

11th March 1936

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume III, 1936

(28th February to 17th March, 1936)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1936



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1936

Legislative Assembly.

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIE ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT.

Deputy President :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

PANDIT GOVIND BALLABH PANT, M.L.A.

SIE COWASJI JEHANGIR, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

SIE LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SIE MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN HAJI SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., I.A.

Committee on Petitions :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A., Chairman.

SIE LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

MR. B. DAS, M.L.A.

DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. M. S. ANEY, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—28th February to 17th March, 1936.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
FRIDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1936—		FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH 1936	
Members Sworn	1789	—contd.	
Presentation of the Budget for 1936-37	1789—1805	The Indian Cinematograph (Amendment) Bill—Re-appointment of Mr. A. S. Hands to the Select Committee	1995—96
The Indian Finance Bill—introduced	1805	Report of the Indian Delimitation Committee—Referred to a Committee	1996—2019
Statement of Business	1805—08	Resolution re Non-ratification of Draft Convention concerning the hours of work—Adopted	2019—20
TUESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1936—		MONDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1936—	
Questions and Answers	1809—45	Questions and Answers	2041—86
Agreement between the Secretary of State for India in Council acting by and through the Governor in Council, Government of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, and the Reserve Bank of India	1845—47	Unstarred Questions and Answers	2086—2127
General discussion of the General Budget	1848—92	Short Notice Question and Answer	2127—28
WEDNESDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1936—		Message from His Majesty the King Emperor	2128
General discussion of the General Budget	1902—1949	The General Budget—List of Demands	2128—74
Statement of Business	1949—51	Demand No. 32.—Home Department—Bureau of Public Information—the propagandist activities of the Home Department through the Director of Public Information especially the publication "India in 1933-34"	2131—55
FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1936—		Demand No. 31.—Foreign and Political Department—Perilous nature of the forward policy pursued by the Government of India	2195—74
Questions and Answers	1953—89	TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1936—	
Statements laid on the Table	1990—92	Questions and Answers	2275—2321
Sir Frederick Whyte's notes referred to by the Honourable the Home Member during the discussion on the Adjournment Motion on the 24th February, 1936	1992—94		
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	1994		
The Decrees and Orders Validating Bill—Introduced	1995		
The Indian Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1995		

TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1936— <i>contd.</i>	PAGE.	WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1936—	PAGE.
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	2222	Questions and Answers	2449—79
The General Budget— List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2479—2507
Demand No. 31.— Foreign and Political Department— <i>contd.</i> Perilous nature of the forward policy pursued by the Government of India	2222—27	Statements laid on the Table	2507—09
Demand No. 28.— Executive Council— No confidence in the Government	2227—60	The General Budget— List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2509—68
Demand No. 79.— Baluchistan— Expenditure due to earthquake at Quetta	2246—69	Demand No. 16.— Customs Grievances of the Employees of the Customs Department	2511—24 2511—22
WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1936—		Position of Bengal Muslims in the Customs Offices at Calcutta and Chittagong	2522—24
Questions and Answers	2271—2310	Demand No. 17.— Taxes on Income	2524—25
The General Budget— List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Demand No. 18.— Salt	2525
Demand No. 39.— Defence Department— Defence policy of the Government of India	2310—47	Demand No. 19.— Opium	2525—26
Demand No. 22.— Home Department— Repressive policy	2347—58	Demand No. 19-A.— Excise	2526
THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1936—		Demand No. 20.— Stamps	2526—27
Questions and Answers	2359—2402	Demand No. 21.— Forest	2527
Amendment of Standing Orders—Representation of the Reports of the Select Committees	2402	Demand No. 22.— Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	2527
The General Budget— List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Demand No. 23.— Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	2528—50
Demand No. 32.— Home Department— <i>contd.</i> Repressive policy	2402—24	Certain grievances of the employees of the Postal Department, especially the grievances of postmen and the inferior servants of that Department	2528—45
Demand No. 30.— Finance Department— Retention of emergency taxation of 1931 and the urgent necessity of its abolition	2434—48	Position of minorities in Bengal and Assam Postal Circle	2545—47
		High rates for telephone trunk calls	2547—50
		Demand No. 25.— Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2550

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
—contd.	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands—contd.	
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2550
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2550—54
Demand No. 28—Executive Council	2555
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2555
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2555
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2555
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2555
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2555
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2555
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2555
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2555
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2555
Demand No. 39—Defence Department	2555
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2555
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2557
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2557
Demand No. 43—Audit	2557
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2557
Demand No. 45—Police	2557
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2557
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2558

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
—contd.	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands—contd.	
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2558
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2558
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2558
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2558
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2559
Demand No. 53—Archaeology	2559
Demand No. 54—Mines	2559
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2559
Demand No. 56—Education	2559
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2559
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2559
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2560
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2560
Demand No. 60-A—Scheme for the improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India	2560
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2560
Demand No. 62—Industries	2560
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2561
Demand No. 63-B—Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation charged to Revenue	2561
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2561
Demand No. 65—Census	2561
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2561
Demand No. 67—Emigration—International	2561
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2562

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>contd.</i> —	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2562
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2562
Demand No. 71—Currency	2562
Demand No. 72—Mint	2562
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2562
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2563
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2563
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2563
Demand No. 76-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue	2563
Demand No. 76-B—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments	2563
Demand No. 77—Re-funds	2564
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan	2564
Demand No. 80—Delhi	2564
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara	2564
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2564
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	2564
Demand No. 84—Central India	2565
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad	2565
Demand No. 85-A—Aden	2565
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India	2565
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India	2565
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Printing	2566

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>concl'd.</i> —	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	2566
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	2566
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	2566
Demand No. 92-A—Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research	2566
Demand No. 93—Currency Capital Outlay	2566
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	2567
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	2567
Demand No. 96—Commuted Value of Pensions	2567
Demand No. 96-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital	2567
Demand No. 97—Delhi Capital Outlay	2567
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances	2568
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances Lending Interest	2568
Statement of Business	2568
MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936—	
Questions and Answers	2569—2606
Short Notice Question and Answer	2606—07
Message from His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General	2607
The Parsi Marriage and Divorce Bill—As passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	2607
Statement laid on the Table	2607—09
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2610
Election of a Member to the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to Hedjaz	2610

	PAGE.		PAGE.
MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936		MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>contd.</i>		— <i>contd.</i>	
The Cochin Port Bill— Introduced. . . .	2611	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2612—59
The Factories (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced	2611	TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1936—	
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill— Re-committed to Select Committee	2611—12	Questions and Answers .	2661—67
		The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2707—50

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 11th March, 1936.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RELEASE OF MR. SARAT CHANDRA BOSE.

1097. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose was imprisoned under Regulation III of 1818 and has now been released?

(b) For how long was he imprisoned? What, if any, was the allowance paid to him in the aggregate during this interval?

(c) How do Government justify the internment of a person without charge or trial for such a long time and the expenditure of public funds on him?

(d) Is it not a fact that Government have stated over and over again in this Assembly that he was a dangerous man and connected with terrorism, and that his being out of prison would involve danger to public peace?

(e) If so, why was he released at all?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes.

(b) He was in jail custody for one year, two months and 19 days, and detained at his own residence near Kurseong for two years, three months and three days. I lay on the table a statement showing the allowances that were sanctioned for Mr. Bose and his family during this period.

(c) to (e). Sarat Chandra Bose was placed under detention because of his connection with the terrorist movement and the answer to question (d) is in the affirmative. His case was, however, examined carefully from time to time and as soon as the Government of Bengal and the Government of India were satisfied that the terrorist situation had improved sufficiently to justify his release, orders sanctioning his release were issued. The payment of allowances out of public funds was in accordance with the specific provision of Regulation III.

Statement showing the Allowances sanctioned for Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose and his family during his detention under Regulation III of 1818.

While in jail custody.

Personal allowances.	Family allowance.	Allowances for other purposes.
Rs. 3-8-0 a day for diet. Subsequently increased to Rs. 5 a day. Rs. 32 monthly Rs. 100 lump sum on first admission to jail.	Rs. 1,200 a month	Rs. 1,334 per annum on a policy plus Rs. 1,157-13-0 as a single payment in respect of another policy.

While detained at Giddapahar.

Personal allowance.	Family allowance.	Allowances for other purposes.
Rs. 150 per mensem. Enhanced to Rs. 225 a month from 1st March, 1934.	Rs. 1,200 a month. Increased to Rs. 1,500 per mensem from 1st March, 1934.	Same as above.

N.B.—Mr. Bose was transferred to Giddapahar on the 23rd April, 1933.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I know, Sir, if Mr. Bose was interned because of his own connection with terrorism or because of the general situation in Bengal?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have answered that question repeatedly on former occasions.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: The Honourable Member said that the Government are very carefully watching the situation in Bengal, and they released him when they thought that the situation had improved,—at least that is what I could hear,—but what I want to know is whether a man is interned because of the situation outside or because of his own complicity with any suspected crime?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said he was placed under detention, because of his connection with the terrorist movement.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Sir, in view of the admission of the Honourable the Home Member that the situation in regard to terrorism has improved in Bengal, and in view also of the fact that nothing untoward has, so far happened after the release of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, do Government propose to consider the cases of other State Prisoners and others who are detained without trial and release them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That all depends. Their cases are reviewed from time to time.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has anything happened since Mr. Bose's release, to make the Government feel that his release has in any way helped the terrorist movement directly or indirectly?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, nothing has happened.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: If Mr. Bose was interned because of his connection with the terrorist movement, why was he released, when his connection with the movement was there all the same? Did he give any undertaking that he would have nothing to do with it any more, or were the Government satisfied that he was really never connected with the terrorist movement at all?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Government were satisfied that the terrorist situation had sufficiently improved to justify his release.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, Sir, what that sentence really means —“the situation had improved”? Does it mean that it had improved independent of Mr. Bose's release, or that Mr. Bose's activities would not aggravate the position, or does it mean that the situation as a whole had improved, justifying the release of even people who might otherwise be suspected to be connected with that movement?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The phrase I used means exactly what it says. The terrorist movement had improved sufficiently to justify his release. Several other detenus have also been released.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: In view of the fact that the terrorist situation has definitely and appreciably improved according to the Honourable the Home Member's own admission, do Government propose to take special steps to review the cases of people who are detained without trial and release them, if possible, at an early date?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Their cases' are constantly under review.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: How many lives do Government compute have been saved by the timely internment of this dangerous man, and how many lives are now endangered by the untimely release of this innocent man?—

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question please.

FUNCTIONS OF A RAILWAY MAGISTRATE.

1098. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Who is the appointing authority of railway magistrates? What are the functions of such magistrates?

(b) Have they any direct rights of arrest, or have they only to decide cases when these are brought before them?

(c) Are railway magistrates provided with free passes to travel on the railway?

(d) What is the area in which the present railway magistrate of Allahabad has authority to act?

(e) Is he provided with a free railway pass; and if so, to what destination is he entitled to travel?

(f) Does this pass permit him to travel beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction?

(g) Have Government received any complaints about the activities of the present railway magistrate of Allahabad, and if so, what action have they taken in that behalf?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b): I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by Mr. P. R. Rau to Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya's question No. 538 on the 25th February, 1925. The powers and duties of these magistrates are identical with those of other magistrates: the word 'railway' is added to their designation presumably because their jurisdiction is either wholly or mainly limited to cases arising within railway limits.

(c) The East Indian Railway Administration have issued passes available, except in one case, over the sections on which these magistrates hold their court.

(d) Mandah Road to Subadarganj.

(e) Yes; available over the whole of the East Indian Railway.

(f) Yes, but action has been taken by the East Indian Railway Administration to withdraw this pass and to issue instead one available over the section within his jurisdiction.

(g) I understand the Honourable Member made certain allegations about this magistrate and was told in reply that the Railway Administration had no *locus standi* in the matter.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: In view of the fact that ordinary magistrates in the country are not allowed any concessions in the way of railway passes, will the Honourable Member kindly explain why passes are issued to these gentlemen?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: To facilitate the quick disposal of railway cases.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: If that is so, is the Honourable Member aware that ordinary magistrates in the country, who have to expedite the work of criminal justice, are not given the same concessions as the railway magistrates are given?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I suppose they are not.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: As railways are a Central subject, does not the Honourable Member think that when complaints against railway magistrates reach the Central Government, they should get into communication with the Local Government and remedy the evils, if any?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir, unless the complaints relate to some matter connected with the railways.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Are these magistrates paid out of the railway funds?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is the Honourable Member aware that these magistrates are allowed to appropriate to themselves a part of the fines they impose on the people? I put some questions on this point some time ago?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: And a reply was given.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: But are they allowed to keep a part of the fines themselves?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Can these railway magistrates order arrests directly on the railway platform or they can only dispose of cases that are brought before them by the police?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: They have all the powers which are ordinarily possessed by magistrates.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: What control is exercised by the Railway Board in the matter of their appointment and supervision of work?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Railway Board have nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it true that these railway magistrates are given a part of the fines that they impose on people as punishment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I believe the Honourable Member has heard the question put by another Honourable Member and the reply given to it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: I did not hear it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He has repeatedly answered that question.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The question was put on a previous occasion and an answer was given, and, if the Honourable Member is very curious to find out what the answer was, the answer was "No."

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Are all these Magistrates stipendiary or are they sometimes honorary magistrates as well?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That depends upon the choice of the Local Government. I have said that the Railway Department have nothing to do with their appointment.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: If complaints reach the Central Government against any particular magistrate, at least the Railway Board can prohibit the entry of these magistrates to the railway platforms as these are under their jurisdiction?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question please.

AMERY TRIBUNAL'S REPORT ON BURMA.

1099. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das** (on behalf of Mr. B. Das): (a) Will Government be pleased to state what final decisions have been taken on the Amery Tribunal's report on Burma?

(b) Did Government forward a copy of the Assembly debate on the Amery report to the Secretary of State?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the recommendations they made in forwarding the copy of the Assembly debate?

(d) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the correspondence that passed between them and the Secretary of State on the report of the Amery Tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the Press Communiqué on the subject published on the 14th January.

(b) Yes.

(c) and (d). No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that the answer "No" to part (c) of the question means that they did not make any recommendations, or do Government refuse to state the recommendations that they made, in forwarding a copy of the debate of this House?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It means exactly what I have said. Government are not pleased to state the recommendations they made in forwarding a copy of the Legislative Assembly Debates.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did they make any recommendations at all?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: They are not prepared to answer that.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What was the result of forwarding the discussion of this Assembly?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That may be gathered from the press communiqué.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did Government support the view of this House that a fresh tribunal should be appointed to re-examine the whole matter?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is the same question in another form. I said that I was not prepared to answer it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why Government are not prepared to answer?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES REQUIRED BY THE ARMY SUPPLY DEPARTMENT.

1100. ***Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah:** Will Government please state the procedure adopted in the grant of contract for supplies required by the Army Supply Department and lay on the table the following further information in connection with the present contracts:

(i) for how many years have the wheat and gram purchasing contracts, and also contracts for grinding wheat been with the present contractors;

- (ii) when were the latest tenders for grinding the wheat called and what rates were offered by the contractors;
- (iii) is it a fact that in response to the call of tenders, several contractors offered lower and more favourable rates for grinding and purchasing wheat, but the contracts were given to the present contractors on a very liberal and highest rates? If so, why were the lower rates offered by others not taken any notice of and the present highest rates accepted;
- (iv) if the difference between the present highest rates in force of the contracts and the lowest rates offered by others be taken, what amount works out for the whole year;
- (v) when is it intended to call for fresh tenders for further supplies?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: As regards the general procedure to be followed in making contracts for supplies required for military purposes I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraphs 112 to 129 of Financial Regulations for the Army in India, Part I, a copy of which has been placed in the Library. Whenever it becomes necessary to make special arrangements which are not specifically governed by those Regulations the orders of Government are obtained. Contracts are awarded to the lowest satisfactory tenders.

I lay on the table a statement giving the other information asked for.

Statement.

- (i) Since 1st June, 1926, in the case of the wheat and gram purchasing contract, and since 1st December, 1923, in the case of the contract for grinding wheat.
- (ii) and (iv). In July, 1933, I am not prepared to disclose the rates tendered.
- (iii) It is true that several contractors offered lower rates than the one selected, but the latter was the most favourable to Government in that it was the lowest rate at which the standard required was likely to be obtained.
- (v) It is impossible to give dates. Government consider whether fresh tenders shall be called for on each occasion before a "long term" agency agreement or contract terminates.

RAILWAY ENGINE AND MOTOR BUS COLLISION AT TINKONIAN LEVEL CROSSING ON THE GIRIDIH-DUMARI ROAD IN THE GIRIDIH COLLIERY AREA.

1101. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that there was a serious railway engine and motor bus collision on the 8th February, at Tinkonian level crossing on the Giridih-Dumari Road (in the Giridih Colliery Area) causing several deaths and injuries to many passengers on the bus, and if so, will Government be pleased to give a detailed report of it?

(b) Are Government prepared to direct the Giridih local colliery authority to station a watchman at the said crossing permanently to avoid any such accident in future?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I am placing on the table an extract from the report of the Senior Government Inspector of Railways.

(b) The question of the action to be taken for manning the crossing is receiving attention.

*Extract from the report of the Senior Government Inspector of Railways.
Description of the accident.*

At 4.30 hours of 8th February, 1936, 'A' Pilot engine No. 1208 was pushing a load of 8 empties and one loaded wagon from Domohani to Kalimoran siding. Brake van with gunner and shunter being in rear of engine. As the leading vehicle No. B. N. R. 10688 passed over level crossing No. 20B on the Dumri Giridih Road it collided with a private motor bus No. SLI-217 which was travelling from South to North, having come from Paresnath. The fore end of the motor bus evidently was actually across the track at the moment of impact. The first truck rode completely over the bonnet of the bus with both its leading and trailing wheels, the bus becoming jammed between the first and second trucks below the buffers. The first two trucks were derailed of all wheels and the third truck of its leading wheels only. The whole travelled a distance of 72' after the impact, the leading truck stopping with its off wheels in the side drain. The speed of the pilot was probably 3.4 miles per hour and that of the bus 10-15 miles per hour.

The motor bus was carrying 31 people of which three were drivers, the rest being pilgrims. Four of the occupants were killed instantaneously and 15 were injured more or less seriously. The bus was a private vehicle and belonged to Sigli State near Kolahpur in Bombay Presidency. It was said to be one of four buses conveying Jain pilgrims from Paresnath to Bhagalpur via Giridih where the collision occurred.

The night was dark and drizzling and visibility was bad.

First to arrive on the scene of accident within an hour was the Assistant Surgeon who with Sub-Assistant Surgeon and dressers rendered first aid to the injured. These were removed to the Civil Hospital at Giridih.

