians in South Africa.

From this correspondence it will be seen that last April, with the approval of the Secretary of State for India, the Government of India took up with the Union Government direct the question of formulating a comprehensive Indian policy in South Africa which would be acceptable to all the parties concerned, and utilised the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Thomas, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to propose a conference on the subject preferably in South Africa, but if the Union Government so desired in India, or on neutral ground such as Geneva. In the alternative, they asked the Union Government to make other suggestions to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the Indian question. The Union Government replied in June last that, while they were quite ready to receive suggestions from the Government of India towards making their policy of repatriation more effective, they regretted their inability to agree to a conference since it was the policy of all parties in South Africa, by means of strict prohibition of Indian immigration and of active repatriation, to reduce the Indian population in the country, as nearly as possible, to an irreducible minimum, and such a conference would be viewed with suspicion as an interference from outside. On July 14th, the Government of India renewed the suggestion for a conference on the ground that repatriation could not by itself provide an effective solution of the problem since

[Sir Muhammad Habibullah.]

63 per cent. of the resident Indian population were born in South Africa and regarded that country as their home, and on the ground that in order to arrive at a satisfactory settlement, alternative measures of mitigating European and Asiatic competition in the economic sphere should be explored. In July the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration (Further Provision) Bill embodying the policy of the Union Government towards the Asiatic problem was introduced, and in September the Union Government replied regretting their inability to hold a conference on the Indian question, unless its main object was more effective repatriation and unless it was limited to some definite and concrete questions connected therewith. They seemed, however, inclined to favour conversations both in connection with repatriation and with methods of reducing Asiatic and European competition. In October the Government of India replied to the Union Government that, before entering into a discussion of the repatriation question or the general question of alleviating direct competition, they would like to send a deputation to South Africa to collect information regarding the economic condition and general position of Indians residing in the Dominion. The Government of South Africa agreed to this proposal on November 10th, and the deputation sailed from Bombay on November 25th. Its defined purpose was to inquire into and report on the economic condition and general position of the resident Indian community in South Africa and to form an appreciation of their wishes and requirements with a view to furnishing material to the Government of India for use in connection with their negotiations with the Union Government. That deputation has collected material and come to provisional conclusions which enabled the Government of India on January 10th to press once again on the Union Government the desirability of a round table conference on the whole question, or, failing that, a fresh inquiry, before the proposed legislation was proceeded with. The Union Government replied on February 6th that they fully realised our anxiety to place the case of the Indian community in South Africa as fully as possible before them. They expressed their willingness, therefore, to propose the reference of the Asiatic Bill to a Select Committee before the second reading so as to enable the Committee to take evidence on the principles of the Bill as well as on its details, subject to the understanding that the Committee should be required to report to Parliament within such limited period as would enable Parliament to deal finally with the proposed legislation during the present session. This offer the Government of India have accepted, but they have made it clear that their objections to the Bill are fundamental and that they are instructing their deputation to present the case before the Select Committee in respect of general principles. It will follow from the statement of their objections to principles that the Government of India are also opposed to the details of the Bill; but it is not proposed to discuss the latter because the Government of India cannot take any action which might be thought even remotely to imply that they are prepared to waive fundamental objections or acquiesce in the principle of the Bill.

From this very brief summary of the course which the negotiations have taken, it will be clear that the Government of India have obtained two important results. In the first place, they have, for the first time

since Sir Benjamin Robertson's deputation, their own representatives on the spot in South Africa who are in a position to keep them informed of the progress of events and to present the Indian case on their behalf before the Select Committee, when it is appointed. While the Government of India have on their records a mass of evidence relating to the position of Indians in South Africa, they feel the necessity of keeping it up to date and abreast of the changing economic conditions of the Union and of relating it to the particular legislation under consideration. They are anxious moreover to establish closer touch with the wishes and needs of the Indian community in South Africa. It is in these respects that the presence of their deputation in South Africa is proving invaluable to them. Secondly, they have induced the Union Government to agree that the Asiatic Bill should be referred to the Select Committee before, instead of after, the second reading. The principles involved in this Bill are so grave and its effects on the position of Indians in South Africa are of such far-reaching consequence, that the Government of India attach great importance to this concession. India naturally takes the strongest objection to measures calculated to relegate Indians to a position inferior to that of other classes of His Majesty's subjects. The Select Committee before the second reading gives a desired opportunity of stating the case and opposing the Bill on these grounds before the Legislature of the Union is committed to the principle of the Bill. The Government of India gratefully acknowledge the assistance that they have derived in the past from the attitude of the Legislature in regard to Indian affairs in South Africa and they trust that, when the Members of the two Chambers have had an opportunity of studying the correspondence which is now made public, they will approve of the line which has been taken.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I am sure the House and the country at large will feel very grateful to Government for the statement which the Leader of the House has made to us to-day. I would however like to ask the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah if it would suit Government to name a day when the statement he has read out and the correspondence he has laid on the table might be discussed in this House.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD HABIBULLAH: Sir, I must say that I am not in a position, on the spur of the moment, to accept the suggestion which has been made by the Honourable Member opposite, but I can assure him that I shall give the matter my best consideration and announce the decision as soon as I possibly can.

RESOLUTION *RE* LEADER OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council to appoint an Indian of suitable rank and qualifications to be the leader of the delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations."

About two years ago, or to be precise on 10th March, 1924, I moved a Resolution in the then Council of State on identically the same lines as the Resolution I have just now read out. In moving the Resolution, I

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

pointed out that there were highly capable and distinguished Indians who could certainly be trusted to lead the Indian Delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations. In speaking on the Resolution the Leader of the House, the Honourable Sir Muhammad Shafi, on behalf of Government expressed full sympathy with the Resolution and gave an assurance that the proposal would receive the most careful consideration. Let me quote his exact words. They were:

"The Government of India fully recognise that the wish expressed in the Resolution which has been moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sethna is natural. . . . The Government of India fully recognise that fact, and the House may rest assured that the proposal will receive the most careful consideration of the Government of India when the time for appointment arrives."

On this assurance being given I withdrew the Resolution.

Nearly two years have passed since then and two sessions of the Assembly of the League of Nations have been held. But I regret very much to say that in spite of this assurance on the part of Government—an assurance which was virtually in the nature of a promise—no action has been taken in the matter and no Indian has been appointed to lead the Delegation. Nay, further, the Government have not taken the House into their confidence and have hitherto given no explanation whatever why the assurance given by Government has not been carried out. This is a circumstance upon which it is impossible to congratulate Government. I do not wish to use harsh language, but it pains me to think that though Government recognised that the wish expressed in the Resolution was natural and reasonable and promised sympathetic consideration, nothing was done either in 1924, or last year, to meet that natural and reasonable wish.

India is an original member of the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations was signed at the Peace Conference at Versailles in 1919, by the late Mr. Montagu, His Highness the Maharaja of Bikanir and Lord Sinha on behalf of India, together with the representatives of 12 other States signatories to the Treaty of Versailles. These 12 States are the original members of the League of Nations, and that number has now increased to 55. Its present annual expenditure is roughly £900,000 and the question of the allocation of this expenditure has been a very contentious problem. At first it was based on population. It is now based on the revenues of each country which is a member of the League and each member is asked to pay so many units. The total number of units for the years 1926-27 and 1928, is 937, and India has to pay 56 units which is roughly 6 per cent. of the total contribution. I may state that there are only four other countries which pay more than India. They are Great Britain which will pay 105 units, France 79, Italy and Japan 60 each and India 56. According to this we shall be paying annually about Rs. 8,00,000 for our share for the next three years, and which certainly is a high sum to pay. I am aware that our delegates did the best they could at the last sessions with the result that they have brought down the payment by India from 60 to 56 units, but we should very much like it to be reduced yet further.

In this connection I may remind the House of the telegrams which appeared in this very morning's papers, which say that Germany is likely to be included amongst the permanent members of the Council. This requires some explanation. The executive work of the Council of the

League of Nations is performed by 10 members. Of these 10, four are permanent and the permanent ones are England, France, Italy and Japan. These four pay the largest contributions, their shares being respectively, England 105, France 79, Italy and Japan 60 each, India coming fifth with 56 units. Besides these four permanent members, the Council consists of six more non-permanent members who are elected annually, and the point that I desire to make is, that the Government of India should impress upon the Indian Delegation to take up the question at the next session and see that, because India is the fifth largest contributor and although it cannot become a permanent member, still she ought on occasions to be made a non-permanent member. In 1925, the non-permanent members were such States as Brazil, Uruguay, Spain, Czecho Slovakia, Sweden and Belgium, and there is therefore greater reason why India, which contributes as many as 56 units, or 8 lakhs of rupees a year, should be made certainly in some years a non-permanent member of the Committee of the League of Nations.

Anything that enables India to play a part in International Councils is a source of gratification to the Indian people. During the war and some years after it, due care was taken to raise the international status of India and maintain and safeguard every point of vantage gained in that direction. The late Mr. Montagu was very particular in that respect. But of late years, a change seems to have taken place and no particular efforts are made to maintain and raise India's international status. The fact that India is not yet a self-governing country involves in itself serious limitations upon our international status with the result that we cannot yet rise to the full height of our stature. This fact in itself renders it necessary that in every international sphere which is open to the Indian people they should be enabled to truly represent their country and to fill positions of leadership and initiative. It is very humiliating to us to have always to fill subordinate places and to play second fiddle to other people, however able and eminent they may be.

Ever since the formation of the League of Nations distinguished Indians such as Lord Sinha, Sir Ali Imam, the Rt. Honourable Srinivasa Sastri, Sir Sivaswamy Iyer, Sayyad Hussan Imam, Sir Dadiba Dalal, and Sir Atul Chatterjee have been appointed on the Indian Delegation and they have discharged their duties with credit to themselves and to their country. Why should not the Delegation then be led by Indians? I see no reason whatever unless it be that when Britishers and Indians work together the first or leading place must necessarily be given to the former, even when India's representation is concerned and when thoroughly capable Indians are available. Such considerations have no longer any place and they ought not to weigh with Government.