Relief train from Madhupur arrived at 11.30 hours and the Divisional Officers by road from Asansol at about 12.30 hours.

Description of site of accident.

The Dumri-Giridih road is a main metalled highway and perfectly straight for a considerable distance on the side from which the motor bus was approaching the level crossing which is a right angle crossing. There are trees on either side of it but not a continuous avenue. Level crossing and road are practically at ground level. Warning crosses are erected at the roadside 208' from the crossing.

The coalfield siding is broad gauge and somewhat tortuous. The approach side from which the pilot was working is on an 8° curve and not one such as would obstruct the view but in this case, in which the engine was pushing the load, rather the reverse. The grade was uphill 1 in 100.

The crossing itself is B class and as such should have a minimum of one gateman. It is fitted with iron swing gates which can be closed across the road and also with side wickets for foot traffic. The surface of the crossing was not bad but the gates and fittings were in miserable condition not having been painted for a very long time. The roof of the gate lodge had fallen in and the building was uninhabitable. There were no brackets or means of erecting lamps at the gates.

Conclusions.

From the evidence it is quite clear what had happened. The level crossing though B class was unmanned. There was no sign of any gateman and it cannot be accepted that there was one appointed to this gate. I cannot consider seriously the evidence of the Colliery Management that the man Dhunoo Miah was the gateman. The man himself denies it and it is impossible for one man to be in charge of two level crossings 100 yards or more apart and yet be held responsible for an accident at either of them.

COLLIERIES WORKING IN THE GIRIDIH COLLIERY AREA.

1102. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: (a) What is the number of collieries at present working in the Giridih Colliery Area?

(b) What is the number of colliery managers, superintendents, foremen, overseers and sardars engaged in those collieries?

(c) Do the officials mentioned in part (b) keep diaries and if so, by whom are those diaries examined?

(d) What amount of time does each of the officials mentioned in part (b) spend in the mines?

(e) Does the Manager ever go inside the mines and if so, does he visit the mines daily, weekly or monthly?

(f) What is the total number of labourers working in those mines?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Six.

(b) Colliery Superintendent—1.

Colliery Managers—6.

Overmen and sirdars—137.

No information is available as to the number of foremen.

(c) Attention is invited to the provisions contained in Regulations 57, 58 (1), 66 (2), 70 (2), (5), (7), 72 (1), and 119 of the Indian Coal Mines Regulations, 1926, which provide for the maintenance of records of inspection, etc.

(d) No record is available.

(e) Under Regulation 24(2) of the Indian Coal Mines Regulations, 1926, the Manager is required to exercise personal supervision of the mine in his charge, and he no doubt visits the mine as often as he considers necessary.

(f) 7,148.

REPORT OF THE ENQUIRY COMMITTEE ON THE JACOBABAD MINE ACCIDENT.

1103. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Is the report of the enquiry committee of the Jacobabad Mine accident ready and if so, when will it be published and if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Honourable Member is presumably referring to the report of the Court of Inquiry appointed by the Government of Bihar and Orissa under section 21 of the Indian Mines Act in connection with the accident which occurred on the 24th July last at the Kurhurbaree (Joktiabad) Colliery at Giridih. This report was published by the Local Government on the 5th February, 1936, and a copy has been placed in the Library of the House.

REVISION OF RULES RE CLASSIFICATION OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

1104. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether their attention has been drawn to the insistent demand throughout the country for a revision of the rules framed by them some years ago, for the classification of Political Prisoners;

(b) whether they have considered or propose to consider separate classification being given to prisoners convicted for political offences not involving violence to person or property, and

(c) if they do not propose to consider the same, the reasons why they do not propose to do so?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Government are aware that in some quarters there is a demand that certain types of prisoners should receive special treatment.

(b) and (c). The question was considered very fully a few years ago and the outcome of that consideration was the classification of prisoners as A, B or C which was introduced in 1930. No circumstances have arisen which would justify any change.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government aware of the hunger-strike of a prisoner in the United Provinces, which, I think, has been called off recently, and one of the demands of the hunger-striker was the classification of political prisoners as a special class?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the question from that point of view?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said no circumstances have arisen which would justify any change.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government aware that in England all political prisoners are treated as special class prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I am not.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether in England political prisoners, to the knowledge of the Government, that is, prisoners convicted of political offences not involving violence to person or property and not convicted of other offences, such as murder, theft, etc., are not treated as special division prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not understand that that is the case.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will Government consider the desirability of classification on the score of the nature of the crime, and not on the score of the financial position of the prisoner concerned?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The nature of the crime is one of the elements in the classification.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that persons convicted of even heinous offences who happen to be wealthy are classed B, while political offenders are classed C if they happen to be poor? That is a fact, the Honourable Member may take it from me. Will he remedy the evil?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Social status, education, habit of life, and the fact of being accustomed to a superior mode of living—that is one element in the classification, and the type of crime is another.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the nature of the circumstances which would influence this Government to abolish this classification into three classes for political prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is hypothetical.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why European criminals, even if they are convicted of worst offences, such as murder, are given B class, while Indian political prisoners are not given even that class?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The facts are not as stated by the Honourable Member.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether the European prisoners are not usually given the B class?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No; that is not the case, unless the circumstances are such as to justify it.

INDO-BURMA FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENT.

1105. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have received a telegram from the Committee of the Indian Merchants' Chamber protesting against the recent announcement made by the Secretary of State for India appointing a committee to consider the question of minor modifications and adaptations that may be found expedient regarding the Indo-Burma financial adjustment;
- (b) whether the recommendations of the Amery Committee have been accepted by them; and
- (c) the reasons why they have decided not to get the issues changed despite the Resolution unanimously passed by the Legislative Assembly demanding a fresh investigation by another tribunal consisting of Indians and Burmans?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) Yes.

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is directed to the Press Communiqué published on the 14th January.

(c) The decision, as the Honourable Member is aware, did not lie with the Government of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India have any part or lot in this decision in the preparatory stages thereof?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is an extremely ingenious third alternative form of the question which the Honourable Member has put before, but which, I have said, I am not prepared to answer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, may I know if Government can say that they are not prepared to answer without giving any reasons? Once a question has been admitted by you, and it satisfies the rules and Standing Orders, I submit we are entitled to an answer, unless Government urge before this House and before you that public interests demand that the question should not be answered. That is the utmost to which the Chair has gone.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When a Government Member refused to answer a particular question, the Chair generally presumed that it was because it was not in public interest to answer the question. But it is due to this House that an Honourable Member of Government, refusing to answer a particular question, shall indicate the ground on which he refuses.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The ground is the general ground that it is not in public interest to disclose the nature of the communication, if any, that passes between the Government of India and the Secretary of State.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is too big an answer, that is to say,

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot help it. Next question.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PROVINCES AND THE CENTRE ON DEFENCE MATTERS AFTER THE INCORPORATION OF THE PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY.

1106. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they are considering the question, in connection with the incorporation of the Provincial autonomy next year, of any changes in the existing relations between the Provinces and the Centre, on defence matters;
- (b) whether they are considering the question of agency for performing defence functions in the Provinces;
- (c) whether it is a fact that they are thinking of creating other agencies within Provincial Governments;
- (d) if so, what they are; and
- (e) what their proposals are with regard to the relations between Federal Finance Department and Army Department, especially with regard to the military expenditure?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: (a) to (d). Government are naturally considering the effect of Provincial Autonomy on the relations between the Centre and the Provinces in all matters including those connected with Defence, and they are examining in particular the functions now performed by Provincial Governments on behalf of the Centre. At this stage I can only say that there is likely to be a decrease rather than an increase in these functions.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the last answer of my Honourable friend, may I ask him to indicate generally the reasons why he thinks there will be a decrease and not an increase in these functions?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: Under the new Constitution, as the Honourable Member is no doubt aware, there is a provision that, when functions are performed by a province on behalf of the Centre, in certain circumstances the province may charge for the performance of those functions. Therefore, necessarily we are considering whether it would be cheaper and equally satisfactory to perform any of those functions ourselves.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government are considering the withdrawing of those functions from the Provincial Governments, and using the Governor as opposed to the Provincial Government for the discharge of these functions?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir. They are not considering that in the Defence Department.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the answer to clause (e) of the question?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The matter is under consideration.

ARTICLE IN THE *FORWARD* ENTITLED "POLITICAL PRISONERS".

1107. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether their attention has been drawn to the leading article in the *Forward*, dated 2nd February 1936, entitled "Political Prisoners";
- (b) whether they propose to take action suggested therein; and
- (c) if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Government have seen the article referred to by the Honourable Member.

(b) and (c). The general instructions regarding the classification of prisoners provide that classification should be made by the courts subject to confirmation or revision by the Local Governments. These instructions, as I have already stated in reply to another question by the Honourable Member, were issued after very careful consideration in consultation with Members of this Assembly and are considered sufficient.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government take an early opportunity of consulting this Assembly, which consists of a large number of ex-political prisoners, on this matter? (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot give any undertaking.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider that matter, because we are the most competent to advise them on this matter? (Laughter.)

(No answer.)

MEMORIAL FROM THE SALT LICENSEES OF VALLUR, ATTIPUT, OF THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

1108. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have received a memorial dated 17th October, 1935, from the Salt (Monopoly) Licensees of Vallur, Attiput of the Madras Presidency;
- (b) whether they have considered or propose to consider their request for concession; and
- (c) what their conclusions on the matter are?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) Yes.

(b) Orders have been passed.

(c) The following concessions have been granted to the licensees of the Vallur, Attiput South and Attiput North salt factories:

- (i) payment of full compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Madras Salt Act, 1889,
- (ii) immediate reopening of the factories as modified excise factories and grant of licenses on this basis to all applicants who were licensees at the time of their closure as monopoly factories.
- (iii) free use of the Tondiarpet Depôt for storage of salt and the payment of the property tax to the Madras Corporation on the Depôt land and buildings by Government for a period of two years from the 2nd January, 1936, and
- (iv) advance payment of one anna per maund for salt that may be manufactured during two years from the 2nd January, 1936.

Further concessions have been refused.

RANGOON-MADRAS SEA MAIL SERVICE.

1109. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they consulted the Burma Indian Chamber of Commerce and Burma Indian Association and South Indian Chamber of Commerce, before they abolished the Rangoon-Madras Sea Mail Service;
- (b) whether they consulted the Local Government of Madras;
- (c) if so, whether it is a fact that they opposed the discontinuance of the service;
- (d) whether they are aware that there is a strong feeling in the matter in Madras Presidency; and
- (e) whether they propose to negotiate with Steamship Companies for the reduction of rates?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The public bodies consulted, before the abolition of the Madras-Rangoon sea mail service, included the Burma Indian Chamber of Commerce and the South Indian Chamber of Commerce. The Burma Indian Association was not consulted.

(b) and (d). Yes.

(c) The two bodies mentioned in the reply to part (a) of the question as having been consulted opposed the discontinuance of the service.

(e) In view of the representations made in this House and from other quarters Government took up the matter again and entered into negotiations with the British India Steam Navigation Company which, I am glad to say have, thanks to the ready co-operation of that company which I would take this opportunity of acknowledging, been brought to a successful conclusion. It has been decided to re-start, with effect from the 16th March, 1936, and to continue up to 31st March, 1937, the direct mail steamer service between Madras and Rangoon in accordance with the time-table in force prior to the cessation of the service. I

should and, that the arrangements now made with the Company will still secure to Government substantial economies. The whole question will have again to be carefully examined in connection with the contract to be entered into for the period commencing from 1st April, 1937.

POLICY RE RECRUITMENT TO THE ARMY.

1110. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether their attention has been drawn to the leading article in the *Hindu* of the 5th October, 1935 (copy† enclosed);
- (b) whether they have noticed the criticism that selection of certain classes and ignoring of others of the population of the country is likely to affect seriously the recruitment to the Army, especially in times of crisis; and
- (c) whether they propose to take steps to improve the position?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes.

(b) The criticism was directed against an alleged "reiteration by persons in authority of the belief that aptitude for a military career is the exclusive monopoly of particular classes"; and the answer is contained in the opening words of the same leading article, which read as follows:

"We are glad to be assured by the Board of Selection of the Indian Military Academy that in no case was a likely youth who appeared suitable on personal, independent grounds refused a chance merely because he came of a class that had not previously engaged in military service."

(c) Government do not understand how the above position can be improved.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the last sentence, but one, of my Honourable friend's answer to clause (b) of this question, may I know whether Government will consider abolishing all these distinctions, and leaving it to the Selection Board to select the very best candidates from whatever communities or classes they may come?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There are no distinctions in force at present. We cannot abolish distinctions which do not exist.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it one of the conditions that a recruit to the Indian Army should be a meat eater?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I inform the Honourable Member that a Brahmin youth from the Chittore District in the Madras Presidency was rejected on the ground that he was not a meat eater?

Sardar Mangal Singh: Is it a fact that out of the Dehra Dun cadets, who have been turned out on account of inefficiency, 80 per cent. are from those classes who have not enlisted in the army?

†Sent to the Department concerned.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: If the Honourable Member is referring to those cadets at the Academy, who entered the Academy by open competition, I think his figures are probably correct.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is the Honourable Member aware of the keen feeling existing in the minds of certain provinces that they are debarred from any sort of military career and that they are not selected in the Military Academy and for the fighting forces?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: If there is any such feeling, there is no ground for it, because entry to the Military Academy is open to everybody.

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGING OF PORTFOLIOS AMONG THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS.

1111. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) at what stage the proposal for changing of portfolios among the Executive Members stands;
- (b) at what stage the proposal to create a separate department for communications in charge of a separate member stands,
- (c) whether this proposal will be kept pending till the Federal Government comes into being?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: As explained by my Honourable colleague, the Railway Member, in the course of the discussions on the railway budget, the matter is still under consideration.

FEDERAL HIGH COURT.

1112. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have come to any decision as to the date when the Federal High Court is to be established;
- (b) what the qualifications of the Judges thereof will be; and
- (c) how they propose to recruit them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The date is still under consideration and no decision has yet been reached.

(b) The qualifications are laid down in sub-section (3) of section 200 of the Government of India Act, 1935.

(c) The appointment rests with His Majesty.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government decided to start this Court, before the end of this calendar year?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the answer to clause (c) of the question, may I know whether the Government of India propose to make any recommendations on this matter to His Majesty?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The appointment rests with His Majesty, and it is not the practice for the Government of India to make recommendations for appointments that rest with His Majesty.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there no recommendation made at all?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, not by the Government of India.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Is any inquiry made by His Majesty through the Indian Government?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is not the practice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How does His Majesty know whether A or B or X is qualified, among the 350 millions of people in India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: From his constitutional advisers.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How do they come to know?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is not my business.

RULES RE STORES PURCHASES.

1113. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) with reference to the new rules issued by them regarding stores purchases, why these rules are not applicable to printing and stationery stores;
- (b) to what extent preference is allowed in respect of price to articles produced or manufactured in India, either wholly or in part;
- (c) the reasons why tenders are to be invited from abroad also;
- (d) why lethal weapons, munitions of war, technical apparatus and equipment, and any other stores required by the Naval, Military or Air Forces of the Crown in India for which drawings, patterns, specifications or designs have been issued, prescribed or announced by the Admiralty, War Office, Air Ministry, Government of India, or Commander-in-Chief in India, shall be obtained by indent on the India Store Department, London, unless they are available in India in accordance with the prescribed drawing, pattern, specification or design?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The existing Stores Purchase Rules have been in force since the 1st January, 1931. Purchases of printing and stationery stores have always been governed by separate rules but these have recently been brought into general conformity with the general Stores Purchase Rules. Copies of both sets of rules are available in the Library of the House.

(b) No specific limits of price preference have been fixed. Each case is decided on its merits.

(c) It is permissible, under the Stores Purchase Rules, to invite tenders from abroad "when considered desirable". This induces wide competition and thereby ensures economical purchase.

(d) Uniformity of pattern or design is obviously desirable in the case of the articles mentioned, and when the conditions required cannot be fulfilled in India the articles have to be obtained from London. I would add however that practically all requirements in the matter of lethal weapons and munitions of war are manufactured in India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there any or much difference between the rules applicable for the purchase of printing and stationery stores, and the rules for other stores?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am sorry that my Honourable friend did not catch my answer to the first part of his question. I said that purchases of printing and stationery stores have always been governed by separate rules, but that these have recently been brought into general conformity with the general stores purchase rules. There is now very little difference between them except such as naturally arises from the nature of the articles purchased.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to clause (b) of the question, may I know whether, in determining the extent of preference to be granted, the need for encouraging certain Indian industries, more than others from the broad national point of view, is kept in mind?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think it is correct to say that that is the case. In my reply to part (b), I have said that each case is decided on its merits. The whole object of the preference is to encourage Indian industries.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I merely wanted to know whether this factor which I mentioned, namely, the need for a particular industry to be encouraged, apart from the price factor, is kept specially in mind.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think I can safely say that that is the case.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the answer to clause (c), may I know generally the countries from which tenders are invited, when it is decided to invite tenders from abroad?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should require notice of that question. To the best of my knowledge, all tenders are widely advertised. There is no restriction on the countries from which tenders may come.

INDIAN SHIPPING.

1114. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether their attention has been drawn to the speeches made at the annual general meeting of the Bombay Indian Merchants' Chamber, published in the *Hindustan Times*, dated

the 2nd February, 1936, particularly that of Mr. Rahimtoola M. Chinoy, President of the Indian Merchants' Chamber, regarding Indian shipping:

(b) whether they propose to do anything by way of helping Indian shipping; and

(c) whether they have considered the criticisms by Mr. Manu Subedar, the retiring President, regarding gold export?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Government have seen the speeches referred to.

(b) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the replies recently given by me to his starred question No. 754, and to part (c) of Seth Govind Das's starred question No. 1057.

(c) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given by the Honourable the Finance Member on the 3rd instant to part (c) of starred question No. 958.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask a question about part (b)? I dare not ask about (c)! Do Government propose to convene a conference, as early as they can, of Indians interested in Indian shipping and have the whole question re-examined—both coastal and ocean going—in view of the present state of the need for encouraging Indian shipping?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There is no such proposal before Government.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the proposal?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I do not think the need for such a conference has been established.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government satisfied that the protection given to Indian shipping today is adequate and satisfactory?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: In reply to previous questions by the Honourable Member, I have detailed the steps taken by Government so far to encourage Indian shipping.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that, so far, the results which have been obtained are not as satisfactory as one would wish them to be, will Government consider the question of convening an early conference, as was done some years ago, with Indian ship-owners and others interested, in order to evolve an agreed plan for a further and more rapid development?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It is a matter of opinion whether the steps so far taken have led to an adequate encouragement of Indian shipping or not.