I know that Sir Muhammad Shafi when replying to me two years ago did say that the appointment of representatives will depend to a considerable extent upon what are the subjects which have to be discussed. Government have not told us that the subjects discussed in 1924, and in 1925, were such as could not be tackled, and tackled efficiently, by Indian representatives if any Indian representative were in charge of the Delegation. We have now Indians with considerable experience not only in Government administration matters, but in all other connections and I do not think that if Government are at all serious in acceding to the wishes of the people that they will experience any difficulty in finding suitable Indians.

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

to lead the deputation no matter whatever the subjects that come up for discussion.

He next observed that so far no one has ever been actually appointed leader of the Indian Delegation by Government, but he in the same breath added that as a matter of practice the British member has acted as the leader because of his position and of his special qualifications. This clearly implies that whilst no one is officially recognised as the leader, yet Government look upon the British member of the Delegation as the leader and this is what my Resolution desires to avoid in the future. The time will come when we shall also put forward the claim that at the Imperial Conference also an Indian should lead. I am not putting forward that claim at the present moment, but I certainly urge that the Indian Delegation to the League of Nations from now onwards will always be headed by an Indian.

I trust my Resolution will meet with the ready support of the entire Council.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to the Resolution so ably proposed by the Honourable Mr. Sethna:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the leader and other members of the Delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations be appointed from out of a panel of six persons to be elected by both Chambers of the Central Legislature."

I am entirely at one with the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend and I also heartily support the very cogent reasons with which he backed the Resolution. My object in bringing this amendment is a very simple one. If India is to be represented in the League of Nations, it ought to be represented by persons who can really be defined as representatives of the people of India. Among the nations which constitute the League of Nations, there is already a feeling that England has got 6 votes on her side by including the Colonies and India as members of the League. The suspicion that existed against the Colonies was largely removed in later years by the independent line of action which the Dominion representatives took in the deliberations of the Assembly. We are told that with regard to India the suspicion still exists. I am therefore anxious that the representatives who represent India in the Assembly ought to be in a position to take a line of action which is their own, which is dictated by the interests of India alone. With your permission, Sir, I shall read a small sentence from Roth Williams, League of Nations, To-day, page 170. It says:

"One thing is certain—unless substantial independence is achieved before League membership is applied for, other States will object. The 'six votes to one' cry was already raised when the Dominions came in and only stilled when it became obvious to the world at large that the Dominions are in fact independent nations and that their delegations to the Assembly take their own line in all questions. But India is still looked at askance as a member of the League for the same reason."

I wish to remove this impression on the minds of the Members of the League by giving India, if possible, an opportunity to let her representatives take their own line of action like the Dominions. When the Government of India nominates representatives it cannot be denied that the policy is dictated by the agency which nominates its representatives. Therefore my amendment is both in the interests of England as well as of India, in the interests of England to remove suspicion that England is weighting her

votes by the inclusion of India as one of the members in her own interest, in the interests of India because she will get representation which is to some extent at least a real one. One objection that is raised is that in the case of other countries the Delegations are nominated by the Executive Government and in no case do the Legislatures nominate these representatives. Sir, it is a fact, but you must remember that the Executives of other countries are responsible to the people, and therefore the nominations made by the Executive will be in consonance with the popular wishes. India, however, occupies a very peculiar position in the constitution of the British Empire as well as in the League of Nations, and such representative character, as we can, consistently with our present constitutional position, give ought to be offered to India. Therefore, I have suggested that the Government be requested to appoint this Delegation out of a panel of 6 persons to be elected by the Central Legislature. I have taken care to say 6 persons advisedly. I do not say that these 6 persons ought to be members of the Central Legislature. They can be any persons outside the Legislature. At the same time, I have not asked that all these people should be Indians. They may be Europeans or they may be Indians. So long as the principle of representation is maintained and so long as India represents all nationalities who made India their home, I do not believe in excluding a European or an Englishman from the scope of election by the Central Legislature. Therefore, I have advisedly used the word "persons". There is another reason also, namely, that I find women are already admitted to the Assembly of the League of Nations. In the third Assembly there was a very distinguished lady who represented a country and who startled the House by proclaiming that the League of Nations was very soon to become a "League of Mothers." Therefore, my amendment does not have the effect of restricting the choice or the scope of selection.

Then, Sir, while discussing this question with my friends, certain objections were urged against this amendment and, when analysed, they resolve themselves into two. One objection is that some people do not seem to have faith in the Central Legislature. In fact, one friend, a colleague of mine, actually put me a strange question. He said—supposing to-morrow the Legislature elects Mahatma Gandhi as a representative and the Swarajists elect him, is the Government to nominate him? Such a question really startled me because, if Mahatma Gandhi were to be induced to accept such an unreal position, I should think the League of Nations and India ought to feel honoured by his representation. I do not think that a distrust of the Central Legislature to discharge its duties properly in selecting six representatives out of whom three can be selected, is justified. Then, Sir, the other objection raised was that the selection by the Central Legislature will to a great extent restrict the Government's choice. The very object of my amendment is that the choice of Government ought to be restricted. The choice ought to be primarily with the representative Government or the Government representing the people. In the absence of a representative Government, the choice is to be vested in the Central Legislature, and therefore I have purposely restricted the scope of the Government. But I have given as wide a field for choice as possible, in order that the Government may be satisfied with at least 3 out of the 6 persons of the panel elected by the Central Legislature. On the question of the leadership, I am in entire agreement with the Honourable Mr. Sethna, and perhaps I should have framed my amendment as a supplement to the original Resolution. But under the constitution of the League of Nations the three members of the Delegation command a single vote. Each Delegation has only a single vote and therefore all these three gentlemen who

[Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu.]

will represent us will cast one single vote. Even if the leader is an Indian and his two colleagues are Europeans who have come to a different conclusion, the Indian leader cannot cast a different vote. He could only try to persuade them by bringing to bear upon them his knowledge and skill in dealing with the question. Beyond that he cannot go. He cannot have a separate vote. The object in view cannot be achieved merely by having an Indian as a leader because the three people act together and cast only a single vote. I doubt not that the Government will consider the claims of Indians for leadership. I have not the least idea of running counter to the original Resolution moved by my friend Mr. Sethna. He has also referred to the desirability of nominating Indian representatives to the International Labour Conference and to the Imperial Conference and such other international bodies in which India is represented. This Resolution, I take it, is only a symptomatic one and it expresses the desire of this House that India should be represented by Indian representatives as far as possible. There are competent men who can represent India in all these Conferences, especially the International Labour Conference. There are both employers' and workmens' representatives who can represent India very honourably. Therefore, Sir, my aim is not to embarrass the Government or to do anything which limits its scope of the choice of India's representatives to the League of Nations. My only idea is to make them real representatives of the country and not to be considered by the outside world as nominees of the Executive Government which is itself irresponsible to the people of the country. So long as the Government is irresponsible and also irresponsive, according to me, to the popular wishes of the people of India, the representatives of the Government of India will not carry any weight. As at present situated in the League, we are merely considered to be the tail-bearers of England and whatever we do we do at the dictates of England. Will England give India's representatives a better status by making them representatives of India? With these words, Sir, I move my amendment and in doing so I heartily support the Resolution also and hope that this House will be able to accept it.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Amendment moved:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the leader and other members of the Delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations be appointed from out of a panel of six persons to be elected by both Chambers of the Central Legislature'."

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS (Law Member): Sir, before I deal with the proposal embodied in the amendment, I think it would, perhaps, be useful if I remind this House of the constitutional position in relation to the appointment of delegates to the Assembly of the League of Nations. I think the House will find that the practical difficulties which would arise, if effect were given to this Resolution, are much more in the case of India, situated as she is, than in the case of a self-governing State. Now, under Article 1 of the Treaty of Versailles the original members of the League of Nations are those signatories whose names are given in the Annex and para. 2 of that Article provides that thereafter that is after the Treaty, any fully self-governing State, Dominion or Colony could become a member of the League of Nations subject to certain conditions with which I need not trouble you. Now a glance at the Annex will show this House that of

all the original members India is the only member which is not a self-governing State, so that, but for the fact that India as a signatory to the Treaty became an original member, she could not have now become a member of the League of Nations, that is to say, not being a fully self-governing State she is not qualified to be a member.

Now Article 3 of the League of Nations provides :

"The Assembly shall consist of representatives of the members of the League."

What is meant by "representative"? How is this representative of a member of the League to be chosen? I would ask the House in the first place to consider the case of self-governing States. Let us take for example England or France. How is their representative to be chosen? Now I think it is obvious that the representative of a self-governing State must be one who represents the Government for the time being in power in that State. If a Conservative Government is in power, the representative must be a member of that Government, or someone chosen by that Government. Similarly, if a Liberal Government was in power, or a Labour Government was in power, the representative must be a representative of that Government. I do not suggest for a moment that there is any legal difficulty in the Government for the time being electing someone, for instance, who is in opposition to that Government. I am taking an extreme case. There is no legal difficulty in the way of doing that, but the practical difficulties, which I think the House is sure to appreciate, are enormous, because the Government are responsible for their policy to the Legislature, and if they are represented in the League of Nations by someone who is not prepared to carry out their instructions as to the policy to be pursued or the action to be taken, it will be difficult to hold the Government responsible for what their delegate does in the Assembly.

I am now only dealing with the case of self-governing States. I will come to the position of India presently, but so far as the self-governing States are concerned, the point that I would like to make is that the representative must be the representative of the Government.

The next point to consider is who is to appoint that representative, and I think it will be found that that representative has been and must always be appointed by the executive government. In a self-governing State the election of the representative by the Legislature, or the election of a panel by the Legislature, from which the executive government is to choose its representative would be an encroachment on the executive. The Legislature exercises its influence when a particular policy is pursued by the representative on the instructions of the executive government, and if the Legislature think that the policy which is pursued is not a correct policy they can exercise their influence on the executive government. But the point I would ask the House to bear in mind is that the representative in all self-governing States represents the Government for the time being in power, and he is appointed by the executive government and must be appointed by the executive government, for after all the executive government is responsible to the Legislature and you cannot hold it to its responsibility if the appointment of its representative is to be interfered with by the Legislature.

That then is the position in self-governing States. Now let us come to India. India is not self-governing. The Indian Government is not responsible, as I shall show presently, to the Legislature or to the people.

[Mr. S. R. Das.]

Its responsibility is to Parliament. Now sub-section (2) of section 2 of the Government of India Act enacts:

"The Secretary of State may, subject to the provisions of this Act, superintend, direct and control all acts, operations and concerns which relate to the government or revenues of India."

And section 33 further enacts:

"Subject to the provisions of this Act and rules made thereunder, the superintendence, direction and control of the civil and military government of India is vested in the Governor General in Council who is required to pay due obedience to all such orders as he may receive from the Secretary of State."

Then section 65 and the following sections, which I need not read but with which the House must be quite familiar, give the powers of the Legislature. Therefore, under the Government of India Act it is clear that the responsibility of the Government of India vests in the Governor General in Council, subject to the control of the Secretary of State, and subject to such control by the Legislature as is conferred on the Legislature by the Act itself. That is the constitutional position, therefore, so far as India is concerned.

Now, who is to appoint the representative? We may all deprecate the position that India is not self-governing, that the Governor General in Council is not responsible to the people but to Parliament. We may all deprecate that position, but until that is changed, and while the constitution remains as it is, I submit to this House that we can only consider the question of the appointment of the representative of the Government of India from the point of view of the present constitutional position of India. From that standpoint, and as I have submitted we can only consider that standpoint, from the point of view of Government, the representative of the Government of India must be someone on whom the Government can rely to carry out its instructions at the meetings of the Assembly. It must be someone on whom the Government can rely, because just consider for a moment what the position would be, and look at the practical difficulties in the way. If the Government of India were to send as its delegate someone who has been elected, say, by the Legislature or by the country, or from a panel which has been elected by the Legislature, the Government of India cannot discharge its responsibility if the delegate who has been elected by the Legislature chooses to pursue a policy in the Assembly which is contrary to the views of the Government of India. So far as the present constitution goes, it is the Governor General in Council who is responsible to the Secretary of State and to Parliament, and therefore if you thrust on the Government of India a person on whom the Government cannot rely, or whose views are not the same as those of the Government, the Government of India cannot possibly discharge the responsibility which is put on it by the constitution, which the present constitution of India, however much we may deprecate it, vests in that Government.

Just as in the case of a self-governing State the responsibility is in the executive government and the executive government must
 12 Noon. appoint its delegate, so here also the executive government must appoint its delegate, for the time being at any rate, if I may use the same words that I did with regard to the self-governing State, for the time being it is the Governor General in Council who is responsible. Now an election by the Legislature of a self-governing State would not give rise to so many practical difficulties, or rather I should say, may not give rise to the practical

difficulties that arise in the case of India, if the procedure suggested by the amendment were followed, because, after all, in a self-governing State the majority of the Legislature at any rate is more or less of the same view as that of the executive government. It is the majority of the Legislature which keeps the executive government in power, and therefore in a self-governing State, if the majority of the Legislature were to elect a panel or elect a representative, there would not be the same practical difficulty, if the executive government were to accept that, as there would be in the case of India, where, as I have pointed out, the Government is not, by its constitution, responsible to the Legislature, and where, from the very nature of things, the Legislature may elect persons or a panel whose views may be directly opposed to those of the Government on a particular question which arises in the Assembly. Therefore, by reason of the anomalous position of India, if I may put it that way, by reason of its present constitution, the practical difficulties of carrying out the proposal made in the amendment are enormous, and I am certain, if the Honourable Members will consider it from that point of view, they will find it is difficult for the Government to accept the proposal made by the Honourable Member in the amendment. Under these circumstances the Government are bound to oppose the amendment and I trust the House will see that the amendment cannot be given effect to and will reject it.

With regard to the original Resolution proposed by the Honourable Mr. Sethna, I am rather in a difficult position. All that I can say to him is that, since he moved that Resolution in, I believe, March 1924, the Government have been giving very serious consideration to it, and I am afraid I am not in a position to-day to make any definite statement as to what the Government propose to do with reference to that Resolution, but the Government hope, this year at any rate, to be able to make an announcement before very long as to how far Government can give effect to the proposal at the next session of the Assembly. I can only repeat what my predecessor said on the last occasion in March, 1924, that the Government recognise the wish, have the fullest sympathy with the motion, and, subject to what I have said as regards the constitutional position, they have every sympathy with the motion; and though I am not in a position now to accept the motion because, as I have said, it is still under very serious consideration and no definite decision has been arrived at, we do not propose, from the point of view of the Government, to oppose that Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. C. DESIKA CHARI (Burma: General): Sir, at first I thought there would be no difficulty on the part of the Government to accept the Resolution. It is a very modest request, and in view of the attitude taken by the Government on previous occasions, I thought there would be little or no difficulty in accepting the original Resolution as it stood. I can understand some objection being taken to the amendment because the amendment tries to bring in the elected principle and we are all aware that these delegations are delegations of the Governments and are responsible to the Governments of the various States. That is the position that the Honourable the Law Member wants us to face before asking the Government to accept either the original Resolution or the amendment. I tried to follow closely the arguments that were advanced by the Honourable the Law Member, but I thought he gave us very cogent reasons for accepting the Resolution rather than for rejecting it. To me it appeared as though all the facts which he adduced in support of his conclusions are

[Mr. P. C. Desika Chari.]

the very things on which we can rely for asking the House to accept the Resolution. First he said it is a matter for congratulation that India was admitted as an original member of the League of Nations. Perhaps he meant that if India had waited and applied for membership later the tests of responsible government, the tests of individuality, the tests of full nationhood might have been applied to the case of India and India might not have come into the League of Nations at all. India is a member of the League of Nations and the membership implies that she has got a status equal to that of any other member of the League of Nations—so far as the Assembly goes,—though she is not on the same footing as regards the Council of the League of Nations, which is the executive body. I bring in this merely for the purpose of showing that there is not much achieved by merely getting into the League of Nations on the same footing and with equal status with other members. It is necessary further that the Delegation representing India should be regarded as an Indian Delegation, as a Delegation apart from that of Great Britain. It must have a national character so that full weight and full consideration may be given to the voice of this Delegation which places the views of India before the Assembly. Unless this national character is emphasised, and unless steps are taken to make the world understand that the Delegation proceeding from India is an Indian Delegation which has got views of its own apart from and distinct from the views of Great Britain, this Delegation is not likely to command any respect. It will be regarded merely as playing the second fiddle, as a second vote taken by Great Britain in the name of India. The Honourable Mr. Ramadas read out to you a passage which would show that the Indian Delegation is looked at askance by some members of the League of Nations. I do not think we need take that as gospel truth, but it shows there may be parties who may be interested in belittling the character of the Indian Delegation and in showing before the other people who are members of the League that the words of this Delegation are not entitled to any weight. They may say these are merely echoing the sentiments expressed by the British Delegation; these are merely repeating what they have been asked to say. It is necessary to make the Assembly understand that the Delegation is really Indian in order that the Indian Delegation can have its proper place, in order to enable it to fight for all the privileges which my friend, the Honourable Mr. Sethna, referred to, in bringing down the share of India's contribution, in acquiring further rights consistently with the dignity which India occupies among the nations of the world. Unless the national character of the Delegation is emphasised in some way or other, it is not possible for India to take her proper place among the nations of the world. India is not likely to be heard to say that she ought to be given a prominent place, as suggested by my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna. Unless some method is adopted, unless it is shown to the world that this Delegation really represents India, it is not a Delegation of merely the British administration, which is carrying on the administration of India with a sort of semi-responsibility to the Legislature, unless this aspect of the case is emphasised, it is not possible for the Indian Delegation to command the respect which it ought to command if this Delegation is to serve any very useful purposes at all, and it is this aspect of the matter that I wanted to bring prominently forward before this Council.

As regards the objections which have been raised, I find they are all purely technical and from a legal point of view. From a bare construction

of the Government of India Act and the Constitution which we find in the Government of India Act itself, the Honourable the Law Member may be quite correct, but it is not this aspect that is sought to be emphasised when this Resolution has been brought forward. No doubt there are difficulties. We take note of the fact that the executive government alone is entitled to appoint the members of this Delegation. This Resolution does not want to alter that. We merely ask let it not be a Delegation of a Government, which is well known to be not responsible to the Legislature, a Government which does not reflect in all its aspects the national, the Indian character, which some Government fully responsible to the Legislature would make it out. In the case of other members of the League, no doubt there is this principle that these Delegations are Delegations of the Government concerned and they are only responsible to the Government, but that attitude cannot very well be taken if the suspicion referred to by previous speakers is to be removed at all. We must make it clear that though the Government are not fully responsible to the Legislature, all the same the people have been taken into confidence, the representatives of the people have been taken into confidence, and the Delegation, though sent out by a Government not responsible to the Legislature, is really a national Delegation, because it has got the approval of the representatives of the people who meet in conclave in the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly. I take it that there may be some difficulties if the Government do not see eye to eye with the representative who is sent out. I can very well understand the difficulty which the Government will be put to if in essential matters the Delegation takes a line of attitude which the Government may not fully approve. And it is for that purpose if the Government fully represent the Indian view point, if the Government take care to select a representative who would be suitable, who would be approved not only by the Government but also by the people—I daresay there are many who can satisfy this test—it may be possible not to conflict with the principle of Government appointing representatives and at the same time the representatives who are sent out may have a national character to impress in the Assembly. If this is done, the words of the Delegation will certainly be entitled to greater weight and they will have their proper place among the other delegates who meet in the Assembly, and perhaps there would not have been very much difficulty in getting into the Council of the League of Nations as the fifth largest contributor of the funds necessary for carrying on the work of the League. As regards the other reasons adduced against this Resolution, I will only say this, that in the case of Governments which are run on party lines, where the Government represents the majority party in the Legislature, then there ought to be no difficulty. If a representative is sent he happens to have the same views as that of the Government. In any other case among the members of the League of Nations we do not find any difficulty at all in the matter of selection by the Government. It is only a solitary instance, where a nation which has not attained to its full nationhood, or which is not allowed to attain to its full nationhood owing to various causes of which we are all aware, it is this solitary instance of a member of the League of Nations which places the delegates of India in a peculiar position. It is necessary to take all steps to remove the suspicion: if anything is done, in the shape of the recommendation contained in the original Resolution, that will go to some extent, if not a great deal, to remove the suspicion, to disarm the critics who may be inclined to belittle the activities of this Delegation. As regards the elective principle, there is no harm in accepting that even.