REFUSAL BY THE INDIAN TEA LICENSING COMMITTEE OF TEA EXPORT QUOTA TO THE TAWNPENG STATE IN BURMA.

1115. ***Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that there are about 82,000 acres under tea in the Tawnpeng State, in Burma,

and that she produces over 14 million pounds of green and black tea per annum?'

(b) Are Government aware of the fact that although attempts have been made by the Tawnpeng State, in Burma, to obtain tea export quota, no export right has been granted by the Indian Tea Licensing Committee? If so, will Government please state the reasons for refusing the quota applied for? If not, are Government prepared to enquire and state the reasons?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Representations with regard to the area under tea in the Tawnpeng and other Shan States and the annual production therefrom have been received. The original applications for the grant of export quotas to these States were refused as they did not comply with the requirements of the Rules issued under the Indian Tea Control Act, 1933. The matter is at present under reconsideration.

REPRESENTATION OF BURMA ON THE INDIAN TEA LICENSING COMMITTEE.

1116. ***Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Has Burma been represented on the Indian Tea Licensing Committee? If not, why not? If so, who is the representative for Burma?

(b) Are Government prepared to amend section 3 of the Tea Control Act, 1933, allotting to Burma two or more seats on the Indian Tea Licensing Committee? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) No. Burma interests were not considered important enough to justify separate representation.

(b) The question of the amendment of the Indian Tea Control Act, 1933, so as to make it applicable to Burma, after separation, is now under consideration.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are the small tea-growers represented on this Committee, especially those in the Nilgiris, etc.?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: What has the Nilgiris to do with Burma?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

TEA ESTATES IN THE SHAN STATES IN BURMA.

1117. ***Dr. Thein Maung:** Are Government aware of the fact that tea estates have been in existence in the Shan States, in Burma, for the last 800 years or so, and that tea seeds for India and Ceylon were originally supplied by the said States?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government are not so aware.

STAMP VENDORS IN THE TOWN SUB-OFFICES OF THE BOMBAY GENERAL POST OFFICE.

1118. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the work at present done by the stamp vendors in the town sub-offices of Bombay General Post Office is proposed to be framed out on contract?'

(b) If so, what are the special reasons for such a course?

(c) Have the present stamp vendors been served with a notice that their services will be terminated as a measure of retrenchment?

(d) Have Government given definite assurances, times without number, that no official would be made to lose his appointment under any scheme of retrenchment?

(e) If the reply to parts (c) and (d) be in the affirmative, what are the special reasons for giving such notices to the stamp vendors which are not in keeping with those assurances?

(f) Will Government be pleased to state the number of such men with their length of service, and whether their services are pensionable or otherwise?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether the pay given to the men engaged on selling stamps by the Contractor in those town sub-offices of Bombay is about Rs. 25, whereas the pay of the departmental stamp vendors is Rs. 60—4—100?

(h) Will Government please state whether they have included in the present and proposed terms of contract the 'Fair Wage Clause'?

(i) Will Government be pleased to state whether as a measure of retrenchment, one of the dufftries of the office of Postmaster General, Bombay, was provided in the Bombay General Post Office as a second grade clerk without any examination?

(j) Will Government please state whether they would provide the stamp vendors in the same manner as the dufftry? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) A proposal to give out on contract the work of selling stamps in the remaining town sub-offices in Bombay City is at present under consideration.

(b) It is anticipated that the introduction of a contract system would result in substantial savings to the Department.

(c) The existing departmental stamp vendors were given two opportunities to pass a simple test in order to qualify for appointment as lower division clerks but they were all unsuccessful. They have now been given a further opportunity to qualify themselves by passing the test examination which will be held after nine months and they have been warned by the Presidency Postmaster that if they fail to qualify there is a likelihood that on the abolition of their posts they will be compulsorily retrenched under the provisions of the Civil Service Regulations. In this warning the word "retrenched" has been wrongly used for the word "retired".

(d) No. I have given no assurance "times without number". But I did say in reply to a question by Mr. Giri on the 11th March, 1935, relating to the withdrawal of retrenchment concessions that the general retrenchment then in progress would have been completed by a certain date and that such decreases in staff as might be justified in future as the result of re-organisation, changes in methods of procedure, fall in traffic or for other reasons would be carried out in the ordinary course as vacancies occurred. That answer was intended to relate to the change in

procedure which would result when the general retrenchment was completed. But it is obviously impossible for me to give an assurance for all time that no employee in this or any other Department will ever be obliged to retire on the abolition of his post. It is, however, the intention, on the present occasion, to make every effort to find employment for the men in question and to refrain as far as possible from compelling them to retire.

(e) This does not strictly arise. But I might add that I hope the stamp vendors will profit by the warning to make every effort to qualify themselves for appointment as clerks.

(f) A statement is laid on the table.

(g) As regards the first part of the question, Government have no information. As regards the second part the old scale of pay for stamp vendors in Bombay is as stated by the Honourable Member. The new scale of pay is Rs. 35—2—55.

(h) No.

(i) No, but before the existing orders regarding qualifying examinations were issued some record suppliers were appointed as lower division clerks without passing any examination.

(j) Government are unable to make any statement until the results of the test which will be held nine months hence, are known.

Statement showing the length of service of the stamp-vendors.

		Number of stamp- vendors.
(a) Pensionable superior service.		
24 years' service	.	1
17 " "	.	1
13 " "	.	3
12 " "	.	5
		10
(b) Non pensionable inferior service.		
10 years' service	.	3
9 " "	.	2
8 " "	.	3
6 " "	.	1
5 " "	.	2
	Total .	21

APPOINTMENT OF UNQUALIFIED HANDS IN THE OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, CENTRAL REVENUES, NEW DELHI.

1119. ***Dr. N. B. Khare:** (a) Is it a fact that the Accountant General, Central Revenues, New Delhi, held a competitive examination in February, 1931, and promised to engage the passed hands in his office?

(b) If so, how many of them have been engaged in the vacancies which occurred up to now?

(c) If the reply to part (b) above be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the number of unqualified hands recruited; and

(ii) under what circumstances they were given preference over the qualified hands?

(d) Are Government prepared to provide the qualified hands in the next vacancies which will occur?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The information is being obtained and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

APPLICATION OF NEW STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO MEN IN THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT RE-APPOINTED AFTER RETRENCHMENT.

1120. ***Dr. N. B. Khare:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of men who were governed by the Fundamental Leave Rules prior to retrenchment on account of economy campaign in the Railway Department in 1931 and were given new State Railway Leave Rules on their re-appointment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government have no information and its collection will involve an amount of labour and expense not likely to be justified by the results.

RESERVATION OF VACANCIES IN THE SUB-HEADS' GRADES IN THE STATE RAILWAY ACCOUNTS OFFICES FOR APPENDIX "D" MEN.

1121. ***Dr. N. B. Khare:** (a) Is it a fact that 50 per cent. of the vacancies in the sub-heads' grades in the State Railway Accounts Offices are reserved for Appendix "D" men?

(b) Are Government aware that the number of Appendix "D" men is very small, as compared with the men otherwise qualified for Sub-headship?

(c) If the reply to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to consider the question of reducing the percentage mentioned above to the proportion the Appendix "D" men bear to the otherwise qualified men?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Promotions are given in the Railway Accounts Department on merit with due regard to seniority. Considering the small proportion of unpassed men suitable for promotion to sub-head's rank the percentage of 50 for Appendix D passed men is not considered too high.

PROMOTION OF APPENDIX "D" MEN IN THE RAILWAY CLEARING ACCOUNTS OFFICE TO CLASS I OF CLERKS.

1122. ***Dr. N. B. Khare:** (a) Is it a fact that Appendix "D" men are being promoted in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office out of turn to class I of clerks in permanent as well as temporary vacancies? Is it in contravention of Controller of Railway Accounts' orders?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state what steps they have taken or propose to take to see that the orders referred to above are observed by the authorities in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Promotions in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office are being regulated in accordance with Rule (2) of the Seniority Rules (a copy of which is available in the Library of the House) and not merely because of passing the Appendix D Examination.

(b) Does not arise.

LIGHTING UP OF TRAINS PASSING THROUGH A TUNNEL BETWEEN THE STATIONS OF JAMALPUR AND BARIARPUR ON THE SAHIBGUNJ LOOP OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1123. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware that between the stations of Jamalpur and Bariarpur on the Sahibgunj Loop of the East Indian Railway, trains have to pass through a long tunnel and that no lights are lit in the compartments when the trains so pass, resulting in pitch darkness?

(b) Are Government prepared to recommend to the railway to light up the trains between the two above mentioned stations?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) No.

(b) I am conveying the Honourable Member's suggestion to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for consideration, but the Honourable Member may be interested to know that the length of this tunnel is about 190 yards, a distance which would ordinarily be covered by train in about twenty seconds.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that pitch darkness even for twenty seconds is unpleasant?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir. (Laughter.)

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Am I to take it in view of his answer, that while conveying this question to the Agent, the Honourable Member has also given his opinion that no hardship is being suffered?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir. It is quite possible the Agent might agree with the Honourable Member and might not agree with me.

SYSTEM OF HAVING A SECOND GUARD IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PASSENGER TRAINS.

1124. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) With reference to the answer to starred question No. 891 on March 21, 1935, is it not a fact that second guards are employed on the Moradabad section of the East Indian Railway and that such second guards standing in the middle of the train signal to guards behind that all are on board before that guard gives the final signal for the starting of the train from stations?

(b) If so, are Government prepared to recommend to the railway to extend this system to prevent accidents?

(c) What reply have Government received from the Agent, when asked to consider the matter of ensuring that all passengers are in before the train moves off, as promised by the Financial Commissioner in the course of his answer to the question mentioned above?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) No. An additional guard accompanies Nos. 5 Up and 6 Down Mails between Moradabad and Saharanpur in the capacity of a conductor guard.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The Agent states that no further action is necessary as the Standing Orders to the staff already provide for the necessary precautions to be taken before the guard gives the starting signal.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: If this extra conductor guard is necessary on these particular trains, why is not an extra conductor guard similarly necessary on other trains?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The conductor guard's business is to assist the head guard with regard to conveniences for passengers, and, this being a fast mail train, having regard to the class of passengers and the numbers travelling by it, an extra conductor guard was found necessary—which is not found necessary in other cases.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Do not these trains travel on other sections also, where many accidents occur because of the lack of this facility?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It depends upon the number of passengers travelling on certain sections.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Sir, a second guard or conductor guard is necessary on all trains, so that he may signal from the centre of the train to the guard in the rear that all passengers are on board; and is it not a fact that because of the lack of a proper signal from the centre of the train, accidents do occur, and will the Honourable Member take steps so that the danger may be obviated?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid, the Honourable Member entirely misunderstood my reply. It is not the business of the conductor guard to signal from the middle of a train that all passengers are safely on board; that is the duty, under the present regulations, of the station staff.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that the station staff does not do this duty, and, therefore, some extra arrangement is necessary?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise out of the question.

OPENING OF A PASSAGE DIRECT TO THE DHARMASHALA OUTSIDE THE ETAWAH RAILWAY STATION IN THE BOUNDARY WALL.

1125. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** With reference to the answer given to starred question No. 992 on March 21, 1935, are Government prepared to consider the desirability of recommending to the East Indian Railway authorities to

permit a passage direct to the Dharmashala outside the Etawah Railway Station in their boundary wall, recently raised shutting out the frontage of the said Dharmashala?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No. Such matters are within the competence of the administration to decide.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Was this plot of land, on which this wall has been erected, acquired by Government for the railway after the station was constructed, or was it a part of the original land that was acquired for the railway?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, I gave a very detailed reply regarding this matter in one of my speeches when the railway budget was under discussion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: And from that reply I gathered that this land was particularly acquired, if I heard the Honourable Member aright, afterwards in order that this wall may be built?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have no such recollection. The wall has subsequently been built in order to stop the free access of people to this particular plot of land in the vicinity of the railway station, as the uses, to which they put it, made it extremely obnoxious to the people who came to the station.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: When was this plot handed over to the railway? That is an important question, Sir, because such plots are not the property of railways at other stations, and they are not, as a rule, part and parcel of the railway?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: If the Honourable Member wants the exact date, I shall be very glad to furnish him with it if he will put down a question.

RIFLE FOUND TO BE PRACTISED BY THE VOLUNTEERS OF THE HINDUSTANI SEVA DAL.

1126. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** With reference to the statements of the Honourable the Home Member that volunteers of the Hindustani Seva Dal were once found practising with a rifle, will Government state whether the rifle has been discovered? If so, will they lay it on the table of the House? If not, what punishment, if any has been meted out to the official who found the rifle in unauthorised possession of persons and took no steps to recover it from them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: If the Honourable Member will refer to the speech made by me in this House on the 8th March, 1935, and to the answer given by me on the 9th March, 1935, to Mr. Satyamurti's question on the subject he will find that I stated that the use of the rifle was taught. I did not say that anyone had been found practising with a rifle.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I take it that the use of the rifle is taught with an ordinary stick? (Laughter.) The Honourable Member says that the use of the rifle was taught, but there was no rifle.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a matter of inference.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I ask what the information is at the disposal of the Government? Was there a rifle, or was there something else? What is the information on which the Honourable Member made the statement?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the information, Sir, on which the Honourable Member made the statement—whether there was a rifle in the possession of this organisation, or none?

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Where is the trigger in an ordinary stick?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: What I said was that the use of the rifle was taught, that was on the information then available, and I find on making inquiries that that information was strictly correct—the use of the rifle was taught.

Honourable Members: How? How? How?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: With an air gun—the use of the rifle can be taught with an air gun.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is there a difference between using an air gun as an air gun and teaching the use of the rifle with an air gun? I have had the use of both, and I do not see how this can be done?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

RULES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY RE ALTERNATIVE ROUTES FOR THROUGH TRAVELLING AND BREAK OF JOURNEY.

1127. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware of the exceedingly complicated nature of the rules on the East Indian Railway regarding alternative routes for through travelling and break of journey?

(b) Are Government aware that not only passengers but even railway officials are often confused as to the exact implications of the rules and much unnecessary inconvenience is caused both to the traveller and the railway official?

(c) Are Government prepared to recommend to the railway to permit break of journey on routes that have been recognized as alternate for through travelling?

(d) If not, are Government prepared to recommend that the timetables that mention alternative routes, should also mention which route is longer or shorter to enable passengers to take tickets expressly by the longer route to avail themselves of the facilities of break of journey?

(e) Are Government also prepared to ask the railway authorities to make sure that tickets are given at the Booking Offices for the routes asked for without any excuse or delay?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The rules are not complicated.

(b) No. A railway official should have no difficulty in giving the information required.

(c) No.

(d) I understand the Administration is taking action on the lines suggested by the Honourable Member.

(e) The suggestion has been brought to the notice of the Agent, East Indian Railway.

UTILISATION OF A RETURN TICKET FOR BREAK OF JOURNEY ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1128. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Are Government aware that on the East Indian Railway, return tickets, even though originally meant for a longer period, can be utilized for break of journey on the return journey only at the rate of a day for every 100 miles, if the destination is left earlier? Is it a fact, for example, that a return ticket from Benares to Delhi, taken on the first of a month and meant for completion of journey in 18 days. i.e., by the 19th of the month, cannot be utilized for break of journey say at Cawnpore on the return journey for ten days if Delhi is left say on the 5th, as in that case the journey has to be completed by the 10th?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes, under the rule applicable for break of journey when a single journey ticket is taken; each half of a return ticket being considered for this purpose as a single journey ticket. Similar rules are in force also on most other railways.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will Government recommend to the railway authorities so to change the rules that a passenger might be allowed to break his journey on his return, anywhere on the way, provided the same is completed within the time permitted on the ticket concerned?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, I have explained the position. The return ticket is treated as a single ticket from the date on which the journey on that ticket is commenced. I do not think there is anything unfair in that.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What is the exact point in insisting on the passenger spending all his time at the destination, and not utilising the ticket by breaking journey for a longer period on the way? What is the exact gain to the railway in insisting on a man holding a return ticket from, say, Benares to Delhi, spending all the fifteen days at Delhi, instead of his breaking his return journey at Cawnpore for instance?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The exact point is that once the return journey commences, the journey is expected to be completed within a certain time, as otherwise the system might be liable to abuse.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will Government consider this point more seriously, because I see no possibility of abuse or anything like that occurring. My suggestion is only to meet the convenience and comfort of passengers concerned?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid the railways have found in actual practice that there is abuse.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is not a break allowed on the return journey?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That the Honourable Member recognises. There is no complaint on that point.

**ALTERNATIVE ROUTE BETWEEN BENARES CANTONMENT AND STATIONS
ABOVE ALLAHABAD TOWARDS DELHI.**

1129. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 535, given on February 25, 1935, will Government state what reply they have received from the Agent, East Indian Railway, to their representation as promised in the answer, regarding the alternative route between Benares Cantonment and stations above Allahabad towards Delhi?

(b) What is exactly the point in permitting the route between Benares and Allahabad to be alternative either *via* Janghai or *via* Moghalsarai, but not giving the same facility when tickets are taken between Benares and stations above Allahabad on the Delhi side?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). The Agent, East Indian Railway, explained that passengers are given the alternative of travelling by either route between Benares Cantonment and Allahabad in competition with the Bengal and North Western Railway section between these two stations. This element of competition does not arise to the same extent for passengers travelling between Benares and stations west of Allahabad. The matter is, however, being examined further.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I take it that the matter will be sympathetically examined and that Government will recommend to the railway the desirability of extending this convenience?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I can only repeat that the matter is being examined.

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRIVACY OF PASSENGERS USING LATRINES ON THE
EAST INDIAN RAILWAY AND THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN
RAILWAY.**

1130. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware that both on the East Indian Railway and the Bengal and North Western Railway lines, the latrines on the platforms have no doors and that men using them sit exposed, causing them great inconvenience and embarrassment?

(b) Are Government prepared to impress upon the railway authorities the necessity of making proper arrangements for privacy for passengers using such latrines?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Old pattern latrines on the East Indian and Bengal and North Western Railways are provided with screens, although individual compartments have no doors or shutters. In the present standard type a door is provided for each compartment.

(b) None of the old pattern latrines have been built for some years past. However, a copy of this question and answer is being forwarded to the Agents concerned, but Government consider it is a matter best dealt with by the Local Advisory Committee.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How many years it will take before the last of these types of latrines will be taken out of use?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: These are not latrines in railway carriages.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Are the new type of latrines supplied with doors?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is what I have said.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How are these latrines kept there without any screens, and I want to know how long will these types be kept in use?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question. It is an argument. Next question.

INCONVENIENCE FELT BY A RETURN JOURNEY PASSENGER ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1131. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway when a passenger is compelled to travel, owing to overcrowding, on his return journey in a lower class than the one for which he holds a return ticket, the guard declines to give him a certificate to this effect which prevents him from recovering his due?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No. Guards and Special Ticket Examiners have been authorised to issue certificates in such cases.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I inform the Honourable Member that I myself found, when I was last travelling between Simla and Kalka, that the guard refused to give the certificate on the ground that the rules of the North Western Railway Administration do not provide for the issue of such certificates?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: If the Honourable Member states that as his experience, I must accept it as a fact.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I too had the same experience that the guards on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and on the South Indian Railway refuse to grant these certificates on the plea that there is accommodation in third class and that people should somehow squeeze themselves in?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: If the guards on those railway lines, having been authorised to do so, refused to give certificates, then the best thing for the Honourable Member would have been to report the matter at once to the proper authorities, pointing out the dereliction of duty on the part of the railway servant concerned.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: How at once? When the train is running?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There are telegraph offices available on the line at frequent intervals and he could have sent a telegram.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: No such offices are available.

PLATFORM TICKETS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1132. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it not a fact that platform tickets have to be taken at many stations on the East Indian Railway when a person desires to visit the platform?

(b) Is it true that the rules make no exception for anyone?

(c) Will Government state if exceptions are made for certain Government officers or on occasions of visits of high personages, like Governors, etc.? If so, under what rule or authority, is this done?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) An exception is made in favour of officers or Non-Commissioned Officers in uniform, deputed to receive or despatch a party of military personnel.

(c) The issue of platform tickets is intended to restrict the admission to platforms of people who do not intend travelling, in order to prevent overcrowding and consequent inconvenience to passengers entraining and detraining. It also facilitates a check on passengers leaving the platform through the exits. It is, however, within the discretion of the Administration to relax the rule for the purchase of platform tickets whenever it is considered desirable to do so.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it a fact that soldiers have free access to the Benares Cantonment station for no other purpose than of taking their constitutional?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Do the soldiers, who go to the platform at the Benares Cantonment station in the evenings, take any platform tickets? Is it the contention of the Honourable Member that they take platform tickets?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: My contention is that they are not permitted free access to the station. Under the circumstances, mentioned by the Honourable Member, the rules require that they should purchase platform tickets.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member instruct the railway authorities that, in the matter of permitting people to visit platforms, they should use their discretion with a little more sympathy and consideration?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am unable to follow the question.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member instruct the railway authorities to allow persons to go to the platform without platform tickets in cases of necessity like posting a letter or buying a newspaper?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir, I am afraid I cannot do that. I have explained the circumstances under which they are permitted to go on to platforms.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Do not the railway authorities allow a large number of persons to go there without platform tickets to receive Governors or other high personages? Why should they not ordinarily allow persons to go to the platforms when they go there to receive marriage parties, for instance?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: As I have said, that is a matter within the discretion of the railway administration.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Then, what are the functions of the Railway Board? Should they not perform some useful functions?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Railway Board cannot look into all matters of detail.

ABOLITION OF MILITARY CANTONMENTS AT BENARES.

1133. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) With reference to the answer to starred question No. 890 on March 12, 1935, regarding abolition of Military Cantonments at Benares, have Government decided how they intend to dispose of the lands surplus to requirements for the Military Cantonments at Benares after the transfer of certain units from Benares to Agra?

(b) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of utilizing the extensive lands that may thus be available for purposes of town improvement and relief of congestion in the old city of Benares?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) As the barracks in Benares are being used for the temporary accommodation of certain personnel previously stationed at Quetta, no land will be available for disposal for some years.

(b) The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government, but the Honourable Member's suggestion will be brought to their notice in due course.

ACTIVITIES OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENTS MEN ON RAILWAY STATIONS.

1134. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that members of the Criminal Investigation Department are posted at various stations and that these have the right of entry to the platform without any platform tickets, even where it is incumbent under the rules on persons going to the platform to take platform tickets?

(b) If so, under what special or secret rule of the railway are they so exempted?

(c) Are there any instructions given to the railway staff that they are to examine tickets of particular passengers at the bidding of the Criminal Investigation Department men and inform them of the contents of such tickets? If not, are Government prepared to assure ticket collectors that no harm will come to them if they do not consider themselves to be subordinate to the Criminal Investigation Department?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes, if they have platform passes.

(b) It is within the discretion of Railway Administrations to issue platform permits.

(c) Government are not aware of any instructions having been issued, but railway employees are expected to assist police officers in the execution of their duties. There is no question of their being subordinate to the Criminal Investigation Department.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that sometimes railway ticket collectors really resent this intrusion on the part of the C. I. D. men?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am not so aware; if the C. I. D. men are there in the course of their duty, the railway ticket collectors have no business to resent their presence.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Are Government aware that last year, when I was travelling from Bombay to Delhi, I was myself troubled at each and every junction by the C. I. D. men and by the railway ticket examiners as well. At all odd hours of day and night, they were knocking at the door of my compartment for tickets?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Does the Honourable Member mean to say that they were doing so because he was travelling in that particular train?

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Yes, the ticket collector used to come with a telegram accompanied by a police constable and used to knock at the door of my compartment.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid that question concerns my Honourable colleague, the Home Member.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: To what class of people, are these platform passes issued?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have said that it is a matter within the discretion of the railway administration.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are no general rules laid down by the Railway Board in regard to this matter?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I shall enquire and give him a reply.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Can railways refuse to give passes to these men?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a hypothetical question.

CONSTRUCTION OF WIRE BOUNDARIES AND MAKING PROPER ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE OPENING AND SHUTTING OF LEVEL CROSSINGS ON THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1135. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: (a) Are Government aware that there are no wire boundaries by the side of the Bengal and North Western Railway lines over large portions of their tracks and that there are no arrangements for the proper closing of their level crossings, resulting in many accidents?

(b) Are Government prepared to impress upon the authorities of the Bengal and North Western Railway the desirability of constructing wire boundaries and making proper arrangements for the opening and shutting of their level crossings?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Government are aware that the Bengal and North Western Railway is largely unfenced. They are not aware that the level crossings do not conform with the standard specifications, which include gates or chains except in the case of unimportant tracks and cattle crossings, where experience shows them to be unnecessary. They are not aware that many accidents result.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement explaining the views of Government on fencing which was laid on the table of the House on the 2nd September, 1929. I am forwarding a copy of the question to the Railway Administration.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government publish annual statements regarding the accidents that take place when trains are running from station to station?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: With regard to this matter, I may draw the attention of Honourable Members to the statement which I have read out which shows curiously enough that there are fewer accidents in places where there is no fencing than in places where there is fencing.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is there any statement at all published regarding the accidents that do take place?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am not aware whether any statement is published, but there certainly must be information, because that statement shows that during three years such accidents were 26 per mile per year, in the case of fenced lines, and 17 per mile per year, in the case of unfenced lines.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Railway Board get periodical reports regarding these accidents that take place on the various railways that are under their management?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that between Benares and Allahabad a number of men have been killed? I am not referring to cattle, I am referring to human beings. The railway line passes through thickly populated villages, and, because there is no fencing, many accidents take place. I have myself seen two such accidents.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There may have been accidents. I am not denying that accidents occur. I say, experience has shown that they are not necessarily diminished by fencing railways.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the advisability of publishing a statement in the usual annual report of the Railway Board regarding the accidents that take place on these various railways under their management?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes, they will consider the advisability of the suggestion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: In view of more accidents taking place where there is fencing, will Government recommend to the railways, that have such fencing, not to waste their money over these fencings?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Is the Honourable Member quite serious about that suggestion?

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Yes, very serious. If there are a less number of accidents where there are no fencings, why put them up at all?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

PUBLICATION OF ADVERTISEMENTS OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EXAMINATIONS IN NEWSPAPERS.

1136. ***Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House, a list of newspapers, both English and Indian, to which the Public Service Commission send advertisements?

(b) Have Government supplied any list of recognised newspapers to the Public Service Commission?

(c) Is it a fact that in some provinces, only Anglo-Indian newspapers have been selected for advertisements?

(d) Is it a fact that even important papers, some of them the only Indian-owned newspapers in their respective provinces, have been excluded and not given advertisements by the Public Service Commission?

(e) Is it a fact that the advertisements by the Public Service Commission are mainly intended for Indian candidates, who generally read Indian dailies in the English language? If so, are the Public Service Commission prepared to see their way to insert their advertisements in all important Indian-owned newspapers, especially English dailies?

(f) Are Government aware that it is likely that advertisements published in Anglo-Indian newspapers only may escape the notice of Indian candidates, a large majority of whom read Indian newspapers only? Have any complaints been received from candidates in this respect?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (d). To ensure that vacancies in services recruited on an All-India basis are made known to candidates belonging to the minority communities, a list of newspapers in which such vacancies should be advertised has been drawn up in paragraph 8 of the

Supplementary Instructions issued in connection with the Home Department Resolution of the 4th July, 1934. A copy of these Supplementary Instructions is in the Library of the House. The Public Service Commission also sends advertisements at times to newspapers published in other places besides those mentioned in this list.

(e) and (f). If the list of newspapers were extended as suggested by the Honourable Member, the cost of publishing these advertisements would be considerably and unnecessarily increased. The newspapers included in the list are such as educated young men of all communities, who desire to enter services recruited on an All-India basis, might be expected to read, and no serious complaints have been received from would-be applicants that they failed to see the advertisements of vacancies. The number of applications received by the Commission would indicate that their advertisements receive adequate publicity among candidates of all communities.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Are not these advertisements meant for giving the widest publicity to the activities of the Public Service Commission? If so, why are not these advertisements given to widely read newspapers?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The object is to secure the widest publicity among would-be candidates for appointments to the services, and my reply indicates that the widest necessary publicity is given.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Is it not a fact that, in the Bombay Presidency, the *Bombay Chronicle*, which is the only Indian owned daily is not given any advertisements by the Public Service Commission?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The *Bombay Chronicle* is not mentioned in the supplementary rules. As I have stated, the Public Service Commission also sends advertisements at times to newspapers published in other places outside those mentioned in the list.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is the name of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* mentioned in the supplementary rules?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is not mentioned as one of the papers in which their advertisements are issued. But the rules leave discretion to the local head of the department in the case of local recruitment to send advertisements to other papers.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is it not a fact that this right of advertising is used rather to patronise and not to advertise?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Is the *Searchlight* of Patna in that list?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir; no Patna newspaper is here.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the Indian-owned papers in that list?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member had better read the list.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it a long list?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

CLOSING DOWN OF THE INDIAN STUDENTS' HOSTEL IN CROMWELL ROAD.

1137. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the reply given by the Under Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons with regard to the closing down of the Indian Students' Hostel in Cromwell Road (published as a special cable in the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 18th February, 1936)?

(b) Is it a fact that the Under Secretary of State pointed out that the decision rested with the Government of India and the Local Governments?

(c) What led Government to advise the closing down of the Hostel? Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of reviving the Hostel?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Government decided to close the hostel because it was insufficiently supported by Indian students in England, many of whom now prefer to make their own arrangements. The reply to the second part is in the negative.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: What are the arrangements Government have made now?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Government have made no arrangements; the students make their own arrangements.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will not Government do anything for them as before?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have already said that it is no longer necessary to make those arrangements.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Will Government explain why this hostel became unpopular with the Indian students?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: That question ought to be addressed to the students.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government aware of the fact that the Indian student population in England and particularly in London considered this particular institution in Cromwell Road as a loyalist home?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Government have no information of that kind.

VOLUMES OF THE SALT MANUAL.

1138. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Salt Manual is published in four volumes and whether only the first volume is made available to the public, and the other volumes are treated as confidential?

(b) Is it a fact that the entire working of salt factories is based on the rules and regulations contained in all the four volumes of the Manual?

(c) Are Government aware that licensees find it very difficult to conform to the rules of a Manual which is not made available to them for study?

(d) Are Government aware that severe punishment is meted out to the licensees for non-compliance with the rules of the Manual?

(e) Are Government aware that the non-availability of the Manual containing the rules to the public leads to a lot of corruption among the subordinates of the department in administering the rules?

(f) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of making all the volumes available to the public?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) Yes. It is presumed that the Honourable Member refers to the Madras Salt Manual.

(b) No. Volume I contains the relevant Salt Acts and the Notifications and rules issued thereunder relating to the working of salt factories, etc. Volume II reproduces the rules and notifications contained in Volume I, and also departmental orders issued solely for the guidance of the officers of the department. Volume III contains forms and registers, and Volume IV standard estimates and type designs for the construction of buildings, etc., in salt factories with which the licensees and merchants have no concern.

(c) All the rules and regulations to be observed in the working of factories as far as licensees are concerned are contained in Volume I. Moreover, the rights and obligations of licensees are fully stated in the conditions of their licenses.

(d) Licensees are liable to severe punishment for breach of the conditions of the licences issued to them or of the Act or rules published in Volume I.

(e) No.

(f) In view of the answers to parts (b) and (c), Government do not consider it necessary to make Volumes II to IV of the Manual available to the public.

Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Ohetty: Are Government aware that many of these officers constitute themselves as prosecutors and judges of infractions of these rules?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: If the Honourable Member is referring to punishments imposed by the Courts under the Madras Salt Act, the answer is obviously in the negative. It is perfectly true that, in certain cases, where the punishment takes the form of the resumption of ~~pos~~, officers of the department have to be both those who give the information of the offences committed and the persons who award punishment. ~~But~~ not the same officers; obviously the higher officers are not the ones who go round and discover the offences.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Are Government aware that these higher officers simply dot the i's and cross the t's of their lower officers?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: No, Sir.

PROTECTION FOR THE HOSIERY INDUSTRY.

1139. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a communication appearing in the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 18th February, 1936, regarding protection for hosiery?

(b) Is it a fact that the protection granted applies only to cotton under-vests, cotton socks and stockings and cotton knitted fabric?

(c) Is it a fact that the representatives of the industry made representation at the time when protection was under contemplation that undervests with collars and sport shirts would escape the higher duty by being treated as apparel?

(d) Is it a fact that the Central Board of Revenue assured the representatives of the industry that the articles referred to in part (c) above would be assessed at the rate of 25 per cent. or 12 annas per pound, whichever is higher?

(e) Is it a fact that owing to a difference of opinion among the Customs authorities at various Indian ports, undervests with collars attached to them, although made of knitted fabric, are now freely passed at all Indian ports at 35 per cent. duty, whereas the fabric of which they are made is assessable to duty at 50 per cent. or 12 annas per pound, whichever is higher?

(f) Is it a fact that a number of representations were made during the last two years to Government to rectify this anomalous position?

(g) What action have Government taken to rectify this defect in the working of the protection afforded to the industry?

(h) Are Government aware that large quantities of undervests with collars or sport shirts have been dumped from Japan, owing to the great advantage in duty during the last two years?

(i) Is it a fact that the Fiscal Commission recommended that industries for which all materials are available in India should get full protection?

(j) Is it a fact that the hosiery industry completely satisfied all the conditions laid down by the Fiscal Commission?

(k) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of remedying the defect in the protection afforded to the hosiery industry by levying a duty of 50 per cent. or 12 annas per pound, whichever is higher, on all cotton knitted fabrics?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a), (b) and (f). Yes, Sir.

(c), (d) and (e). Government received representations to the effect that the protective duty on cotton undervests might be evaded by the importation of such vests with collars and pockets attached. The trade was informed that such garments would still be assessed as undervests. Genuine sports shirts and pullovers are assessed as apparel and are liable to duty under item 52 of the Import Tariff Schedule.

(g) and (k). The matter is receiving the consideration of Government.

(h) Government are not so aware.

(i) No, Sir.

(j) I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 192 of Chapter IX of the Report of the Indian Tariff Board, 1932, regarding the grant of protection to the cotton textile industry.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Independent Party will now move the next motion relating to the demand
12 Noon. for grants. Which is the motion they want to move?

Mr. K. L. Gauba (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Demand No. 39, motion No. 465.

DEMAND NO. 39—DEFENCE DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,25,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of the 'Defence Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,25,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of the 'Defence Department'."

Defence Policy of the Government of India.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced to Re. 1."

Sir, I deem it an honour to sponsor the main cut of the Independent Party on this budget. It might be asked why the Independent Party have for several years in succession sponsored a cut relating to defence? One might equally ask why the Military Junta, represented by my friend, the Army Secretary, year after year, raids the Central Revenues to the extent of 50 per cent.? One might equally ask why the grievances voiced in this House year after year pertaining to Indianisation, the excess of expenditure and various other matters are not put right by the Defence Department? This year there are several reasons in particular—and I shall briefly indicate them—why this cut should be considered by the House as more important than ever. *Firstly*, we have had the retrenchment of the war block in which several Indian King's Commissioned Officers have left or have been removed from the effective services in the Army. *Secondly*, we have had an amazing revelation made by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief at the Indian Military Academy, Dehra Dun, that the right material for the Academy is not forthcoming.

Thirdly, we have an excess in the military budget and indications that the military budget of the future will even exceed the proportions and limits which it has reached today. *Fourthly*, we have had the employment of Indian troops on Imperial ventures during the year without the sanction of the Indian Legislature. *Fifthly*, we have continued extravagance in almost every department of the Army. *Sixthly* we had the refusal of the Army Secretary the other day to agree to the Indianisation of Gurkha regiments. *Seventhly*, we had the use of troops against unarmed crowds last year and the refusal of Government to enquire into the circumstances and the extent of force used in each case. *Lastly*, we have the international situation and its bearing on the military budget and the burdens of the future.

I will, first of all, refer to the speech of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in its relation to the Indian Military Academy. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said that the right material for the Indian Military Academy was not forthcoming. It must be remembered that in the formation of this Indian Military Academy, in the framing of the rules, in the selection of candidates that are admitted into the Academy, our class—the politician class—is not taken into confidence by the military authorities. If, after all these years, they now find that the quality of the material which they have in the Indian Military Academy and which is forthcoming for the Indian Military Academy is not satisfactory, I submit that they themselves are to blame.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Secretary, Defence Department): Could the Honourable Member refer me to the actual speech in which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is said to have made that statement?

Mr. K. L. Gauba: His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief made a statement at the Military Academy, and it was referred to in a question in this House.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): It was the late Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Yes, the late Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I know perfectly well that the late Commander-in-Chief never said that the material at the Academy was not satisfactory; what he said was that the competition was unsatisfactory.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): They know it.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: The Defence Secretary can now tell us whether he is satisfied with the quality of candidates at the Indian Military Academy and with the material forthcoming for the Academy. The question is perfectly clear—and they themselves admit—that the quality of material is not satisfactory. Now, that was.—I might in passing say—even admitted on the floor of this House. The reasons for these are three-fold: firstly, the method of recruitment, secondly, the very large percentage of Y cadets that are admitted to the Indian Military Academy, and thirdly, the inadequacy of pay for those who pass out, so that the Academy does

[Mr. K. L. Gauba.]

not attract the very best quality of persons in the country. Regarding the first, namely, the manner of recruitment and selection, I would remind you, Sir, what Sardar Sant Singh stated in this House the other day—how at the Selection Board his son appeared and it was indicated that he was the son of an anti-Government man. I do not wish to go into any particular personalities: all I say is that I know of several cases where candidates got marks for the deeds of their fathers, either a *plus* or a *minus*.