[Mr. P. C. Desika Chari.]

After all, the Government are given the last word in the matter, and we may trust the Legislatures to select a panel of persons of whom some at least would be acceptable to the Government, and the Government have got the last word in the matter. They can by appointing those delegates and by giving them necessary instructions how to act—that is the most important thing—they may see that the person who is leading the deputation does not act contrary to the instructions given by the Government, while at the same time taking care not to make it appear to the Assembly that this Delegation is merely a Delegation which is asked to repeat parrot-like the British view point, but a Delegation that can also take an independent line of action of its own. I have therefore great pleasure in supporting the original Resolution as it stands, because I find it is expedient and prudent to do so, because half a loaf is better than no bread, and it is better that something at least is done in this direction to see that the Delegation has the national character. It will be of some purpose and the Delegation may do some good work and may make itself felt and create an impression on the other members of the League of Nations.

THE HONOURABLE SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTAB, MAHARAJADHIRAJA BAHADUR OF BURDWAN (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, before a nation becomes a self-governing State, if a compliment is paid to it by Government in allowing it to send delegates to the League of Nations, naturally that Government gets tied in a knot such as the Government of India have got into at the present moment by sending delegates from India to the League of Nations. I do not propose here to criticise the present position. What, however, I am concerned with is not only the Resolution moved with such clarity by the Honourable Mr. Sethna, with which I may say at once I have the fullest sympathy, but also the amendment to that Resolution moved by Mr. Ramadas Pantulu. Sir, I would not like to give a silent vote against the amendment of Mr. Ramadas Pantulu. I am very grateful to the Honourable the Law Member for giving such a clear statement as to the present position of the Government of India as well as the constitutional position of a self-governing State. I think the Indian Legislatures are very often—and very naturally—inclined to overrate their own importance, forgetting, at the same time, the constitutional position. Whether the present constitutional position is to be entirely regretted is a matter I leave to others. What I feel is this that, if India aspires to be a self-governing State, it is making a great mistake in trying to inflict undue importance of the Legislatures over the Executive even if the Executive to-day were a Swaraj Executive. In these matters, as the Honourable the Law Member has pointed out, the Cabinet or the Executive Government must have unfettered discretion. It is quite true that in a self-governing State the majority of the members of the Legislature or the Parliament, as the case may be, would no doubt sway the Executive or the Cabinet of the day in their decisions. But I do not think that even in a self-governing State any Legislature would consider such a panel necessary. It is because the constitutional position in India is not fully realised that this idea gains ground. I am glad that Mr. Ramadas Pantulu, however, has been liberal enough in suggesting that these six members would not necessarily belong to the two bodies of the Legislature. But I would certainly deprecate, and deprecate strongly, if these two bodies became a mutual admiration society. But the real point to-day is Mr. Sethna's Resolution

and I should like to ask the Honourable the Law Member from what he said whether he did convey or not that, whilst the Government of India were not in a position to accept the Honourable Mr. Sethna's Resolution, he was not going to oppose it.

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS: That is so.

THE HONOURABLE SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTAB, MAHARAJADHIRAJA BAHADUR OF BURDWAN: That being so, I beg to support Mr. Sethna's Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (Punjab: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I think the Law Member has taken the wind out of the sails of the amendment from the legal point of view. As to the Resolution I would like to put before the House that when we call India a unit, it does not mean British India only but also the territories of Ruling Chiefs. I think to a very large extent the present Resolution has been met in a way by the Government because they have sent during the last few years as India's representatives able and picked Maharajas. The Maharaja who represented India last time has since been chosen as a Chancellor of all the Maharajas.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Not of the League of Nations.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN: At any rate, the Ruling Chiefs must also be considered as the representatives of India. I think the real representative of India is one who is able to help the State and materially help the country from foreign encroachment or to make it more able to support its cause and not the one who by misleading the voters becomes a representative. Now, Sir, if we were to see nominations and elections. I can say that India's representatives hitherto have done some substantial service to the Government and that the Government have chosen better representatives than some of the representatives of the people. This question has also to be taken into consideration. I personally think that whoever have been chosen hitherto by the Government and sent under the circumstances were the best representatives. If, for instance, Government were to choose the Nizam of Hyderabad, he is the ruler of a country just as big as Germany or France, or any of these members, taking the territory, etc., into consideration, and the same is the case with those who have been chosen by the Government. If you were to see their State forces who went to fight the battles of the Empire as well as those of India, I think there is no one who can claim that he has helped India more than those. That way too I think the representatives chosen by the Government were the best representatives. If election were resorted to, as far as I have seen in these days, any man who is able to block or try to block the present machinery of government is considered to be the best representative, so the danger is that such a man will be the first to be elected and the last to be representative. So long as India does not become a nation in the true sense you cannot call the representatives representatives of the nation. I have said this many times that India consists of various religions, various creeds, and perhaps there is one section absolutely against the other, and perhaps also one nationality in a province or in a smaller portion of a province is dead against the other; so that if that was considered I do not know who would claim to be representatives of the nation. There

[Colonel Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Khan.]

would have to be a good many battles between the provinces and the provinces and various religions, etc., before one gets predominant so as to call himself a representative. I think a nation which is a third party, which has come from outside and controls all the various small nations of India and tries to keep them together, is, I think, up to the present time the best authority to represent this continent. I think in one way all that Mr. Sethna has asked has practically been acted upon and as to the amendment, as I have pointed out, it is practically impossible now as things stand because the elected representative will not be a proper representative of India at all. I think the House for the present ought to reject both the amendment and the Resolution because it is premature.

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, the House is indebted to the Honourable Mr. S. R. Das, for the lucid exposition of the constitutional position of the Government, and I think I am convinced by his arguments. At the same time I wish to point out that the Delegations in recent years have given little or no satisfaction. I will only recall the Delegation for last year whose report was before us only a few days ago. It was headed by the Right Honourable Viscount Willingdon, *ex-Governor* of Madras, possessing very little experience of the Central Government and of Northern India; then we had His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala as second representative. He represents a small State of mediæval autocracy. Lastly, we had Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee, a distinguished member of the Indian Civil Service, who recently retired from the Viceroy's Executive Council to take his place as High Commissioner for India in London. He really and truly represented the people of India. But, Sir, what are the functions which these gentlemen are called upon to perform? They were asked to discuss the reduction of armaments, the pacific settlement of international disputes, they were invited to consider the protection and welfare of children and young people, the protection of minorities, mandates, collaboration of the Press in the organisation of peace, and so on. What this House has to consider is whether these gentlemen discharged their duties thoroughly. In my opinion future Delegations should be such as would contain a sitting member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, a Prince of some eminence and a representative of the Central Legislature with substitute members from our Legislatures.

Compare our last years Delegation with the Delegation of Canada. Canada was represented by the Honourable Raoul Dandurand, Senator, Member of the King's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of State, representative of the Government in the Senate. I don't think we had a Member of this House in the last delegation. The next was the Honourable Hewitt Bostock, Senator, Speaker of the Senate, Member of the King's Privy Council for Canada. Even the Government of India had not the courtesy to ask you, Sir, to go to Geneva on our behalf. And the last name is more important, the Honourable Philippe Roy, former Senator, Commissioner-General in France. And the substitutes are equally important, Mr. Walter Riddell, Dominion of Canada Advisory Officer accredited to the League of Nations, M. Jean Desy, Member of the Canadian Bar, Professor at the University of Montreal, Professor "agréé" at the Sorbonne, Counsellor to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Compare their Delegation with ours. Why do not we follow the Canadian example as far as possible?

I shall not, Sir, further pursue this point. I will refer you to the amendment of my Honourable friend Mr. Ramadas. He wants a panel of six persons to be elected by both Chambers of the Central Legislature, from which the Government are to choose their representatives. But he himself has answered the question, and I need not pursue it further than to quote his own dictum. He talked of policy. The policy must be the policy of the Government of India and in fact in regard to the question of the reduction of armaments it must be the policy laid down by His Majesty's Government. If Mr. Ramadas is one of the panel of six who is chosen to represent India, will he carry out the mandates of the Government of India or of His Majesty's Government? The position is one of constitutional importance. I therefore oppose his amendment.