An Honourable Member: Deeds or misdeeds.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Yes, deeds or misdeeds—a *plus* or a *minus*. The second reason why there is unsatisfactory material at the Indian Military Academy is this very large percentage of Y cadets. It is an unheard of thing that 50 per cent. of the candidates for Sandhurst should be recruited from the ranks of the British Army, and yet that is the percentage of entrants into the Academy from the ranks of the Indian Army. At the Indian Military Academy, you have an attempt made to make into officers persons who, obviously by reason of their status in life and otherwise, are meant to be of the Viceroy's Commissioned class of officers. These persons who come from those classes, unless they have very large means of their own, obviously cannot even after passing out keep up the position and status of good officers. As regards the pay and status of these persons who pass out of the Academy, the other day, my friend, the Defence Secretary, stated that it was based on the scales of pay which are admitted to persons of like grade who pass out in England. If one sees those salaries (I have not very much time, otherwise I would take my friend through the figures, which I have here), there is a big difference, and the difference in India is marked, amounting to well over Rs. 100, between the young Second Lieutenant who comes out from England and the man who passes out from the Indian Military Academy.

I briefly pass on to the question of the retrenchment of the war block. You will remember, Sir, that there were several Indians who were granted King's Commissions soon after the war, and the reason given by the Army Department for retrenching these persons is that they were too old and unlikely to be able to command their regiments. I submit, the real reason is that a very large number of these officers were not attached to Indianised units, but to British units, and the fear was, not that they would not be able to command their regiments but, that they were reaching an age and position in their regiments when they would be in a position to command British officers there. We know there are several cases where Indian officers with King's Commissions have been weeded out on one excuse or another, sent to the Remount, into the Political, into the Transport, into the Territorials—anywhere where they will not command British officers. This war block retrenchment is nothing more or less than a continuance of the same policy.

In the few minutes time at my disposal, I will briefly refer to the military budget. The purpose of the military expenditure in India, the reason of the large amount spent on the army is stated to be two-fold—firstly, the maintenance of internal security, and secondly, to defend India's frontiers. Now, I ask you to consider that these two criteria are nothing new in the administration of the Army in India. The Army in India has

been performing these functions for years. Therefore, if the budget in 1913-14, which was not an abnormal year, was 30 crores, why should it be 45½ crores today? One can say that in certain branches, say, the Air Force, there is considerable development: very well, take one crore or 1½ crores for the Air Force: but how do you make up the difference of 15½ crores between 1913-14 and 1936-37? We found that in 1922-23, the budget had risen to 62½ crores and the explanation then given was increase on account of various extraordinary charges, status and position and various other matters on account of the war. Those price levels have fallen all round, and there is absolutely no reason why the budget cannot be brought down to a figure round about the pre-war figure. I believe, in another place, the other day it was mentioned that the military budget could be reduced to nine crores, but that is a ridiculous suggestion. All I say is that there is ample scope in this budget; and if one goes through it one will find many items, which if you are interested and if you sincerely mean to cut down expenses, you can certainly do it. It is stated that the military budget has been reduced to below possible proportions and that there can be no further reduction and that, in the future, there may even be an increase. If one looks carefully into the Army budget, I do not think, you can find that there has been a very sincere or painstaking reduction in the expenditure even in the last few years, and I will tell you why. You have had in the last few years the military budget *plus* the surplus stores which you have been consuming. You have not continued your construction. You have had the emergency salary cut. If you had a normal military budget all these years with all these three items you would still have maintained the figures very much around the post-war figure. Therefore, I submit, that a real attempt to reduce the army budget has not yet been made.

Last year, Mr. Tottenham went into a little mathematics on a debate of this kind. He calculated that £150 millions is the total amount spent on defence in the British Empire. He also, by a process of mathematics, arrived at the conclusion that £150 million was equal to Rs. 200 crores; by the same process of mathematics he arrived at the conclusion that the share of Great Britain was 11 annas in the rupee, that of the Indian tax-payer three annas, and of the dominions tax-payer two annas. I say there is no greater condemnation of the Indian military budget than those figures. If all the dominions pay only two annas in the rupee and India alone is saddled with three annas, I do not think any further comment is necessary on it

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What is the average income of the people of India?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has two minutes more to finish.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: I will not, therefore, go very much more into the details of the question. I will only say this, that the figures given so far as the military expenditure is concerned are not correct. There are several items which appear in other items of the budget—for instance, ten lakhs of rupees as presents to the Government of Nepal, no doubt for the use of Gurkha regiments in this country.

[Mr. K. L. Gauba.]

In conclusion, I will only say this, that we see from the newspapers that the international situation is really serious. The clouds of war are gathering in several parts of the world. I say to the Members opposite that a disappointed and discontented India is a thing which Members opposite should in their own interests endeavour to avoid. So far as the army is concerned, we have had promises of Indianisation. We have had promises of reduction in military extravagance. We have had various other promises which yet remain to be fulfilled. Now, Sir, what happens when a pledge is broken? We have a defeat of the Government in the lobby. We had three defeats of the Government in the lobby yesterday. But, Sir, I say, if war breaks out, the broken pledges of Government may have other and more serious consequences.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I rise to oppose the motion that is before the House . . .

Some Honourable Members: The amendment has not been put yet.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced to Re. 1."

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I rise to oppose the motion which, I believe, is now before the House. I listened with deep interest to the speech just delivered by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, and whilst I listened to the many points he raised, especially to the concluding part of his speech, I thought that the latter part of it absolutely threw out of account and contradicted the former part. He started, Sir, with a catalogue of complaints against the Defence Department, and he ended by striking a note of warning regarding the international situation. Sir, I am one of those who has studied the military situation in India with some considerable care.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, Oh!

Mr. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): How?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I know more about the army in India than you do. I have served in the army, while you have not.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should address the Chair.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Very well, Sir. Let me, through you, state that I have served in the army, while Honourable Members opposite who shout have not. Sir, I am one of those who strongly believe that India today cannot afford to reduce the army by even one single man or rifle, but that does not mean that the cost of the army cannot, in certain matters, be reduced. I do not want reduction in expenditure of the army at the cost of efficiency. I want that clearly to be understood in the beginning. When an Honourable Member of this House gets up in all seriousness and states that the military expenditure of this country has not been reduced, it is, Sir, to say the least, an outrage on truth and a

travesty of facts. No one can deny, looking through the former military budgets, that the former Commander-in-Chief, Sir Phillip Chetwood, displayed not only the qualities of a great soldier, but of an able administrator. For it was he who, against the advice of his experts, reduced the military budget by nearly ten crores during the five years he was Commander-in-Chief. That reduction was made at a time when India was more or less free from foreign aggression. Today, Sir, India, in common with all countries in the world, is faced with an international peril. Let us not forget that the Far Eastern question looms large in the horizon, of international affairs, and at any moment, India may be dragged into the conflict in the event of a war in the Far East and even the West. We must not be blind to that fact, and, I submit, if you have a Commander-in-Chief in whom responsibility has been placed in regard to the defence of India, it is the duty of this House, which is unfamiliar with such matters, to assist him. The Commander-in-Chief is certainly in a better position to express an opinion on and to control military matters, to some of which reference has been made by the previous speaker, than any other Honourable Member of this House. You cannot make, nor can you play with an army on paper. A paper army may be the play mate of politicians, but is not one that can be used for the defensive and offensive purposes of a country, especially of India, rift as it is with communal dissensions. Times have changed, and India has perilously gone down to a low level in regard to her armaments, I mean the quality of her armaments, such as is needed to defend it against a first class power. The Commander-in-Chief himself stated in another place that the army in India today was not adequately armed with modern equipment to enable it successfully to withstand an attack by a first class power.

Then, Sir, there are other points the Honourable the Mover brought forward, so far as the motion before the House is concerned. He referred to difference in the treatment meted out between Indian Officers and British Officers, who have been recently retrenched owing to the war block promotion. I am not sure whether he refers to Indian officers holding the King's Commission; if he does, then, I think, it is the duty of the Government to remove the difference and to give equal attention to Indian officers as they are giving to British officers. If the Defence Secretary will only show to this House that the Government of India and the Defence Department will extend to Indian officers the same terms and concessions as are being given to British officers, I am sure, there will be no room for complaint.

As regards the remarks made by the late Commander-in-Chief regarding the Indian Military Academy, I have nothing to say, because that is his opinion and he has every right to his views.

As regards the employment of Indian troops outside India without the consent of this House, I believe that this took place when the House was not sitting, but I feel that the Defence Department should, in future, consult this House, whenever it is possible, indeed I feel it is a privilege to which this House is entitled before the Indian army is sent outside the shores of India.

Sir, the Honourable Member then tried to make a comparison between the military budget of 1913-14, with the military budget today. I was surprised to hear what he said, because, surely the position in 1913-14, is not comparable with the position today, both as regards the size of the

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

army, the mechanisation of the army, the cost of food supplies, the standard of living and the prices of various classes of raw materials required for the army. Why attempt to sacrifice efficiency for economy? Why not help the Defence Department by advising them in very many matters? We can here move the Government to realise that, if India is to continue to be the country for garrisoning 60,000 British troops, mainly for Imperial purposes and needs, if India is to continue to pay for the upkeep of these 60,000 British troops,—as she has been doing so for years —(apart from the two millions recently returned on account of decapitation charges),—the time has come when this House should demand that this expenditure should be met or shared by the Imperial Government, and that India should be afforded opportunities of manufacturing her own arms,—indeed to supply the needs of the army in every respect, rather than indent for these from another country. This is one way in which we can reduce the army expenditure.

There are one or two other ways I might suggest to reduce the army expenditure. There are certain departments of the army, such as the Medical Department which, I maintain, without any doubt, can be run at a lower cost. The Honourable the Defence Secretary knows my views on this matter, particularly in certain sections of the Army Medical Department,—I refer in particular to the Royal Army Medical Corps (Ranks). There are a few hundreds of these soldiers who have been brought here as trained nurses to do the work of male nurses in British military hospitals. Sir, I consider this as nothing else but a luxury, a financial extravagance. There is no need for these men in these hospitals, and, if there is any need, that need can be supplied locally.

Another matter, that I again wish to stress, and, with greater emphasis than I did in previous years, is the recruitment of British nurses in England for British military hospitals in this country. Sir, I am told that there is a military policy that the British soldier must receive the same medical advice in this country as he would receive in England. I asked at the 1932-33, Military Retrenchment Committee, what was this policy, and I was told that the medical officer who treated the British troops had to be registered in England. Sir, there are any number of medical men in this country who are registered medical practitioners in England. Again, when I asked, why hundreds of nurses were brought from England at such high cost, (at 3 or 4 times the salaries they get in England) to this country to supply the nursing needs of the British military hospitals, when there are hundreds of first class fully qualified nurses in this country who were searching for work, I was given no reply, except that it was the policy and that it could not be altered. Here are instances where lakhs of rupees, which are being squandered on what I would call a nursing luxury, not a professional necessity, but financial extravagance.

These are some of the practical items in which real economy could be effected in the military budget, but to which the Defence Department turns a deaf ear. If my Honourable friend had confined himself in his cut motion to such questions of economies, I should have supported him. But when he brings up the points that he did, I am sorry I cannot do so. Sir, I oppose the motion before the House.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I wish to support the motion that has been moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba. I am not surprised that the motion has been opposed by my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney. When I read that Anglo-Indian community was going to be the second line of defence for the Empire in India, I am not at all surprised at the attitude that my Honourable friend has taken up in this debate. But inasmuch as the position that has been enunciated at the several Round Table Conferences is that the defence of India is increasingly the concern of Indians, I feel I am justified in participating in the debate that has been started.

Sir, I wish to attack the policy, the purpose, the personnel, and the proportion of the army. It has been laid down by this Legislative Assembly, long ago, that the policy, so far as the defence of India was concerned, should be: "the defence of India against external aggression and the maintenance of internal peace and prosperity". That is the only criterion by which we have to judge the strength, the structure, the organisation and the expenditure of our army in India. But, as a matter of fact, it has even been suggested now that the Far Eastern situation is developing fast, and that there are war clouds in Europe. It only means that the policy is to be governed not by what has been laid down in this Resolution of the Assembly, but by the world situation; in other words, by the imperial considerations of Britain. I do not agree for a moment that the Indian Army should be taken away from the Indian soil for the purpose of Imperial Britain. If we confine ourselves to the criterion laid down in this Resolution, I submit, in the first place, that the strength of the army, assuming for argument's sake that it is sufficient for these two purposes,—still the cost has been very excessive. That point has been to some extent conceded by my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney. If it is only a question of internal peace, I think it is largely the function of the police, and taking a rough estimation of the police forces, both armed and unarmed, in India, it is over three lakhs. Taking that factor into consideration, I submit, that even this strength of the army is excessive. But to prevent external aggression,—I would, for argument's sake, agree that that portion of the army which is to be reserved for this purpose may be accepted to be correct for the time being, and yet we can effect financial savings to a very large extent. Is it seriously contended at this stage that the Indians are not capable of defending their own frontiers? Whatever may have been in the past, although I do not agree with that also,—it is not the capacity, it is the opportunity that is wanted. If the Government are serious that it is really the concern of India herself to defend and to chalk out a policy of her own, not lakhs, but according to Townshend, every year, if we apply the method of Prussian conscription, eight lakhs of people are available for military service. Can we not replace these 66,000 Britishers? Is it seriously contended that man to man the British soldier is superior? I can quote a hundred passages on the inefficiency of the British soldiers, but that is not the point today. Since the Mutiny, on fourteen occasions, the Indian Army has been used outside the Indian frontiers, and on all those occasions, if the Government was successful, it was mainly and entirely due to the intervention of the Indian Army. (Hear, hear.) It is not that I say so, but I am prepared to quote chapter and verse from British observers, publicists, and even British military men. If we want

[Mr. N. V. Gadgil.]

and if we have the right to determine the defence policy of India, it should not be the concern of anybody else but of Indians themselves. India should not be, in the words of Lord Salisbury, the Eastern barracks for the Britishers and a training ground for the British boys with occasional picnics on the frontiers. But the only consideration that should weigh with us should be whether they are absolutely necessary today.

It has been pointed out on several occasions, that because of internal disputes between Hindus and Muhammadans, British troops have to be called. But I honestly feel that it is because of their presence that the disputes have continued and will continue. Leave us alone. You have come here with a definite policy of divide and rule. That has been frankly admitted by Elphinstone, the first Governor in Western India, down to General Coke. I do not want to take the time of the House by quoting chapter and verse. If you want to continue that policy—you may not say so, you do not want to give up the policy of counterpoise that is really at the bottom of keeping 66,000 Britishers and not having an army of one united and homogeneous type. Very recently it was pointed out that Gurkhas are Indians and that they have been employed as such. There are 76 battalions excluding Gurkhas, and 20 battalions of Gurkhas in India. It is a misnomer,—and when I say that, I fully know my responsibility as a Hindu—it is a misnomer to call Gurkhas as Indians. What is at the bottom of this policy? They want to exclude every community in India which will develop a sort of political consciousness. They are gradually excluding the Punjab Muhammadans and Sikhs and Hindus, and recruiting Pathans and Muhammadans from the frontier and much beyond that, and Gurkhas from the other side. They want to keep the army away from political influence so that the tragedy of 1857 may not be repeated. I assure them that a worse tragedy is in store for them. It is not by strength of arms that you are going to hold India any longer. Do you realise what are the implications of your policy? Do you realise that lakhs and lakhs of young men come out of the universities with legitimate channels of employment blocked? Are they to remain what their forefathers were—mere slaves and Babus like Piche Lal? Even the Bengali race—which was called a race of cowards by Lord Macaulay—whatever may be the motives and methods of the bomb throwers in Bengal—has developed a courageous psychology. I do not approve of their methods, but I do not question their patriotism all the same. Today I want to point out that they have developed a psychology, and if you do not take advantage of that and use this precious material for the army, I am not a prophet, there is no need of a prophet to tell you that your days are numbered. It is the same thing in my part of the country. I give you one example. The community to which Dr. Ambedkar has the honour to belong was the community that supplied soldiers for the Britishers in the early years of the 19th century, and they won for the Britishers the whole of Western India. There are still the stone monuments to evidence this because the Government will give you nothing but raise stone statues. Today that community of 86 lakhs of men can surely give you two lakhs of soldiers but you will not have them. The Mahrattas, both the Brahmins and non-Brahmins—where are they—dock workers, mill workers, *chaprasis* and clerks—working hard so that Mr. Modv may become a knight and Sir Cowasji may become a Baronet. We, who created that Maratha Empire and ruled that Empire

—where are we? Mind you, although you have disarmed us, we have developed a technique of mass action, whereby, without resort to arms, we will put an end to your rule and it is no wonder that the whole of Western India is socialist today. Just as the Mahrattas conquered the whole of India 150 years ago, today they will conquer the whole of India on the ideological front and make the whole of India socialist. You are not using that material. Why quote from history? I am not a believer in history and tradition as the repository of title deeds for present power and patronage. I am my own ancestor. May I give my personal example. In 1914, as soon as the war started, I offered myself as a recruit at Neemuch where the military station was. I was hardly 18. I was told: "You are a Brahmin". No fault of mine. Then, in 1917, when the Government knew perfectly that it could not do without widening the scope of martial classes, I offered myself as a recruit. I served in the army for six months as an N. C. O. I have justification for participating in this discussion, I assure Sir Henry Gidney. I can tell you further that I was recommended for King's Commission at the Military College at Indore. I had an interview with His Excellency then. I do not want to name him. I was told this, that and the other. The reason was that I was a Brahmin connected with all political workers in my province. I am proud that I was not given the Commission. Today I am an N. C. O. in a different sense—non-co-operator. Sir, it is not the capacity, it is the opportunity that is needed. Even today, although I have not handled a rifle for 15 years, I can shoot the Frontier Pathan a straight bull's eye. I can shoot Mr. Tottenham where he is safely sandwiched between Mr. Joshi, my townsman, the champion of the proletariat and the representative of bourgeois culture, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: But, Sir, I do not want to do either. It may be daring sport but it is not a paying proposition. My point is that it is not the capacity but the opportunity. We are told that we have not got enough competition for the entry into Sandhurst. Will you put me in charge of your department for five minutes? I will give you 300 boys from Poona and the same number from every university town in India but your methods of recruitment are such, that if I were to expose you, I am sure you, Sir, will rule me out and I do not want to take that risk.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Will you give me five minutes more?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair is not allowing that concession. This is by arrangement.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: If we replace the British element by the Indian element, we can certainly effect a saving of 13 crores. That is exactly what has been stated in the Capitation Report.

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Not 13 crores?

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: I won't quote this, unless I am certain.

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Rs. 13 crores was stated to be the cost of the British Army, not the amount that might be saved if it was replaced by Indian troops.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: The statement here is "the extra cost of maintaining the British troops in India over the cost of maintaining a corresponding number of Indian troops is estimated at £10,000,000" and without monkeying with the ratio it comes to Rs. 130,000,000.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: I only wish to add this. These 13 crores can be saved, and I assure my Honourable friend, Mr. James, that it will be used, not for exploitation by the superficialities, but will be used by those who are sincere, who have thought deeply and honestly for the equitable distribution of national wealth and income, including the European Group, provided they accept the responsibility of Indian citizenship and help us in driving out these men. Sir, I support the motion.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I had made up my mind to support this motion if the Mover of the motion would have talked sense and not attacked the martial races, but as the last speaker and the Mover of this motion have spent a lot of their time in attacking the martial classes, I rise to oppose the motion.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: On a point of personal explanation. I did not say a word about martial or non-martial classes.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: I will just prove what you have said. I will first take the Mover of this motion. He said that the best material is not coming up in the Indian Military Academy, Dehra Dun, because of the large number of army cadets being admitted in the Academy. May I ask him, is there any country in the world where some classes are taken in the ranks and not taken as officers? Would he like the enlisted classes, who have been tested for the last one century all over the front, to remain in the ranks, while they are officered by classes who have never been tested and have never commanded even three men? Would he like all Sikhs and Mussalmans, Pathans and Gurkhas who have proved gallant soldiers to be officered by some other classes who never joined in the ranks? Is there any country in the world where we find such a state of things, where some classes are taken in the ranks, and not in the rank of officer? Why, he simply grudged, I think, the fifty per cent. of the commissions that are being given to the Indian Army.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Mr. President, I am sorry to again interrupt the Honourable Member. On a point of personal explanation, may I say that the speaker is entirely misrepresenting what I said. I never said anything about fifty per cent of the commissions being taken away by the Indian Army.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: You have said that large numbers of the army cadets are being taken by the Indian Army.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: All I said was that you are recruiting officers for the present Indian Military Academy to the extent of fifty per cent. from the ranks in the Indian Army. I did not say anything about the classes. (Voices: "Yes, yes".)

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: You said that the rank and file of the Indian Army, who are not well-educated, are, therefore, not fit for command. Now, may I tell you that Field Marshal Robertson rose from the ranks to be the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and his services, during the Great War, are well-known. I myself joined the Army as an Indian officer, and when I was given a commission at Indore, I passed at the top of your Oxford and Cambridge B. A.'s and I got a senior commission. (Voices: "Very good!") No doubt many men join the Army, but it is not all who prove themselves to be satisfactory. In our Indian Army, there are particular classes who are enlisted because they have been serving the army for centuries and that is the reason why we are getting such good material, so far as they are concerned, in the Army. I am very sorry to say that there are classes, who are not enlisted in the army, because they have never joined the army, and have no tradition behind them, that is not producing good material in the Army . . .

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): But they won't let you command a regiment.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: When the time will come, they will do so.

An Honourable Member: The time will never come.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Certainly it will. Now, Sir, another point my friend raised was about the war-block officers. There is no doubt that about 400 officers had to be retired from the service because during the War when these officers were taken, all these 400 officers had not been sent away and there was a great block to promotions and that is why that scheme was adopted. Now, with regard to the military budget, my friend really contradicted himself. He referred to the international situation in the world

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, I referred to "extravagance" here—I did not say anything else.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: My friend knows that Japan is spending on her army 46 per cent. of her total revenues, and Russia has more than doubled her army since 1923 and 1925, and she can within two months mobilize an army up to six million men. Now, my friend must know that India has to take her part in the international situation. If there comes to be another war in which Russia is involved, then she can mobilize six million men, and why India with a population of 350 million men could not raise about seven million or eight million men?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Let us have conscription then.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: My friend, Sir, who last spoke

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: I am not your friend.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: My "Honourable friend", I mean—the parliamentary language used in the Assembly, is probably a Mahratta in the general sense, I do not know if he is a Brahmin Mahratta, but he said that he is a marksman and can shoot a Pathan from a hundred yards,—probably so, in this House when Pathans are absolutely unarmed and sitting in the front Benches. My friend also said he has served six months in the army. Well, I am reminded of one rule in the army that, if within six months a recruit is not fit (Laughter), he is discharged as being unlikely to be an efficient soldier. (Laughter.) Then, he says something about political influence in the army. Well, there should be no political influence in the army, let me tell him that. Honourable Members must by now have known of the happenings in Japan and they can well imagine what political influence in the army can do. (Hear, hear.) You have seen big politicians killed in Japan, where the army is now out of hand; and that is the result if the army is put under any sort of political influence. So I say for God's sake keep the army absolutely away from political influence. (Hear, hear.)

An Honourable Member: Why are you here then?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: I am no more a soldier now. (Voices: "Oh, oh!") Now, Sir, with regard to the question of enlisting particular classes in the army, well, no doubt there are some classes who have been taken into the army for the last sixty or seventy years and they are the tested classes. Sir, India is a very big country. I have no grudge against anybody, against any class coming up and joining the army; they must be given the chance; but India is a very big country, a vast sub-continent, and England or Japan are very very small countries, and there, there is conscription to join the army and fight, but in India, with her population of 350 million, you can keep separate the truly fighting classes, as during the Hindu kingdom also there used to be Khatriyas, Rajputs, etc., and that is why here we must leave the martial classes absolutely separate, simply to fight, and you go on and run the mills or the railways and other civil administrations. Let us, therefore, carry on the army side, because we are the tested soldiers

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Do you include the British people also as martial classes? (Laughter).

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Well, they are not Indians: I am talking about India. I do not think that all the other classes that are not now enlisted in the army cannot fight; if they will join the army, they will probably learn within fifty or sixty years and they will no doubt create a reputation, but taking now straightaway those classes who have never been enlisted before and have never been known to fight, well, I am reminded of a story in Kashmir. Sir, there was an attempt made to enlist the Kashmiris in the Kashmir army. Formerly, His Highness the

Maharajah of Kashmir never took them except the Dogras and Muslim Rajputs. Now, after he raised a Kashmir battalion in Srinagar for his army,—they were transferred to Jammu, the Commanding Officer of the Kashmir battalion came up and said: "I am marching with my whole battalion, Sir, with all their rifles," etc., and he said, "he wanted some police". The General asked, Why? He said; "to guard us and our rifles on our way from Srinagar to Jammu". (Laughter.) Sir, that was the result of the experiment, Sir, I think I have done enough.

An Honourable Member: Yes, more than enough.

Sardar Mangal Singh (East Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I rise to support the motion that has been moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba. It may appear a little strange that when the war clouds are gathering on the east and west and when the other nations are increasing their armaments and military expenditure, we, in India, are pressing the Government to decrease their military expenditure. But the situation here, Sir, is different. The army policy of the Government of India is one of those first-class political issues on which a consistent and persistent agitation has been carried on in the country by the public, and equally persistently and consistently public opinion has been flouted by the military authorities. Our grievance against the military policy has been there for the last eighty years and the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 was one of the phases of that agitation, but the Government of India have been treating the military as an excluded subject altogether and no suggestion that has come forward from this side of the House has ever been accepted by the Government. I am referring to the demand of this House. Recently we passed a Resolution, practically unanimously, that Government should appoint a Standing Committee to consult whenever Indian troops are to be sent out and when the Legislature is not in Session. But, in spite of definite assurances, the Government have now come forward with the lame excuse that such a proposition is unheard of in any other country in the world.

I propose to confine my observations to two aspects of the Indian Army, namely, Indianisation and the military expenditure. By

1 P.M. Indianisation, I mean, firstly, the transfer of the control of the military administration to the people of India; secondly, replacing the British officers by Indian officers and thirdly, replacing the rank and file of the British Army by Indian nationals. As regards the first, the Round Table Conference Defence Committee insisted and they laid down a definite policy that henceforward the defence of the country would, to an increasing extent, be the concern of the Indian people and not of the British Government alone. That policy has been accepted by His Majesty's Government and, I understand, that it has been incorporated in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General. That being the case, I ask the Government of India how they propose to carry out that policy. On the other hand we fear some deterioration. At the present time the defence is under the charge of the Governor General in Council and Members of the Council are able to influence the military policy, but under the new constitution, Defence has been entirely excluded and in future, it would be the concern of the Governor General alone. Moreover the Finance Department and the Military Accounts Department are to be separated from the General Accounts Department. The policy of

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

increasing association of Indians with the Defence is gradually receding to the background and, in this matter, there is a definite deterioration and the curve of Indianisation is definitely moving downwards.

As regards Indianization of the officer rank, this is a subject which has so often been discussed in this House, but it is so important that it would bear a repetition. There are more than 7,000 British officers in our army and we have to replace them by Indian officers. That was the question before the Defence Committee in England and that question has been discussed by several expert committees. Those expert committees have decided this much that Indianisation is possible and that it is a practicable proposition and that it can be carried out within thirty years. It was in 1922 that the military experts committee decided that the Indian army could be completely Indianised within thirty years and that, by 1952, the last British officer will have left this country.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: It was 25 years according to the Rawlinson Committee.

Sardar Mangal Singh: My Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, although he served in the army, does not know which committee has decided this.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Which committee recommended this? None as far as I know. Though one of the members had drawn up a scheme showing that such replacement was possible within a certain number of years.

Sardar Mangal Singh: For his information I will refer him to Shea Committee Report.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: No, it is the Rawlinson Committee.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: That committee made no such recommendation.

Sardar Mangal Singh: But the Government of India took more than ten years to decide their course of action. In 1932 they decided, that by 1952 they will not Indianise the whole of the Indian army but that they will Indianise only one division consisting of 12 infantry regiments, three cavalry regiments and some ancillary services. Now, they propose not to replace the British officers alone; they are at the present moment replacing Viceroy's Commissioned Indian officers by Indian officers and they call this Indianisation. In all seriousness and in all humility, I put it to the Army Secretary whether this is Indianisation. They are Indianising a complete war division and, for this, we have to produce about less than 200 Indian officers. But under their scheme we will have to produce about 500 Indian officers because we will first replace the Viceroy's Commissioned officers and, after that, we will begin to replace the King's Commissioned officers. I may tell the House that it would probably be in 1942 that the first British officer would be replaced by an Indian officer in this division which we are going to Indianise. If I am wrong, I stand corrected. In this matter I have to submit that this method of Indianisation is entirely wrong and their manner of proceeding is further defective. I quite agree, although for different reasons, with

my Honourable friend, Mr. Gadgil, that their method of recruitment to the Military Academy, Dehra Dun, is defective. I, of course, do not agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, that this breakdown of the scheme is due to the recruitment of "Y" cadets from the army. For aught I know of the inner conditions of Dehra Dun Academy, the nominated cadets from the army are doing much better than the competition-wallas. (Hear, hear.) I submit that we should press that the number of "Y" cadets should be increased in future (Hear, hear), so that the right type of men may come to take the place of the British officers. In this respect, I would remind the Honourable Members and my Honourable friend, the Defence Secretary, that when they say definitely that they would not take soldiers from certain classes, because they are not good soldiers, I would ask the Army Secretary how can he prove that if they are not good soldiers, they will make good officers.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Secretary, Defence Department): When did I say so? Will the Honourable Member refer me to any statement that I have made to that effect?

Sardar Mangal Singh: The Honourable the Defence Secretary has several times, in answer to questions on the floor of the House, said that they were not recruiting from certain classes, because they would not make good soldiers.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: All that I said was that we recruit from certain classes, because they make better soldiers than other classes.

Sardar Mangal Singh: That is the same thing. I do not suggest for a moment that the military authorities are doing it deliberately with the object to make this scheme a failure, but if they were to do it deliberately they would proceed exactly in the way in which they are proceeding now. In the Dehra Dun Academy they are taking men about whom I can say definitely that they would not prove good soldiers. The figures that I have collected definitely prove that out of those cadets who have been turned out of the academy on account of inefficiency, about 80 per cent. of those people come from the non-listed classes. Again, when the successful cadets go to the army, there is a tendency amongst officers from the non-listed classes to leave the army and join the Political Department and other departments. Sir, I respectfully submit to the army authorities that they should take only those men who are anxious to make the army their profession for the rest of their life. I would not allow the army to be used as a stepping stone to secure employment in other departments. I am sorry for my Honourable friend who, although he declares definitely today that he is no longer a soldier but represents the soldiers in this House, has, whenever any army question comes up in this House, betrayed the interest of the army. And I request the army authorities to nominate only such officers here who would stand by the army, who would stand by the men and officers and would guard their interests.

Then, Sir, in the third place comes the replacement of the rank and file of the British Army. I do not expect that the military authorities for a moment doubt the courage, the loyalty and the bravery of the Indian soldier. And when they dare not say that, I would ask them, why

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

not remove the British soldier from the soil of this country? What are they here for? Why should they be paid from the Indian exchequer when we can have equally efficient, equally brave and equally courageous soldiers at four times cheaper rates? Incidentally I may also mention that the British Army at least is maintained here for Imperial purposes. And such being the position, the British Government should pay a large share of the expenditure of the Indian army. This has been admitted in this pamphlet which has been distributed officially:

"It is a plain fact that the focus of world unrest has shifted eastwards and ever further eastwards since the great war, and that the army in India at present occupy the front line of resistance to any threat to the Empire as a whole."

When this is the position, why should not England pay a substantial share of the military expenditure of the Indian Army? I submit, that either they should withdraw the British Army and replace it by Indians or at least they should pay the full cost of the British Army, that is stationed in India. That would satisfy public opinion in this country in this respect.

Sir, I have, during the course of my observations, shown that without reducing the efficiency and without reducing the strength of the Indian Army the expenditure on the army can be considerably reduced, if Government would only consider it proper to trust the Indian soldier and no longer want that counterpoise which was put into force after the mutiny of 1857.

Sir, I support the motion.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, it is one of the great tragedies of this country that we should discuss a vital issue like this in an atmosphere of unreality. Sir, it is an atmosphere of unreality for this reason, namely, as the House very well knows, whatever we may say or we may do, it is not going to make a pennyworth of difference to the budget. If some more proof is wanted of this, one of the Commander-in-Chiefs of this country has already said that it is not left to the Government of India, not even to the Indian Army Authorities, either to increase the Indian Army or to reduce the British Army in India. That being the case, it might be thought that it is absolutely useless to discuss this proposition here. But, whatever it may be, this drama is played every year in this House, and it would not be fair for us, who have been elected as representatives of the people, not to take part in this farce that goes on year after year. We have been well accustomed to the policy that robs us of the promises which have been given to us, for what is the vital issue that is before

the House? I refuse to think that it is a question of Rs. 8 crores, or Rs. 10 crores, or Rs. 30 crores or Rs. 40 crores. Sir, the vital issue before the House is the defence of the country. And who is going to defend? That is the vital issue. After all, points of honour cannot be settled by economical principles. One of the great English writers has said that an Englishman always does things on principles. If he wants to cheat, he will cheat on commercial principles (Laughter), and here we are going to be persuaded that the defence of the country, which is a point of honour and which ought to be a point of honour with every nation and every people on God's earth, is going to be settled by economical principles. It cannot be. After all, Indianization was accepted, not by the Government of India, but by the British Government, and it will not be amiss to go into the history of this Indianisation, so that we may realise that whether it is on the Civil side, whether it is on the Dominion side or whether it is on the Indianization side we have always been cheated. After the principle of Indianization was accepted, we had an era of Committees as usual. We had the Shea Committee, we had the Skeen Committee, we had a number of Committees

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: The Military Requirements Committee.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: The Indianisation of the Indian Army Committee, the Military Requirements Committee, and, on the top of that, we had the Capitation Tribunal—and the Rawlinson Committee. But what is the moral of all this? The moral and the substance of this is that Indianisation was accepted. Some committees were favourable to us, other committees were unfavourable. Now, the reports of those committees which were favourable to us—the committees which said that complete Indianisation was possible, the committees which said that within the next 20 years, 50 per cent. of the Indian Army should be indianised—were never presented to some of other committees which came subsequently. If this is not downright fraud, what is it? I suppose in military language it is called a strategy, a strategy of acquiring everything without undergoing any expense or firing a shot. Wellington is supposed to have displayed the greatest strategy at the campaign of Telavera, because he won the campaign without firing a shot. I say that those who are responsible for our military policy, for what in popular parlance would be called fraud, but which in military language would be called strategy, are even better than the Duke of Wellington. Eventually, this indianisation became the indianisation of units. From the indianisation of the army, we came down to the indianisation of officers, and then we came down to the indianisation of units, and we have had opinions offered in this House, so that we may be reasonable enough to understand that complete indianisation was impossible. Now, there is one advantage in discussing this question today, and it is this. We have always been charged with making destructive criticism. But when we make a constructive criticism, we are told that it is an arm-chair criticism, that this criticism is not made by people who hear the whine of bullets in a frontier valley, that, this criticism is not made by people who see faces going black when death takes its toll in the ranks. Therefore, when we do make our criticism, if it is constructive criticism, we are arm-chair critics. If, on the other hand, we are not in a position to make constructive criticism—because, whenever we make constructive criticism, it will not be followed and cannot be followed—then

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

our criticism is supposed to be destructive. Therefore, heads they win, tails we lose. It is always India that loses and it is the other side that always wins. This is so far as the principle of indianisation is concerned.

Now, the military are those who are responsible for military policy, and I do not want to blame the Government of India, not even the Indian military authorities, because I know that they are absolutely powerless. The Commander-in-Chief himself has said that the policy is laid down by the Imperial Defence Committee who are in consultation with the Cabinet. They lay down the policy. Whatever show the Government of India may put up here, they cannot change a letter, they cannot change a comma, they cannot reduce a rupee, and, therefore, my criticism is not directed towards the Official Benches. But what I feel about it is that it is a distinct tragedy for the nation and that it is a distinct tragedy that the Government which is supposed to govern us and which is supposed to be responsible for the welfare, for the discipline, for the character, of the people, arrogates to itself the authority for everything without educating us for the responsibility that we are to assume in this life.