I now come to Mr. Sethna's Resolution, and I feel inclined to oppose it also, because though my heart is with Mr. Sethna my head is with the Government. There is a very knotty point kept in the background by Mr. Sethna as well as by the Honourable the Law Member, and that is the position of the Indian Prince in the Delegation. That is the only thorn in the way. I can assure the Members of this House that the leadership of Indian Princes of India's Delegation will never be accepted by the people of India. If we support the leadership of an Indian Prince we shall be stamping the seal of the approval of this House to the continuance of mediæval autocracy which exists in certain parts of India.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, the Law Member has explained to us the constitutional position, that is to say, that we Indians having no self-government are not in a position to send representatives to the League of Nations. Such being the case what is the object, what is the gain by joining the League of Nations?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member is perhaps misunderstanding the Resolution. There is no question of whether India should or should not be a member of the League of Nations. That question is not before us.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO: The Law Member said that, as we have no self-government, we could not send our representatives to the League of Nations. Such being the case, is it necessary for us to take part in the deliberations of the League of Nations? We are paying a large sum of money, namely 8 lakhs of rupees. Apart from that there is no advantage gained by our taking part in the deliberations of the League of Nations. There is no question of the Assembly of the League of Nations giving us any extra position in the League of Nations.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid I fail to follow the Honourable Member's argument. Am I to understand that he is opposing both the Resolution and the amendment? There is no question of whether India should or should not remain a member of the League of Nations. What the Honourable Member is apparently arguing is that India should not send any delegation at all.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO: I say that India must be represented by a representative of the people, by a Member of the Central Legislature. If we are not in a position to do this there is no use of India taking part in the League of Nations.

[Dr. U. Rama Rao.]

Either we must have the Honourable Mr. Ramadas's motion carried, or if you are unable to carry that, the best thing is not to take part in the delegation at all. Then, Sir, Mr. Sethna has said in his Resolution that the Governor General should appoint an Indian of suitable rank to be a leader of the Delegation representing India. How could a man who is not a representative of both the Central Legislatures be in a position to represent India? His representation will not have any value or strength in the country. Such being the case, I am strongly of opinion that we must support the amendment moved by Mr. Ramadas.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Sir, two days ago was the first non-official day of the Council. The Leader of the House congratulated the Council that its first non-official Resolution should have been on so important a subject as agriculture. May we, the non-official Members, be allowed to congratulate the Leader, and through the Leader, the Government, for having accepted the first non-official Resolution, and I trust that similarly during the life of this Council the percentage of non-official Resolutions which will be accepted by Government will be a far larger one than was the case in the life of the last Council. I am glad to judge from the remarks of the Honourable the Law Member, that, whilst he will not accept my Resolution, he will have no objection to my Resolution being passed. That is exactly I take it the reply he gave in answer to the Honourable the Maharaja of Burdwan.

I think, Sir, the Honourable the Law Member has reason to thank my friend Mr. Ramadas for his amendment, for the reason that the greater portion, may I say 9-10ths of his reply, was devoted to the amendment and only one-tenth to my Resolution. I think he devoted only a few sentences to my Resolution because in his heart of hearts he must admit that Government have not carried out the assurance that was given to this House two years ago and are therefore to blame. But what pleases me most, and I am sure it will please this House also, is the concluding remark in his speech that he hopes that Government will very soon make a pronouncement which he thinks will prove satisfactory to the Council. We may take that to be a very satisfactory answer to the Resolution which I have had the honour to bring forward to-day.

The Honourable Mr. Das has given very cogent reasons for not allowing the amendment to be passed. I would only like to add one more. My friend Mr. Ramadas's amendment gives very little scope to Government for the selection of suitable men; it practically gives them no selection, because it is ten to one that the men chosen for the panel might not be persons who would be in agreement with the views of Government, and as the Honourable Mr. Das has pointed out, it is absolutely useless to send a man whose views do not coincide with those of Government. On the other hand, no self-respecting delegate would undertake to go on behalf of the Government of India if he was forced to carry out views which were not his own. For that reason too I oppose the amendment. But another reason is that human nature is what it is, and if we have a panel of six, in spite of what fell from my friend Mr. Ramadas, it is quite likely that all the six would be Indians, and I for one do suggest and would insist that at least during the transition period there must be a Britisher on the delegation. For this reason as well, I oppose the amendment.

In regard to what fell from the Honourable Mr. Das and to which reference was made by Dr. Rama Rao, did I understand the Honourable the Law Member to say that India is there as a member of the League of Nations only by accident?

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS: Because we were one of the original signatories, not by accident.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Yes, the accident of being an original member. Do I understand that if we were not amongst the original members, we would not be included now?

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS: We would not be elected to-day because it is only a self-governing colony which is entitled to join.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: My answer then is that because we contribute 8 lakhs a year surely some means would have been devised to bring us in so that the League of Nations did not lose these 8 lakhs. However that is beside the point.

In conclusion, I would once again thank the Honourable the Law Member, for no matter how briefly he has replied to my Resolution, he has informed us that a pronouncement is to be made very soon, and I do trust that this House will be satisfied with the pronouncement which is to be made. But, Sir, I would like this motion to be put to the vote in order that Government may know what is the wish of the non-official Members and consequently the chosen representatives of the people.

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS: In order to avoid any future misunderstanding I should like to make one matter quite clear. I said in my speech that we hope to be able shortly to make a final decision on the subject-matter of this Resolution and to announce it. I should not like the House to understand that that is a definite promise on my part to make the announcement very shortly. We hope to be able to do so before very long.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: At any rate, Sir, it will be before the members of the next Delegation are chosen?

THE HONOURABLE MR. S. R. DAS: Oh, certainly.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The original question was:

"That the following Resolution be adopted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to appoint an Indian of suitable rank and qualifications to be the leader of the Delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations.'

To which an amendment was moved:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the leader and other members of the Delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations be appointed from out of a panel of six persons to be elected by both Chambers of the Central Legislature.'

The question I have to put is that these words be substituted for the original Resolution.

(A division was claimed by the Honourable Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu and taken by Members rising in their places.)

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Ayes are 6 and the Noes 34; the Noes therefore have it.

The amendment was negatived.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is:

"That the following Resolution be adopted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to appoint an Indian of suitable rank and qualifications to be the leader of the delegation representing India at the next session of the Assembly of the League of Nations.'

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE FORMATION OF A SEPARATE KANNADA PROVINCE.

THE HONOURABLE BAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution which stands in my name

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee of officials and non-officials be forthwith appointed to inquire into, and suggest ways and means for, the formation of a separate Kannada Province."

Sir, this Resolution aims at the long-wished-for redistribution of Provinces in India on a linguistic basis. The proposal is no new one nor has it been flung at the Government all of a sudden to-day as a surprise. In fact, it has been agitating the peoples' minds ever since the inception of the Indian National Congress. Year in, year out, during the past forty years, the Congress has been putting forth its demand for the regrouping of Provinces in India based on language before the Indian Government. Just before the inauguration of the Reforms, the Honourable Mr. (now Sir) B. N. Sarma moved a Resolution in the old Imperial Council, *anent* the rearrangement of Provinces on a language basis.

Sir, the existing territorial distribution in India is the result partly of administrative expediency and partly of historical accident. The history of Indian administration under British rule reveals a steady growth in the number of Provinces into which the country has been divided. This increase was not only due to the gradual expansion of territory acquired by the British from time to time, but also to the necessity of effecting suitable rearrangements on grounds of administrative expediency. The growth of the Indian Provinces has, therefore, been more or less chronological and was not based on the operation of any logical, linguistic or ethnic considerations. This accounts for the arbitrary divisions of the country into provinces and the heterogeneous grouping of districts into each province. For instance, the Mahrattas are divided between Bombay, the Central Provinces and the Nizam's Dominions; the Telugus between the Central Provinces, the Nizam's Dominions, Mysore State and the Madras Presidency; the Canarese between Mysore State, the Madras Presidency, the Bombay Presidency, Coorg and the Nizam's Dominions; the Uriyas between Madras

and Bihar provinces and till recently, the Central Provinces. Such an arrangement based on no principle whatever clearly indicates that the whole grouping was haphazard, and that neither ideals of administrative efficiency nor those of national upbuilding have ever exercised the minds of the rulers or the ruled.

Nevertheless, there have arisen individual administrators from time to time who had the perspicacity to discover the error in the existing territorial divisions and sketched a correct plan of distribution. Sir John Strachey pointed out that "the political limits of the Provinces have little connection with any physical characteristics". Sir Thomas Holderness observes that :

"with the exception of Burma, no province represents a natural unit, that is to say, the provinces do not stand for differences of race or language or geographical distribution. They are purely administrative divisions of territory."

So far back as 1902, Lord Curzon's Government wrote :

"The question of territorial and administrative redistribution in India is, indeed, in our judgment, one of the most urgent and vital of the many problems for which we are at present endeavouring to find a solution."

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms has expressed the view that in order that provincial administrations under the new dispensation might be efficient and effective, the provinces should be redistributed in such a manner that it should be rendered possible even for non-English knowing people to take an active part in the administration of their respective provinces by the adoption of the vernacular as the language in the Councils. This can be expected only in administrative units where there is one common language and the report consequently urges on the speedy redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis. Lastly, we have the opinion of Sir Frederick Whyte, who, in his book on India's Reformed Constitution, which is being published by the Government of India, says :

"Language is an important factor in connection with national unity in India. The various provinces should have their own languages."

He thinks local patriotism is the foundation of enduring Federalism and considers the revival of Bengali very significant. A similar revival of provincial languages in other parts of India should provide a sound foundation for provincial autonomy.