After the strategy come the tactics. After all, I am in sympathy with the Army Department or those who represent the army here when I see that they have to find out some kind of excuse for the policy that is denied to them, but I hope that they will also have sympathy for us when they see us utterly disgusted over a vital question like this. Year after year we put up these legitimate claims—elementary claims of the nation which may be considered as their absolute birthright, because if defence is not the birthright of the nation, I fail to see how any other claim or any other right can be the birthright of any people. I am not criticising, therefore, except the tactics that were followed. And what were the tactics that had to be followed? We have a kind of Military Academy, and because you cannot have indianisation, the rate at which indianisation is going to take place is to be extremely slow—I think you yourself pointed out that it will take something like 700 years for indianisation. Therefore, the admissions to the Academy must be cut down. The admissions to the Academy cannot be more than 60 per year. The admissions to Sandhurst, Woolwich, Cranwell, have to be limited. It was not merely by means of restricting admissions that the rate of Indianisation was retarded, but in many other ways, the tactics were followed so that Indianisation may not go forward at a rapid pace. One of the most diabolic ways of preventing Indianisation is the division of Indian races into martial and non-martial races, because it creates dissension. Even in this very House today we saw that over an innocent remark of my friend, Mr. Gadgil, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan took umbrage and said why should a man from the ranks be prevented from accepting commissions? I will be false to history, I will be false to my own opinions which I have always held, that traditions have nothing to do with the matter at all, that this stress on traditions is absolutely false and is merely an excuse to keep away the people from their legitimate rights. I have no objection to officers being taken from the ranks. I can point out to you that it is not merely the scions of great families and prominent families and educated people who have become great generals. Look at Napoleon's generals: look at the republican generals—Marshal Ney and Marshal Murat and others: anybody who is conversant with history will tell you that they

were taken from the ordinary people and they proved themselves to be the ablest generals of the times. Therefore, I do not object to the officers being chosen from the ranks. But this I do say, that by putting unnecessary importance on martial and non-martial races unnecessary divisions have been made. By putting unnecessary importance on officers chosen from the ranks as against officers directly recruited, there again another dissension has been made; and I say that it is absolutely unnecessary to make all these dissensions. What I would say is this: if a boy is capable, if he proves himself capable in a competitive examination—because after all there cannot be a better test of competency than competition and not relying merely . . .

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated: Non-Official): Arithmetic and Mensuration?

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Yes, yes: I know all that, because if that were so, my Honourable friend could not have been a Captain and there might have been better Captains of the people. (Laughter.) I say you should rely on competency alone, not because it affects the eye, or something else; I have had a little experience of this in my own line—the I. M. S. where the competitive examination has been abolished and selection has taken its place: I fail to see how you can get competent material for officers by a slipshod, neopotic method, a method of favouritism like this: and the only reason that I can think of, why this method is followed, is that competent boys will be rejected and all kinds of excuses put forward and I can say that those boys of parents from the ranks, whose cause the Honourable Member is championing, if they have a little self-respect will not get admission: what the Government want is that even the parents of these rankers must be absolutely docile—in common parlance we call them toadies—who will say “yes” to everything that their superior officer says. The subject is a very large one, I know . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only one minute more. (Laughter.)

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Sir, I want to make only one point: what are the traditions on which they lay so much stress? Take your air force. In 1914 what traditions had you? Do you forget, that for the defence of London you had to request the French Government to come forward and lend their assistance for the aerial defence of London? And your air traditions, if there are any, can only have been built after 1914. If that is the case, in this country, could not the same traditions have been built up? Could not your air force have been manned by Indians? And yet what is happening today? There are 2,000 officers in your air force. How many of them are Indians? Hardly 100.

Coming to the Navy, this country had a navy at one time. If you will permit me, I can prove that there was a navy at one time: it is immaterial whether it was a regular navy or not, but we had a naval tradition. That tradition was completely killed and annihilated by this Government. I will read the resolution of the Surat Council in 1651—and this also relates to my race and Mr. Gadgil's race or the Mahratta race—but I do not want to be misinterpreted by my other non-martial or martial friends in this House—I make no distinction. I say it is environment and nothing else

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

and all this talk of tradition is pure bunkum: in the Surat Council this was the resolution:

"So long as that pirate and universal robber lives who has no regard for friend or foe, God nor man, there can be no security in any trade in this country."

And the Surat factory had to be closed down by the greatest power of our own day—that is the British nation. Therefore, to say that we had no navy and there cannot be any naval traditions in this country and, therefore, we should not have a navy, is, I repeat again, utterly false. I find, that out of 114 men or personnel of the Royal Indian Navy, only four are Indians. This is the respect which is paid to the traditions. Therefore, it all comes to this. We have been cheated out of the regular Indianisation on excuses which have been put forward, which are absolutely flimsy and flabby,—I may say even mean and fraudulent; and because we have been cheated out of our birthright, that is the defence of our own country; I oppose this grant and support the amendment.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Sir, may I rise to a point of order? Formerly it was the practice that the Government Member used to give us a summary of what had been done in the course of the year on the budget speech: and very often it was the Commander-in-Chief. Since then, also the Secretary in the Army Department during his speech on the budget used to give us a resume of what had been done in the course of the year. I speak subject to correction, because I was not present here at the time of general discussion—no such thing has been done in this House up to the present moment, and I want to know whether it is the desire of the Government that we on this side should express our opinions first and then they should give a reply to our criticisms. Is it not fair that we should know something from them also before any debate, worth the name of a debate, can take place in this House?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I say, Sir, that I am not aware of the practice, to which the Honourable Member refers, when he says that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief or the Army Secretary used to give a summary of events that have taken place during the year in the course of the budget speeches. That was probably before my time.

Mr. M. S. Aney: That is a fact.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: You may take it from me that that is so.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Last year, I intervened in the debate at an earlier stage, and I am prepared to do so now, if Honourable Members wish.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Yes, I do wish it and I am sure the House would welcome it. I was speaking for myself.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I would also say that, even if we have not given in a speech a summary of events during the year, we do now publish and place in the hands of Honourable Members a written summary of the important events that have taken place during the year, and that has already been placed in the hands of Honourable Members.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member wish to speak now? Does any other Member of Government wish to speak now? The Chair takes it that the Defence Secretary will reply to the debate.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Yes, he will reply to the debate.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am quite prepared to reply to the debate now.

Several Honourable Members from the Opposition Branches: No, no, not now.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: No, no, you cannot make the final reply. If the Government really wish to take up the position that they must have the last word, then, Sir, there is no debate in this House at all.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot force any Honourable Member to speak on the debate, Government have certainly a right of reply. If any Honourable Member representing Government wishes to take part in the debate at this stage, certainly he will be allowed to do so.

(At this stage, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan rose to address the House.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti and other Honourable Members of the Opposition: Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan does not represent the Government. He cannot address the House.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Sir, I am in possession of the House. I raised the point of order, and I take it that the Government do not wish to take part in the debate at this stage, but would resort to the last word. If that is so, then I would avail myself of your permission to speak.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot ask the Honourable Member to reply, because it has considered all the rulings on the point and has come to the conclusion that the practice of treating this as an amendment is a right one, and, therefore, the Chair cannot allow the Honourable Member to make the final reply.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: The motion is moved by the Honourable the Finance Member. He asks for the grant on behalf of the Government. That is the motion. To that motion, an amendment is moved. Therefore, the only Member who is entitled to reply is the Mover of the motion, and that is the Finance Member. Any other Member, whether on the Government Bench or on the Opposition Bench, I say, Sir, with great respect, can only take part in the debate. That has been the practice all along. There is no question about it. The Mover of the motion is the Finance Member, the Mover of the amendment is my friend, Mr. Gauba. Then, it is open to any other Honourable Member to participate in the debate as a Member, but one would have expected that the Government would put up their spokesman to place their case at an early stage of the debate. As the position stands, this is all one-sided expression of views, and I don't think it is fair or it is even regular.

An Honourable Member: There is no fairness.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: As regards the fairness, I cannot pronounce an opinion on it. Apparently, there is only one Honourable Member who is in a position to speak on this subject, and that is the Defence Secretary. The debate now is on the amendment to the motion moved by the Honourable the Finance Member, and, so far as this debate is concerned, I will allow the Defence Secretary to reply, but I do point out that it is extremely desirable that some other Member of Government, if possible, should intervene in the debate and state the Government case so that other Honourable Members may reply.

(Again, at this stage, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan stood up to speak.)

Honourable Members of the Opposition: You are not a Member of the Government. You cannot speak now.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does Mr. Jinnah want to speak now?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Yes, certainly, Sir. Only I wanted to make the position quite clear. (Applause from the Opposition Benches.)

Sir, I enter my most emphatic protest against the attitude that the Government have adopted in this matter. I think, Sir, it is this sort of attitude which reduces this Legislature to an absolute farce. ("Hear, hear" from Opposition Benches.) Just imagine, Sir, speaker after speaker has put the case from the Opposition Benches. We are told there is only one man on the Treasury Benches who has got the entire store of knowledge with regard to the army, and nobody else. Sir, I can quite understand the Defence Secretary taking part in the debate and if any new points are raised by speakers thereafter in the debate, surely some other Member of the Government should be competent enough to reply to those points. Really, Sir, I must enter my most emphatic protest against this practice, because this is really getting worse and worse. I shall not say anything more now. Let me get to my speech, because I have got very limited time.

Sir, this question has been debated on the floor of this House for many years now, and I am one of those who had taken some part in the debates on previous occasions on this subject. The position, when boiled down, comes to this. The policy of the Government is that the army in India is a garrison, and it shall remain a garrison, that the British Raj is the occupation of India, supported by a garrison. We on this side desire that that occupation should cease and the army should be truly national and peoples' army.

An Honourable Member: The British will then have to pack off.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: These are two opposite policies, they are like poles asunder. How is it then possible for us to meet the Treasury Bench or for the Treasury Bench to meet us? I have felt that it is useless, it is hopeless to argue on the floor of this House, because, when, after years and years of struggle, we have forced them morally, when they have exhausted every plausible excuse, they make some sort of a declaration of policy similar to the one which we heard the other day, that the British Government is solemnly pledged that the ultimate goal of India is Dominion Status

and responsible Government. So, in this matter, the ultimate goal is the Indianisation of the army, the ultimate goal is that the occupation will cease and the garrison will be nationalised army. That is the ultimate goal. Well, some of us are pleased and say: "We are on the right lines, Oh, we shall get something". We have taken the horse to water, but he does not drink. What are we to do? Sir, I have said over and again, and repeat again before this House, that the total number of vacancies per year, so far as the officer rank in the Indian Army is concerned, is about 120. It was with the greatest difficulty that we were able to induce Government to give some sort of a number at the Round Table Conference, and it is round about 120. Now, I ask the Treasury Bench, and I ask you, Sir, can't we give 120 youngmen from amongst a population of three hundred and fifty millions of our countrymen? We are told that suitable material is not forthcoming. But mind you, 120 vacancies are not all allotted to us. That is the total number we are recruiting, I don't think it is one third even—that is assigned to Indians. Therefore, it means about 30 at the utmost.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: 60 a year.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Of course, I stand corrected, but I am not really
3 P. M. sure that that is the correct figure.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There are sixty candidates taken every year into the Indian Military Academy, and about sixty cadets pass out every year.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I say, the number passed and admitted as King's Commissioned Officers—we want that number, and not the total number at the College. It means it is not the same. My Honourable friend has forgotten his finance. (To Honourable Sir James Grigg.)

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I see all right. But he did not say what you said he said.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I understand the Defence Secretary, but the Finance Member does not understand. He is out of it. The Defence Secretary and I understand. What the Defence Secretary means is this. We have got the full number at the College, 60, but, out of those 60, you see there is a course of 2½ or 3 years, every year the number that actually obtains the Commission is about one-third.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The actual number that obtain commission every year is 60.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I beg your pardon. I say, I am not prepared, unless I am satisfied, I will not agree with that. I say, the total number of vacancies that occur in the course of a year is 120, and I refuse to accept that out of 120, 60 Commissions are given to Indians every year. I refuse to accept that. If the Defence Secretary will quote to me the authority and the figures, then I shall consider whether he is right or not.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I can explain the position.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I do not want his explanation. (Laughter.) I want a straight answer to a straight question. Does the Defence Secretary say that last year 60 Commissioned Officers passed and were given their Commissions in the army—Indians?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I still say no. I do not believe that unless I see the record. It is impossible to believe that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Viceroy's Commissions included?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That may be so.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: If I may say so, where the Honourable Member has gone wrong is in saying that the total number of vacancies is 120. The total number of vacancies for the Indian Army at present may be 120. The Indian army, as he is aware, consists of infantry and cavalry only. The programme of Indianisation now in the course of progress includes other arms, artillery, engineers, and so on, which hitherto have been parts of the British Army. Therefore, the requirements for our Indianising division are greater proportionately than they would be if it was a purely infantry and cavalry formation.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Now, I understand. I was talking of Sandhurst; I was not talking of anything else. I was talking purely of Sandhurst, and I repeat again, and I say, unless my memory betrays me,—I say, and I have no doubt with regard to the statement that I am making, that the total vacancies for Sandhurst—I repeat that again,—we found after great difficulty, were 120, and the number allotted to Indians every year that will obtain the King's Commission is not even one-third of it, I repeat that again. That is my point. But this is merely going away from the real point. The real point is this. Take 60 if you like, take 100, take 120. My point remains, I refuse to believe this, only the man, who believes that is fit to be in the lunatic asylum,—to say that India cannot give you 120 men fit to have the King's Commission out of 350 millions, I cannot believe it, it is impossible for me to believe it. What happens? We have now got the horse to the water. The horse does not want to drink. (Laughter.) Put a little whisky. (Laughter.) Rub his nose. (Laughter.) Therefore, we are merely beating the air. The policy is fundamentally different—their policy and ours. For the first time we heard on high authority from the *ex-Commander-in-Chief* that suitable materials were not forthcoming, the national leaders of the country were not forthcoming to take the responsibility of the defence of the country—men who ought to be in the army. That is one accusation. The other accusation is, an insinuation is made that the martial classes—we have committed ourselves to give them a fairly large number—are such a poor material that really it is not satisfactory. It is in order to set up the non-martial classes against the martial classes, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, happened to make that statement *bona fide*, with a *bona fide* impression. That perhaps is the real reason, and he quotes it, because it is put into his mouth by a high authority. Up jumps my Honourable friend there—Captain Sher Muhammad Khan,—and protests against it, and, on that ground, says that he will not support this motion. Sir, that is the old game. If there is no class, they create a class; if there is a class; they keep them separate and divide them. They give us enough work to go for each other, and fight against each other, and the Treasury Bench is quite happy. I appeal to my Honourable friends on the Opposition Bench. It is the Government's policy, we know it. The Englishman does not say it in so many words. That is his great characteristic. He

understands what he is doing, he does not want to tell you what he is doing. It is for you to understand what he is doing and find a remedy. Let us also search our own hearts. My Honourable friend, Mr. Gadgil, made a splendid speech, but he wound up with the fervour of the Mahrattas. Where do I come in?

An Honourable Member: You are a Mahratta. You live in Western India.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Unfortunately I am not. Where do I come in? The Mahrattas to rule India. Let us also search our own hearts? Let us also analyse our own weaknesses, our own faults, and create that sanction behind, that the Treasury Bench may understand your language also. But unfortunately that is wanting at present. May I also tell the Treasury Bench that the more you go on with this policy—it may be, temporarily, provisionally you are scoring, but you are making a great mistake, the greatest mistake. If you really wish to remain friends with India—there is a long way yet—if you really think of the future, I appeal to you, if my appeal can be of any value to you, don't treat India like this. Be honest and straightforward in your policy. If you wish to Indianise the army, if you want to Indianise the officer rank, believe me, you can do it, and there is no obstacle in your way, unless you want to make excuses. It is for you to decide, but I have no misgivings that at the present moment you do not wish it. That is not your policy and you want to make every possible excuse that you can and try to put us off the scent. Do it if you want to do it.

Then, with regard to the British troops, it was said, if I remember rightly, at the Round Table Conference, that the British troops must be reduced gradually, and again there is an admission that they must be reduced or that they may be removed altogether in course of time, *but gradually*. Who is to decide what is the meaning of "Gradually"? After that pronouncement of policy in the Round Table Conference by His Majesty's Government,—they were a party to it—I was horrified to hear here a pronouncement made by the Commander-in-Chief that it was impossible to reduce or do away with any portion of the British troops. I hope I am not misquoting.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: He never made such a statement.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Not a violent statement. He politely told the Council of State that it cannot be done.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: He said that it cannot be done immediately.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is it. That is exactly what I said—gradually. I understand your language perfectly, but the misfortune is that my countrymen do not understand your language. That is my misfortune. I have said enough to show where we stand. It is up to us to do the needful. Let me appeal to you, my countrymen, and say that it is in your hands. Can you do it? If you can unite, it will be done.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is no use avoiding the issue or ignoring the facts. It is an admitted fact that in this country there is nobody who agreed with the military

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

policy of the Government. The military policy, which has been pursued by the Government, had been criticised ever since the present Reforms came into existence, and Government have been sleeping on the demands which have been consistently made every year on the floor of the House for the Indianisation of the Indian Army. In 1923, I had moved a Resolution that all future recruitment of British officers for the Indian Army should be stopped and the officers in the Indian regiments should be recruited from amongst Indians. When I moved that Resolution, it was about five in the afternoon, and, after I had moved that Resolution, the debate was adjourned for about a week or so. Next day, the then Commander-in-Chief, the late Lord Rawlinson, came with his suggestion which acted like a bolt from the blue. He announced that eight Indian units would be Indianised at once, and the result was that the House, which was with me in the morning, left me, and I had only 16 votes left with me. They wanted me to withdraw, but I did not withdraw, because I knew that there would come a day when I would stand justified.

An Honourable Member: You have grown wiser since then?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Shut up please. Those Indianised units today are like the depressed classes and no officer of that regiment is feeling happy. I think, Sir, according to the policy which is being pursued by the Government in the matter of Indianisation, it will take not decades, but centuries to Indianise the whole of the Indian regiments. Leaving aside the British troops, what we wanted as a first step was that at least our own Indian regiments should have their own officers. When India can produce soldiers, when India can produce, as in the War, even good officers, when we had even Indian officers who were commanding British troops during the War, why should not Indians be given the chance to become officers? In the War, there were several cases when no British officer was left to guide the British troops, the Indian officers took the command and distinguished themselves. When we have known that even people from the ranks rose to great distinction, what is the justification for not giving us a proper chance to defend our own shores? I do not minimise the good work which has been done by the British officers in the Indian regiments, but whatever they might have done, they are not to be expected to continue to be officers of the Indian regiments, simply because at one time they were very useful. An Indian can hold charge of a big province. An Indian, not of the millowner class, to which my friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, referred, even of the same class as my friend can go up to command an Indian regiment. People, who started in the army with a low position, have risen to very high position. We have got an example in the Marshal of our Assembly who distinguished himself in many spheres. He started with a very small position, and he rose to be a Captain with great distinction. There is no argument in the Government saying that recruits will come little by little or in a progressive manner, and that it cannot be done immediately. When my friend, Mr. Jinnah, asks "Cannot India produce 120 men who can take up positions as recruits for Sandhurst", Government come up and say "there are not sufficiently qualified people and that sufficient material is not forthcoming". It is the fault of the Government that they are not getting people who will be suitable for the Indian Sandhurst. If they say that they are not going to have recruits from the other classes:

except those classes who are called the martial classes, and if these martial classes are poor people, if the Indian officers holding Viceroy's Commissions are, in fact, poor people, then they cannot afford their sons to be educated at Dehra Dun; and, if that is so, then it is the duty of the Government to give them proper subsidies and scholarships so as to be trained properly (Hear, hear), and they should do something material to educate them. When, Sir, we find that the Indian Government are sending some people to be taught abroad as mechanical and electrical engineers, and when we find them awarding scholarships in other cases, then, I ask, why should not scholarships be given for the benefit of the poor Indian officers holding Viceroy's Commissions who cannot afford to send their boys up, but who nevertheless can accomplish great things and who will be a credit to this country? (Hear, hear.)