Sir, I think I have now established a strong case for the redistribution of provinces on a language basis and Kannada must on that ground be constituted as a separate Province. As I have already pointed out, the Canarese-speaking people are scattered over the various provinces of India, to wit—the Madras Presidency, the Bombay Presidency—the Mysore State, the Nizam's Dominions and Coorg. The greatest disadvantage of this political misfortune has been the *alienation among our own people*. Karnataka has a glorious historical past, it has a language rich and variously cultured and developed from different inspirations—the Jains, the Lingayats and the Brahmins—and it has a culture of its own and is bound to play an important part in the consolidation of the future federated states of India. But, at the same time, Sir, it requires no great historical insight to see that during the turmoils of political unrest in the country before the advent of British rule, she has suffered much and that since the fall of the Marhatta Empire in the first quarter of the 19th Century, the ruin of Karnataka has been complete. The peace under British rule has been

[Dr. U. Rama Rao.]

the peace of the land of the dead. To-day, Sir, owing to the helpless and dissipated condition of the Karnataka people, we find our language mutilated, our culture gone, our traditions, literature and art almost forgotten. To a man from Belgaum, Kannada from the lips of a Mangalorean sounds effeminate like the affected voice of a male actor playing the role of a female on the stage. The Mysorean retorts that the Bijapur Kannada is a ruthless slaughter of that beautiful language. Government also, though they parcelled out the Kannada people in different administrative compartments, find that in their educational policy, they want different primary text-books in the Bombay Karnataka from those that are in vogue in the Canarese Schools of the Madras Presidency. The Mysoreans again want a third set of text-books. And yet all these people represent the same culture and must be proud of their own heroes, military, literary, religious

and others. By mixing together in one chaldron, two or three
1 P.M. languages, the administration becomes more expensive and less efficient. There are at present, in the whole of the Karnataka, excluding Mysore and the Nizam's Dominions, about 3 colleges and 48 High Schools, but the curriculum of studies is different in different provinces and therefore, the uniformity in cultural advancement and progress is in no way maintained. Further, the Karnataka people sadly suffer from the want of a University of their own. Local self-government cannot be developed consistent with the character, civilization, culture, tastes and inclinations of the Kanarese-speaking people. There is no scope for the fostering of local patriotism. Nor is their voice patiently heard and their grievances adequately redressed in the local Legislative Councils, their representatives therein being in a hopeless and miserable minority unable to enforce their will against the overwhelming odds of other communities and interests. To cite a recent instance, Sir, when the Andrah University Bill was rushed through in the Madras Legislative Council, the inhabitants of Bellary, who are mainly Karnatakas, begged, petitioned, entreated, cajoled, in fact, did all that human nature is capable of doing under such circumstances, to see that Bellary is not included within the fold of the Andrah University. But, Sir, their voice had been the voice in the wilderness; so, one fairly good district of the Karnatakas had been torn from their map and there is every likelihood of its being completely Andrahsised, if no separate Karnataka province is constituted in the immediate future. The fate of other districts in other provinces also is similarly doomed.

Sir, it has been admitted on all hands that opportunities for self-development, scope for civic discipline, chances for the cultivation of one's own language and literature, and above all conditions for effectual political autonomy, could exist only when each language area has a scheme of administration wholly unto itself. Recognizing this, Lord Hardinge had laid down three cardinal principles which must be satisfied before any scheme of redistribution of provinces on a language basis is undertaken. There are (1) that the settlement of boundaries in order to be satisfactory and conclusive should provide convenient administrative units, which are at once furnished by contiguous tracts of country, where the people speak a common language, (2) that the settlement should satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people, and (3) that the settlement should be clearly based upon broad grounds of political and administrative expediency. Let us now apply those principles in the case of Karnataka. Sir, the Karnataka province of the future will consist of 10 districts, the northern

division consisting of Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur, Karwar and Bellary, the southern consisting of Anantapur, Hosur, the Nilgiris, Coorg and South Kanara. The total area of the British Karnataka would come to 43,615 square miles with a population of 8,211,750. Though the area is less than that of Assam, Karnataka has a population much larger than that of Assam. Geographically also it will form one contiguous tract of country providing a convenient administrative unit. The second principle is that it should satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people. Sir, the people of Karnataka have been crying themselves hoarse for the formation of a separate Karnataka Province for a long time past. The Karnataka people with one voice demand it and the Karnataka Press warmly support it. The Indian National Congress, on a representation made to it by the people of Karnataka, has carved out a separate Congress Karnataka Province, so to say, which is now functioning as a separate and independent entity and recently the Congress had its session also held at Belgaum, in the newly constituted Congress Karnataka Province. When the late Right Honourable E. S. Montagu was in India, in connection with the reform inquiry, the people of Karnataka in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies and Coorg assembled in public meeting, resolved to present a memorial to him regarding the unification of Karnataka. and the memorial that was accordingly presented urged that :

“ for the proper realisation of self-government, it is necessary to organise the country into a series of self-governing provinces, and principalities federated by one Central Government and that in order to make provincial autonomy real and effectual, the re-adjustment of provinces on a language basis is absolutely essential.”

Now, Sir, the second of the conditions is thus fulfilled. Then comes the last condition, i.e., political and administrative expediency. As matters now stand, we, the Karnatakas, can never exercise in either of the Provinces, Madras or Bombay, that influence to which we consider ourselves entitled by reason of our numbers, wealth and culture. This is a substantial grievance which will be felt all the more keenly in course of time as the representative character of the Legislative Council increases and with it the influence which these Assemblies exercise upon the conduct of public affairs. To take again the example of Assam, though it has a population less than our own, it has a Legislative Council of its own of a much larger representative character, while we, Karnatakas, have only 6 members to represent us in the Bombay Council and 4 in the Madras Council. Thus, administrative expediency also calls for the carving out of a separate Kannada Province. Let me add one more principle to be applied here, namely, the cost of administration. In my opinion, the cost of general administration would be comparatively small, having regard to the smallness of the area and population. Enormous savings may be effected under various headings, including travelling allowances. There are already several small administrative units in India, such as Ajmer, Merwara and the like and Karnataka will be one among that fold. The probable income of the would-be British Karnataka would be about 3½ millions and with the rapid expansion of railways, irrigation facilities, coastal traffic, etc., which are woefully neglected at the present day, the income is bound to increase and the prosperity and well-being of the Karnatakas assured and placed on a firm basis.

Before I close, Sir, let me answer one or two possible objections to this proposal. It is said that the scheme of redistribution of provinces on a language basis is not conducive to national unity, and this would eventually lead to disintegration. Sir, the upbuilding of the Indian nation is only

[Dr. U. Rama Rao.]

possible on a plan of federation in which each provincial factor shall occupy a sub-national position. To secure this end, the Provinces should be homogeneous and be devoid of elements that lead to inequality of progress so that various subordinate centres of self-consciousness may come into existence around which national life groups itself into distinct units. We have the mighty example of the United States of America and the humble instance of Switzerland in support of my statement. The United States of America consist of as many as 48 provinces each independent in itself. The biggest province has an area of 100,000 square miles and the smallest, namely, Columbia, about 70 square miles. Switzerland with an area of 15,951 square miles and with a population of 3,815,848 has got 22 provinces divided according to linguistic area. Each province is independent of the other and is not bigger than even two of our *taluqs*. In our own country, we will have at the utmost 19 provinces based on language instead of 15 incongruous, irresponsible units which we have at the present day.

The next objection is that the redistribution should not precede the grant of full provincial autonomy. To make it follow is in my opinion to place the cart before the horse. By the time we get provincial autonomy, we must have ready-made administrative units based on language and territorial integrity. Such is the scheme of provincial autonomy which Lord Hardinge had outlined for India. According to his scheme there would come into being separate, small, self-contained and self-reliant States, in which no one community could retard another in its progress. It is only thus, Lord Hardinge said, that:

"all the nationalities in India can be started simultaneously on the road to self-development and ultimate self-government. Those which advance rapidly would be given greater facilities and would necessarily be more independent than those that lagged."

Lord Hardinge added:

"No greater facilities could be given to the people of India than the fostering of local patriotism by the construction of a new map on an ethnological and linguistic basis and the consequent friendly inter-racial competition for civilized progress and ultimate autonomy."

Now, Sir, my Resolution merely asks for the necessary spade work to be done before the advent of full provincial autonomy, which, it is hoped, will come in the near future, so that a new Kannada Province may be formed at once and endowed with a separate autonomous administration. This is by no means an easy task and I have therefore proposed the appointment forthwith of a Committee of officials and non-officials to inquire into and suggest ways and means for the purpose of forming a separate Karnataka Province. There will be nothing lost by this inquiry; on the other hand a good mass of useful evidence and public opinion will be gathered and made available for ready use. I now commend this Resolution for your kind acceptance.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that, with a view to regrouping of Provinces, as far as possible, on a linguistic basis, a Committee with a non-official majority be appointed to inquire into, and suggest ways and means for, constituting the Kanarese-speaking tracts of the provinces of Madras and Bombay into a separate Kannada Province."

Sir, I am in substantial agreement with the Resolution and my amendment is intended to emphasise one aspect of the question. It is this. I desire that the claims of the Kanarese to separate provincial integration should be dealt with as a part of a comprehensive scheme of reform affecting the whole country. It is well known that with the exception of Burma and two or three other provinces in India no province represents a natural unit, and that most provinces are artificial aggregations of tracts of country which owe their origin to historical accidents or political and administrative exigencies. On the one part a single people characterised by a common tradition, culture and language are cut up between different administrations and on the other hand as many as five or six distinct linguistic groups are thrown into a single province. The province from which I come, Madras, is composed of Tamils, Telegus, Keralas, Kanarese and Ooriyas.

At the same time the Telegus, Kanarese and Ooriyas are divided between four different administrations. It cannot be disputed that this arrangement has very grave defects. Firstly, it is a hindrance to good government as it cannot produce administrative efficiency. Secondly, it prevents the process of the upbuilding of the nation as it destroys the sub-national spirit of the homogeneous groups by rendering them weak, disorganised and disunited. The defect in the existing territorial divisions engaged the attention of several British administrators and their views are well worth consideration. Sir John Strachey, Sir Thomas Holderness, Sir Bampfylde Fuller, Sir George Chesney and Sir Francis Younghusband all pronounced themselves in favour of the reform. A very comprehensive survey of the question is to be found in the famous despatch sent by Lord Hardinge's Government on the 25th August, 1911, in connection with the reunion of the 5 Bengali-speaking divisions into one province and integrating the Hindi-speaking population of Bihar and Chota Nagpur into another. All the arguments that can be urged in favour of reorganisation of provinces on linguistic bases are embodied in that document.

From the popular side, the anti-partition agitation in Bengal, the Biharis' plea for separation from Bengal, Berar's desire to be added to Maharashtra, and the demand of the Oriyas, the Sindhis and the Kanarese for separate provinces were the outcome of the desire for self-expression. But each of these peoples urged their respective claims with a desire to secure greater advancement for them in education and influence in their separate provinces and did not put forward any comprehensive scheme for reorganisation of the country as a whole. The first organised attempt at formulating a scheme for the country as a whole was made by the Andhras. When Mr. Montagu visited India in 1919 and toured the country along with Lord Chelmsford, an influential deputation, composed of representatives of the 11 Telegu districts in the Madras Presidency, waited on the Secretary of State and the Viceroy and presented a memorandum on the subject. That memorandum was presented later on to the Joint Parliamentary Committee by Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao and is to be found in the Appendices to the Joint Select Committee's Report (Volume III, page 110). I respectfully commend it for the perusal of the Members of this House. It also contains annexures giving a detailed scheme for the whole of India. From the figure then obtained the proposed Kannada Province would comprise 7 British districts covering an area of 29,000 square miles and a population of 6 1/3 millions. It is certainly large enough to have a separate administration. It will be two and a half times the size of Belgium.

[Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu.]

It is hardly necessary to point out to this House the place which language and literature play in national development and the advantages to be derived by integrating people speaking a common language and possessing a common literature which enshrines their traditions. But I am anxious that the reform should be undertaken as a part of a comprehensive scheme, as I stated at the outset. My reasons are *threefold*. In the first place the existing provisions of the Government of India Act relating to the creation of new provinces and sub-provinces are very unsatisfactory. Dealing with the clause which corresponds to section 52A of the Government of India Act, the Andhra spokesmen before the Joint Parliamentary Committee said as follows:

"The clause does not contain any safeguards that the same form of administration prevailing in the Province from which it is separated would be guaranteed to the new province. We feel that the proposal for the appointment of a Deputy Governor and the creation of a sub-province is beset with difficulties. In the first place the clause does not define the relations between the executive of a major province and the executive of a minor province. We presume that a legislature will also be created for the minor province with subordinate powers of legislation. If this is the intention various questions, such as the powers of the two legislatures, the powers of the representation of the minor provinces on the legislatures of major provinces, the question whether the administration of the minor province will be entrusted to ministers, these and other questions arise for consideration. If it is the intention of the framers of the Bill that all these questions should be left to the decision of the Governor General in Council, we see very strong objection to the clause as it stands."

It now stands as section 52A with all these defects. So my Kanarese brethren are not in a position to know what kind of administration will be vouchsafed to them if they are forthwith integrated into a separate small province. Secondly, as Swarajists, the mover of the Resolution and myself cannot desire the multiplication of dyarchical provinces. At the same time I agree that we ought not to wait till we get autonomy. So we urge the necessity to take immediate steps, from now, to find ways and means for constituting Kannada into a separate province with such provincial autonomy as her sister provinces will secure in the revision of the constitution, which cannot be long delayed. Thirdly, by reason of the very confused manner in which various groups seeking separation are now intermingled, the adjustment of the claim of one for integration as a separate unit will necessarily lead to a consideration of the claims of the other groups. So with this emphasis on the desirability of tackling the whole question as part of a comprehensive scheme, I heartily support the Resolution of my Honourable friend.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (Punjab: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I am thankful to the Mover for bringing this Resolution because the first Resolution had long been disposed of and we would not have had anything to do this time before the Council adjourned.

I am sorry, Sir, that most of my colleagues by leaving have left this Resolution to be moved in an empty Chamber. Perhaps they may say they do not know what this province is. Great trouble has been taken to explain, but owing to the language used and the accent of the Honourable Member some of us have been unable to grasp what was said. But all the same, as India is so backward in industry, it is a very nice thing to manufacture new provinces. I have to oppose the Resolution, Sir, because my province has lost this portion of Delhi as well as the North-West Frontier

Province, and if there are any more partitions made the provinces will become very small. That is one of the reasons why I oppose this Resolution. In India, Sir, they say that every 18 miles the language changes, so if the language was the essential condition in grouping provinces, there would be provinces every 18 miles apart all over the place. Then comes the question of economy. If this province were made, it would have to have a Governor and all the paraphernalia and all the expenditure of a province. Unless our friend would like to do the work as a Governor and pay the expenses which India would have to pay, I think it would not be acceptable to India. So I do hope, Sir, that this proposition will be rejected.

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. E. B. HOTSON (Bombay: Nominated Official): Mr. President, the Resolution which has been moved lays stress upon the particular needs of the people of the Kanarese-speaking country, while the amendment seeks to strike a more general line and asks for a reconstitution of the whole of India on linguistic grounds. I would ask the House, before they accept this Resolution or the amendment, to consider it very carefully both from the point of view of principle and also from the question whether there is any genuine, strong popular demand for such a regrouping, and in the third place, whether the proposal is administratively and financially practicable. On the question whether a linguistic basis is the best one on which to divide a country into provinces a very great deal has been said. I do not think we need go into that now. I will only point out that the experiences among the succession states of the Austrian Empire and in the Balkans do not show that distribution on this particular basis leads to peace or to happiness. It leads rather to the creation of oppressed minorities. I do not think we can press this comparison very far; at the same time it must be remembered that all over India now the cry of Bombay for the Bombay people, Burma for the Burmese, is becoming stronger than it used to be, especially in the search for all sorts of employment and most of all among candidates for Government service among their friends. Now, if we divide all India linguistically, shall we not rather be introducing a new element of difference into the country, a new division, and not strengthening, not increasing its unity? Looking at the Bombay Presidency, it consists of four large language divisions. I do not think any one can say that the Province of Bombay has been hampered by the existence of different languages. I think, on the contrary, its culture has been widened by intimate contact between neighbours. Undoubtedly its financial resources have been increased. Sind could not have taken up the Barrage now being built at Sukkur without the assistance of the rest of the Presidency; the great irrigation schemes going on in the Deccan now could not have been taken up unless the other members of the Presidency had helped. If the forest policy in Kannada had been shaped merely by the immediate need for money in a small province, they would not have been in as flourishing a condition as they are in to-day. In Gujerat even the famines that struck so sorely at the people would have been more severe in their effects on the province and those effects would have been more lasting had not the treasury of the whole Presidency been open to help the Gujaratis. I think we must hesitate before we can accept this principle as a suitable one. Now, whether large or small provinces are better for India is another point on which I will not enlarge at the moment. At the same time some of

[Mr. J. E. B. Hotson.]

us have been in various provincial legislatures. I think each provincial legislature is proud of its own position and its own power, and it is felt very strongly that if India was broken up into a larger number of small provinces, the power of each local legislature would be less than it is now. The power of the Central Legislature would be enhanced. Now are we prepared to say at once that this is altogether a step in the right direction? Our friends want provincial autonomy. Are they going to get that provincial autonomy sooner? Are they going to make it more real by reducing the powers that the provincial legislatures have already? I think it is very doubtful. I will not say more on that point now.

I pass on to the question whether there is any strong, popular demand for this change. On this point I can only say that about three years ago it was proposed to bring in a Resolution into the Bombay Council asking for the creation of a separate Kannada Province. That Resolution was disallowed for certain reasons. It was disallowed because in the form in which it came forward it proposed in the Bombay Council that large portions of the Madras Presidency should be taken away and added to the Bombay Presidency. Had there been any great demand it would have been very easy for the people who desired to press the question to have framed that Resolution in a different way, in such a form that it would have been admitted and could have been discussed. To the best of my knowledge no Resolution of that sort has ever been brought forward or put on the paper in Bombay since then. I remember very well having seen a number of Resolutions asking for an additional Member to represent the Kanarese districts in the Bombay Legislative Council, but owing to the luck of the ballot, and to the abstention of our Swarajist friends from taking part in business during part of the last two Sessions, those Resolutions never came forward. They were put on the paper though, whereas a demand for a Kannada province has never appeared on the paper. I have had many friends among the representatives of that part of the country and have never heard them press this question strongly. Our friends from Sind have asked for separation occasionally. I do not think they really want it, but we have heard their request. We have not heard in Bombay any equally strong request from the Kanarese-speaking people. One reason I would bring forward, but time is short, is that there is no real homogeneity in the Kanarese country now. My Honourable friend has already mentioned the differences in dialects. We have also great differences in religion and in caste. We have now the people that used to be the rulers of the whole of the Karnatic reduced to the state of outcasts. We have people in the very lowest stages of social evolution, and along side them people in the highest stages. We do not see as a matter of fact that those in the highest stages are doing anything to bring forward those in the lower stages. That is not the case even in such parts of the country as are homogeneous. There is nothing to show that it would be the case were these provinces differently constituted. Now, as to practicability, we have had lots of figures. The Mover of the Resolution said that there were 8 million inhabitants in the country which he would make into a Kannada province. The mover of the amendment, if I caught his words correctly, said there were 6-1/3 millions. I have got certain figures here which show that the Kanarese-speaking people in any tract which could be brought together would not number more than about 3 millions. There

are only two districts which are almost entirely Kanarese, those are Bijapur and Dharwar. In two other districts the Kanarese number a large proportion; those are Belgaum and North Kanara. There are two more, namely, South Kanara and Bellary, in which there is a very considerable proportion of Kanarese-speaking inhabitants. Elsewhere there are very few. It is conceivable that four districts and parts of two other districts might be made into a Kannada province. In Anantapur, out of a population of 9 lakhs, there are 90,000 speaking Kanarese. In Madura there are 1 lakh out of 2 millions. In Salem, there are fewer than $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs out of over 2 millions. In South Kanara there are $2\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs out of $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions. In Coimbatore there are $\frac{1}{2}$ million out of nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions. In Bellary, one of the districts where they are strong, there are 482,000 out of 862,000. I do not think our friends mentioned Sholapur, but at a meeting which was held at Belgaum a short while ago, they claimed this district, on the strength of numbering 50,000 out of $7\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs. In North Kanara, i.e., Bombay Kanara, there are 226,000 out of 401,000, and in parts of that district there are no fewer than 181,000 who speak Konkani, a dialect of Mahratti. In Coorg, I find out of 168,000 only something under 70,000 speak Kanarese. The Kanarese population there is not quite 45 per cent; of the rest, a large number speak a dialect called Coorgi or *Kodagu*, which, I understand, is related to Kanarese but not the same. The two languages together will amount to 70 per cent., but the Coorgi people themselves are as strongly particularist as the Kanarese, and would as strongly resent domination by outsiders. They do not want to be eaten up by the Kanarese any more than the Kanarese want to be eaten up by others. Thus the province which the Honourable Mover would desire to create would really be nothing more than a large hole with a fringe round it. The hole is Mysore—I do not mean any disrespect to that great State by this description—and the fringe is the Kanarese-speaking country round it, with a lump on one side to represent the four Bombay districts. The total revenues of the province, so far as I have been able to make an estimate, would not reach 2 crores of rupees. Out of that how are you going to make a province with a Government and a Legislature that could command any influence in India as a whole? The Kanarese people in the Bombay Council now hold an important place; their counsels are listened to. They have influence which is as strong as that of any other section there. Where would they be if they had a tiny legislature of their own and sent up 1, perhaps 2, Members to the Central Legislature of India? It would be against their interest, not in their interest, that this proposal should be accepted.

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR (Home Secretary): Sir, I should like to express in the first instance my gratitude to my Honourable friend from Bombay, for by the first speech which he has made in this Council, he has relieved me of a very great deal of what would otherwise be my responsibility. His lucid and cogent statement can, I think, have left little doubt in the minds of the House as to the practical possibilities of both the Resolution and of the amendment. My task is therefore limited to explaining very briefly what is the attitude of the Government of India towards this particular proposition and to other propositions of the same character. The Government of India regard, and will always regard, with respectful and sympathetic consideration any proposals for the constitution of administrative units on the basis of linguistic areas which are clearly supported by a very strong popular sentiment and which on examination are found to produce a reasonable, sound and progressive administrative proposition. That view was held and is expounded in the Joint Report.

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

It is dealt with in the Joint Parliamentary Report on the Government of India Bill. But I should like to invite the special attention of the House to this fact that the Joint Parliamentary Report in particular lays stress upon two points. They indicate very strongly that any such proposition must have a genuine and forcible popular opinion behind it, and that opinion must, and ought to, be expressed in the first instance in the local Legislative Councils concerned. Now, Sir, it is a very remarkable thing that the Honourable Dr. Rama Rao gave no clear indication of the existence of any strong measure of popular support. Still less did he indicate to us that the measure had been considered and debated in the local Legislative Councils. Having regard therefore to the very careful pronouncement on this matter which was made in the Joint Parliamentary Report, I think that we should be acting very dangerously indeed if we ourselves at this stage accepted this Resolution, regarding which we have not the slightest ground for believing that the local Legislative Councils desire to urge it—with regard to which indeed we have evidence that opinion in one local Legislative Council at any rate is distinctly averse from it. Now, Sir, when I defined very briefly what the attitude of the Government of India would be towards a measure of this kind, I said it would necessarily be one of respectful and sympathetic consideration, but naturally also any further action to be taken would necessarily be conditioned on the existence of a large number of other factors in what would undoubtedly be a most important decision. The Honourable Member who moved this Resolution did not, I think, succeed in satisfying the House with regard to the existence of these other factors. I do not deny myself that a linguistic basis might be a very important, a very potent, factor in the constitution of an autonomous provincial area. But after all the linguistic factor is by no means the only one. The history of the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay covers a long space of time (though not precisely in their present form) and the association with them of these linguistic communities is not a thing of yesterday or to-day. Traditions, connections and interests have been formed, to which very careful consideration must be given in any scheme for a reformed administration. The historical, geographical, political, economic and social factors in the modern world are factors almost as powerful, as, if not in some instances, even more powerful, than those of language alone. On these points, I say that the Honourable gentlemen opposite have not succeeded in satisfying us. But I have one further objection to make and I wish to make it clear that I am not now discussing the general merits of the constitution of provinces in the comprehensive manner suggested by my Honourable friend Mr. Ramadas Pantulu, nor indeed am I entering into the precise merits of the proposition of the original Mover. Speaking generally, the objection which I think must weigh with us as a very powerful objection is that we are invited to take official action in a matter which I should have thought every consideration of prudence and statesmanship would have dictated should be left to popular initiative. I fear our experience sometimes has been that action taken by the Government of India with regard to the redistribution of provinces has not always been received with a very warm welcome and that its history has not always been a very happy one. It, therefore, behoves us to be particularly careful. I know that any action that we may take in this direction, however much it might be in accordance with the wishes of one of the gentlemen opposite, would be received with a very great deal of suspicion in many quarters. Might it not be said, as was indicated by the Honourable gentleman who preceded

me, that the Central Government had its own interests in having smaller, poorer and therefore weaker provinces under its control? If the Honourable gentlemen, having considered and gone into the matter further, come into this House once more with a proposition which satisfies all the necessary preliminary conditions that there is a strong, genuine and powerful demand for it, that that demand has received its natural and immediate constitutional expression in the local Legislative Councils and that the proposition which emerges will be one which is administratively sound, politically progressive and economically favourable to the populations concerned and moreover that, after taking all these considerations into account, the results of the proposition will be one which will be conducive not only to the interests of the province, not only to the interests of the communities, but to the interests of India as a whole, then we should be prepared to give our most careful consideration to that proposition and take such steps as may be found to be incumbent upon us. For these reasons I must ask the House to reject both the Resolution and the Amendment.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO: The Honourable Member who spoke just now said that there was no popular demand. I have said in my opening speech that people have been anxiously asking for this province for several years. Any member of this House who will read the papers of the Karnataka province from Mangalore, Bijapur, Dharwar and other places will find that local papers have been asking every day for a separate province. Apart from that, when the Right Honourable Montagu came out to India in connection with the Reforms scheme, the deputation that waited upon him, among other questions, asked for a separate Karnataka province. The Indian National Congress after going into the facts of the case did come to the conclusion that a Karnataka province was very necessary, and so they formed the Karnataka congress circle for their own purposes. Then, again, Sir, my Honourable friend said that there ought to be a demand from the local Legislative Council. I remember aright one Member from Bombay who belongs to the Karnataka area did bring this matter to the notice of the Bombay Legislative Council, but he was told that it was not the concern of the Local Government but that of the Government of India. Sir, that was the attitude that was taken up then. Now I am asked to go to the local Legislative Councils. So, between the two Councils, there is no chance for the Karnataka province to be carved out. As for the popular demand, if the Honourable Member is not satisfied that there is any such demand as I have just now mentioned, then the best thing for him is to appoint a committee which should go about and make inquiries to find out if there is any demand or not in the country. I have shown in my opening speech that a number of meetings were held all over the province of Karnataka during the last 4 years. I am myself a Karnataka man and ought to know the feelings of the people living there. Such being the case, if the Honourable Member is not satisfied that there is a popular demand, the best thing would be to appoint a committee to go about all over the province and find out the real facts. I am much obliged to the Honourable Member, however, that he has accepted the principle that provinces ought to be formed on a linguistic basis. Sir, there is a good deal of popular support. My Honourable friend to my left said that the population of Karnataka is 8 millions. I have got a slip here by which I can show it comes to 13 millions including Mysore and Hyderabad. If you exclude Mysore and Hyderabad, the population comes to 8 millions. So, the figure that he has quoted is not correct. The figure that I have quoted

[Dr. U. Rama Rao.]

is from the Census Report which is much more reliable than either my figure or his figure.

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. E. B. HOTSON: My figure also came from the Census Report.

THE HONOURABLE RAO SAHIB DR. U. RAMA RAO: But the figures which he quoted for Dharwar, N. Kanara, Coorg and Bellary are not correct. There are a number of people who talk Kanarese in Madras Districts. In all these districts Salem, Nilgiris, Coimbatore, Anantapur and the Southern portion of South Kanara they did talk Kanarese originally but now they talk Tamil, Malayam or Telugu. I want all this bordering area to be carved into a separate province. If you do not do this, year after year the number of Kanarese-speaking people will go down. In another 30 years half the population of Karnataka will speak Telugu or Maharatti or some other language. As for the income, I said 3½ crores. The moment we have a separate province, it will go up considerably. We have no railway facilities at present and if you have a coastal railway from Mangalore to Goa, the income will go up considerably. At present there is no irrigation facility at all in Belgaum, Bijapur and Dharwar and other places. They cannot raise more than one crop a year. So, unless you help us, we have no means of getting any assistance at all. Madras does not help us. So between Bombay and Madras we are nowhere. There are at present in the whole of the Karnataka about 4 colleges and 36 or 37 high schools. Sir, these are all the considerations which must weigh with the Government in forming a separate Karnataka province. With these few observations I once more appeal to Members of this House to look at this question dispassionately and see that a committee be formed to go into the question. As for expense I do not think you require a very costly machinery as in the other provinces. We do not want Members of the Executive Council or Ministers on a high pay of Rs. 5,000 per mensem.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The original question was:

"That the following Resolution be adopted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee of officials and non-officials be forthwith appointed to inquire into, and suggest ways and means for, the formation of a separate Kannada Province'."

To which an amendment has been moved:

"That for that Resolution the following be substituted:

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that, with a view to regrouping of Provinces, as far as possible, on a linguistic basis, a committee with a non-official majority be appointed to inquire into, and suggest ways and means for, constituting the Kanarese-speaking tracts of the provinces of Madras and Bombay into a separate Kannada Province'."

The question that I have to put is that that substitution be made.

The motion was negatived.

The question then is that the original Resolution be adopted.

The motion was negatived.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 18th February, 1926.