Sir, a great deal has been made out on the political ground. My friend says that he should come up and everybody must come up and allowed to be made an officer. I say, Sir, this is not the time that the other classes should come up and seek to join the army by reason merely of the fact that they are not now allowed to, when people who ought to get it, who have been serving this country in the military sphere, the truly martial classes, are not getting the King's Commission in sufficient numbers; this is not the time for you to get the principle accepted that those classes, whose profession was never to go into the military profession, should be taken up as officers. That would be inconsistent, because, Sir, the soldier, whoever he may be, likes to be officered and to be commanded by a person who really belongs to his own class, the fighting and martial class, who can, in fact, prove himself to be as brave as he is. You must remember there are so many other difficulties. Thus, everyone knows that, so long as the caste system remains in this country, you are bound to have this result that there will be separate military castes. The martial and non-martial classes must exist as long as the caste system exists in this country; and, if that caste system is done away with, then and then alone will the martial classes disappear at once. . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I know from the Honourable Member whether all the Mussalmans belong to the martial races?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: There are many classes of people who cannot be called to belong to the martial classes among the Mussalmans. I do not say that all the Mussalmans belong to the martial classes.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What class do I come from?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, asks me whether he belongs to the martial or non-martial class. The simple question is this: has anybody of Mr. Jinnah's class or of his community served as a soldier or not? If he tells me that there is a single soldier of his class in the army, then I would include him. . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: One soldier will do, one soldier will do?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: One good soldier will do. If my Honourable friend can furnish one man from out of his class as an ordinary soldier, as a private, then he is entitled to make good in his profession and come up as a General, and I do not mind it, but the creation of Generals on paper won't do.

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

Here, Sir, I have got a grievance against the Government, namely, that they are flouting the opinion of this House. Last time they carried one Bill and they made it into law, which was not desirable from many points of view. That was, of course, carried by the votes of the Assembly, and nobody can say that was not carried constitutionally, but I must say today that that law is not justified, that is not a law which is wanted in the country, no "martial class" man is pleased with that, and the greatest mistake, the greatest blunder Government are making is this, that they are alienating the sympathies of the martial classes and they are not pleasing the other classes, and thus they are losing both sides at the same time. (Hear, hear.) They must have somebody who must be satisfied at least; the martial classes have got their grievances on account of the policy which is pursued in recruiting the officer-class at Dehra Dun; so they are not satisfied. I think I am right in voicing the feelings of all the martial classes in this country. Then, I think, my Honourable friend, Mr. Gadgil, represents the "other class", and, well, he has shown that they are not satisfied too. Then, my Honourable friend, Sardar Mangal Singh, coming from the martial classes, has voiced their feelings perfectly correctly. . . . (Interruptions.)

Sir H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): Our community is also greatly dissatisfied. (Laughter.)

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I would like the Bombay Knight certainly to come up and command a big regiment of Parsis who should get themselves enrolled as a reserve force of India.

Sir Oowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): The martial classes will wipe them out in one battle! (Laughter.)

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I agree that the Bombay Parsis will be a very good substitute for the martial classes in India. (Hear, hear.) They are all financiers of course.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How are you going to vote—tell us that?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let the Honourable Member proceed with his speech.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: (Interruptions.) Sir, I object to these interruptions; if people want that parliamentary language must be used, they must behave in a parliamentary manner; if they cannot do so, they must know that they will be treated, as they deserve to be. (*Ironical cries of "Hear, hear."*)

Sir, there is one thing on which I want to lay a great emphasis, and that is this, and here I think I am voicing the feeling of the whole country, that the British troops ought not to be paid from the Indian exchequer. I do not say that the British troops should not remain in this country. There are many considerations on account of which British troops cannot be sent away, but the British troops in this country are not the permanent soldiers of India. The troops that are stationed in India come out here for a few years, and then they go away to some other country. They do not develop any sympathy for India, they do not stand as an Indian army, while our Indian regiments are the true Indian army.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I will conclude shortly. Therefore, if these troops are stationed in India simply to serve the purposes of the Imperial Government, then it is but right that this country must not pay for them and the country whose interest they are serving should pay for them. (Hear, hear.) Sir, these are the two points which have been pressed year after year in this country, and as Government have never listened to our voice, and although I am generally against every motion of that kind which merely discusses a policy and then seeks to refuse a grant, although I have never supported that kind of cut so far, yet, in this case, I think it is the duty of every Indian to support this cut motion. (Applause.)

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, once more it falls to my lot to oppose a motion which is intended as a general censure on the defence policy of the Government of India, but the only practical effect of which, if it were passed and if the cut were not restored, would be to deprive a certain number of hard working and innocent clerks in my own Department of their livelihood.

Sir Gowasji Jehangir: You take four lakhs from the amount provided for Quetta.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: It would have no effect whatever on the defence budget proper. I wonder how Honourable Members would give their votes today if I were to tell them that Government have no intention of restoring this cut, if it is passed.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: We shall congratulate ourselves.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: They may say that it would place them in a very unfair position, if Government were to resort to tactics of that kind. I do agree with a great many Honourable Members who have spoken today that we are discussing this matter in an air of unreality and it is in many ways an anomalous position. But I do wish to point out that the unfairness is not altogether on one side. There are other means open to Honourable Members for voicing their disapproval of particular aspects of defence policy. I do not think they can deny that their real object in moving a cut motion of this kind is to force the Governor General to use his special powers to restore the grant.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is the intention.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That brings me to the first main point that I have to make. As various Honourable Members have said, year after year we have exactly the same discussion on general lines on this subject. Year after year, the same old arguments are trotted out, some true, some half true and some not true at all; and year after year, I am expected to get up and within the short space of half an hour to cover the whole range of the defence budget and incidentally to provide a target for the big guns opposite. I really do not quite see why I should do so.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Because you are paid to do it.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: We never get down to any details in this discussion on army expenditure. We very seldom hear any really constructive criticism. I do not object to that so much, but I do say that this annual debate on policy serves very little purpose. I know, Sir, that Honourable Members may say: "That is not our fault. All we know about the army is that it costs a great deal too much and that it is being Indianised much too slowly. We do not know anything about the details of defence administration because you will not let us". That also is a contention which I should like to challenge today. I do say, that during the last four or five years, Honourable Members of this House have been given ample opportunities to learn a great deal about the details of defence administration. But, somehow, Honourable Members do not seem to trouble their heads very much about the details of defence administration from year's end to year's end; and then, just on one occasion, once a year, they concentrate their forces, they put down a verbal barrage of great intensity, they deliver a crushing blow and they cause the Viceroy to restore the cut; and then, Sir, they sink back into contented apathy for the rest of the year until the Budget Session comes round again.

An Honourable Member: What is the alternative? You go on in your usual way in spite of our protests.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Does the Honourable Member know that a non-official Member moved in the other House that a Committee should be appointed of both Houses but that the Commander-in-Chief turned it down.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Even this year, we passed such a motion in this House.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I know such a motion was moved today in another place.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: This very Session we passed a motion in this House for the appointment of a committee.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I also remind Honourable Members that the argument put forward in favour of appointing a Committee to advise the Government was that Honourable Members of this House at present do not know anything about defence and that they would like to learn?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Quite so.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That does not seem to be a very good argument in favour of a claim to give advice.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Otherwise we will never learn.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I may point out that Honourable Members could have learnt a good deal more about defence if only they had taken advantage of the opportunities offered to them.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If you like, we will go to a school to learn.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: We laid before the Retrenchment Committee of this House the most detailed information on all subjects under the Defence head. We have appointed Members of this House to be Members of the Military Accounts Committee which reports to the Public Accounts

Committee. Our Financial Adviser has taken a great deal of trouble in preparing explanations on interesting subjects such as Military Engineer Services expenditure and administration, or on the working of our Ordnance Factories but the Members of the Military Accounts Committee, who have taken part in its proceedings, I am afraid, pay comparatively little attention to those interesting and complicated matters. They prefer to concentrate their attention on individual cases of financial irregularities. In addition to that we have issued, during the last few years, pamphlets and reports, many of them at the wish of this House; and we have been taking special steps recently to get into closer touch with the Press and to give them information on many controversial matters connected with Defence. All that work that we have been doing entails a great deal of labour and trouble for the staff of my Department whose fate is now hanging in the balance; and that, Sir, is the sort of atmosphere in which we have to work. I do suggest that we have some reason to complain on our side and some reason also not to take quite at their face value the protestations of certain Honourable Members who say that their one object is to learn more about Defence so that they may help instead of hinder the administration.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to follow today those who have spoken in general terms as usual on the subject of Indianisation or those who have spoken in similar terms on the general level of defence expenditure. I dealt very fully indeed last year with our policy of Indianisation and I could not do justice to that subject again this year without repeating wholly what I said last year, and that would take far too long. If Honourable Members are interested in this subject, they will find all that we have to say about it in the debate that took place on the 12th March, 1935. All I can say, as I have said before, is, first that we are now working out a definite experimental policy for the Indianisation of the army on a fairly large scale, based on the complete substitution of Indian for British officers in a very considerable part of the army; secondly, that there can be no alteration or extension of that policy until a sufficient number of Indian officers have successfully reached the position of commanders of companies and squadrons; and, thirdly, that that position cannot, in the nature of things, be reached for another two or three years. Whether that policy is a good policy or a bad policy—and I do honestly believe that very few Honourable Members have really taken the trouble to understand it—whether it is a good policy or a bad policy, Government, I submit, would lay themselves open to a charge of singular inconsistency and vacillation if they were to agree at this stage to alter it in any material particulars.

Now, Sir, in the speeches that have been made by Honourable Members today, as usual, the arguments have gone a long way to cancel each other out. One Honourable Member wants us to confine the recruitment of officers to the martial classes. Other Honourable Members complain that we are taking far too many cadets from the Indian Army. We have also heard criticisms of our methods of recruitment and we have also had allusions to what Sir Philip Chetwode said last year on the subject of the material at the Academy. Now, Sir, these methods of recruitment, I would remind the House, are the methods that were definitely approved and recommended by the Indian Military College Committee, which contained representatives of this House: that is to say, half the vacancies are offered to open competition, irrespective of caste, creed or anything else, at an examination which is conducted by the Public Service Commission;

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

and the other half are reserved for cadets from the Indian Army. And, as I said only this morning in reply to a question of my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, the Public Service Commission are satisfied that no likely candidate is refused a reasonable chance at the open competition, from whatever part of the country he comes and whatever may have been the traditions of his family. Next, Sir, as regards what Sir Philip Chetwode said, or what Honourable Members say that Sir Philip Chetwode said, I think there is some misapprehension. Sir Philip was at that time dealing with a Resolution recommending an increase in the number of vacancies at the Indian Military Academy. What he said was that he was perfectly satisfied with the material at the Indian Military Academy; he thought it was the best possible material and that it was good. But what he was perturbed about was that there was not more competition for the 15 vacancies which are offered every half year. He said, and it is perfectly true, that we get at present just about enough really good men to fill these 15 vacancies, and what he would have liked to see was at least 30 or 40 good men coming forward to compete for these 15 vacancies. At present a large number compete, but a great many of them, obviously, have no qualifications or any real desire to take up a military career.

Now, Sir, I think that between these conflicting points of view our present policy may before long be proved to have followed that middle course which is so often correct. If that policy can be given a reasonable chance of working itself out and, if there could be a respite from political criticism of it for a short time,—and after all, Sir, such political criticism must have a depressing effect upon the young men at the Academy itself,—I do think that, in course of time, the necessary educational adjustments will be made in this country, and from whatever source we get them we *shall* get the best men in India to fill our vacancies in the army. I may add that in a few years, I believe, these young officers who are now passing out from the Indian Military Academy will themselves form the best possible advertisement of our present policy.

Now, Sir, that is all that I have to say at the moment about the general policy of Indianisation. There are three further points that I must take up arising out of the speech of the Honourable the Mover of this motion. He said that we were getting rid of Indian officers in the war block in order to prevent them from commanding their battalions. He suggested, secondly, that we were turning Indian officers out of their regiments into departments, like the Indian Army Service Corps and so on, in order to prevent them from commanding British officers and British personnel; and he added, thirdly, that we were offering these Indian commissioned officers far too low a scale of pay. As regards the first, the war block, I can assure the House that the Honourable Member is not correct. We have had to choose out of the officers of a certain seniority in the army as many as four hundred, who had to be transferred to the unemployed list for no real fault of their own, but for reasons which have been explained before to the House. And if we have included in that number a small number of Indian officers, I can assure the House that that was done with no political bias whatever.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Why was it done at all when you knew that you wanted all your Indian officers for your own army and they were not blocking any one's promotion?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: We want to have less officers of a certain seniority and we have to choose, out of the officers recruited during the years in question, a certain number to be axed and placed on the unemployed list; but the selection of those officers is purely a question of comparative efficiency and has nothing whatever to do with nationality. I can assure the House that these few Indian officers who have been placed on the unemployed list will receive exactly the same terms as British officers and they will be given every opportunity, just as much as is given to any British officer, to secure employment elsewhere if they wish it.

As regards the second point that he made, that we were getting rid of Indian officers from their battalions in order to prevent them from commanding British personnel, I would only point out that the particular example that he selected was the very worst possible example that he could have selected from his own point of view. He seemed to think that Indian officers would lose the chance of commanding British personnel if they went into a department like the Royal Indian Army Service Corps. The facts are precisely the opposite.

The Indian Army Service Corps cannot be Indianised by units as we can Indianise the infantry; that is to say, if any Indian officer goes into the Indian Army Service Corps he becomes automatically senior to a number of junior British Officers who follow him at a later date. He also automatically commands a number of British non-commissioned personnel in the Indian Army Service Corps, a thing that he has no chance of doing if he remains in his own battalion.

Thirdly, about the question of pay, all I can say is that the pay of these Indian commissioned officers is based on the pay that British officers receive when they serve in England. It is exactly the same pay as British officers in England get,—if anything, slightly more than that. And in view of the opinion held by Members of the Opposition Party as to the general level of salaries in this country, I really do not think there is any justification for increasing those scales of pay. At any rate

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, on a point of personal explanation, I did not complain about the pay of the persons being retrenched on the war block. I complained of the pay of those persons who pass out of the Indian Military Academy.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That is what I was referring to. The pay of the cadets who come out from the Indian Military Academy is exactly the same as the pay of British officers serving in England.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: No, Sir, it is not.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: It is of course a fact that British officers in the Indian Army get more and British officers of the British service serving in India receive more pay than they would if they were serving in England. But the pay of the Indian commissioned officer, coming out of the Indian Military Academy, is the same as that of the British officer serving with a British unit in England; and that, Sir, is a perfectly fair basis on which to put their pay.

That, I think, is all I have to say at the moment about Indianisation. I should like, if I could, to have a talk with the Leader of the Independent Party on this subject and try to clear up the difficulty about the figures

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

into which we got at the beginning of his speech. It is a complicated matter and I do not think I could explain it clearly here without a little more notice. But I should be very glad to have a discussion with him at some later date, if I can, and see if I can explain the position to him.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I may explain to the Honourable Member that I have understood his point,—of course not the exact figures, and so on. I am extremely obliged to him that he will give me the information, but I was thinking of the number which we fixed at the Round Table Conference, namely, how many vacancies there were from Sandhurst. Of course, now we have got an Indian Sandhurst as well as a British Sandhurst, and, therefore, my number related only to that and not to Woolwich or Cranwell.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I can understand that. The position is complicated by the fact that the Indian Army hitherto has contained only of officers who have come from Sandhurst, that is for infantry and cavalry, whereas, in the future, we hope it will contain other units of different arms. And also there is another point which I omitted to mention when I interrupted before, that the number of officers per battalion in future is to be on the British scale, that is to say, 28 officers per battalion as against only 12 at present, and that naturally would affect the total number required as compared with the present output from Sandhurst.

Now, I should like to turn to the question of the general level of Defence expenditure, and here also I must confine myself to only one or two remarks. The first is, that probably India is the only important country in the world which is not, at the present moment, engaged in materially increasing both the numbers and the cost of its defence forces. If it were really a fact that the level of defence expenditure and the strength of the Army in India were dictated by Imperial and not by Indian considerations, I cannot imagine any moment at which the effects of that dictation might more obviously have been expected to show themselves; and yet, what is the position? Since 1914, we have reduced the strength of the Army in India by some 60,000 fighting men, including some 20,000 British troops. We are still further reducing the number of British troops gradually as we proceed with the programme of Indianisation, which involves the formation of Indian artillery units in place of British.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: At what rate?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Slow rate.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Are you mechanising the Indian units?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I may say a few words about that later. The point is, we are not today increasing the strength of the army by one single man, and the reason is—and I hope Honourable Members will reflect on this carefully—that India at present does not require such an increase.

The only other points I have to make on the general level of defence expenditure are to try and meet to some extent the arguments of the Honourable the Mover when he complained that there was no reason whatever why we should not return to pre-war levels of expenditure, and also attempted, I think, to belittle the success of our efforts in the direction of

retrenchment. If the Honourable Member will read Chapter V of this pamphlet "Facts and figures about defence", he will see there a very full exposition of the reasons why it is impossible to expect a return to pre-war levels of expenditure. I cannot go into all those reasons now, but the most obvious of them is that there has been a rise in wages all round—a general rise in pay. The pay of the British soldier has been doubled, the pay of the Indian sepoy has been more than doubled, the pay of British Service officers has been greatly increased, and the pay of British officers serving in the Indian Army has also been increased. Whatever may be the case as regards the fall in the price of commodities, you cannot expect a fall to take place in wages corresponding to the fall in prices. I might incidentally mention that, so far as the actual price of commodities is concerned, we were, before the War,—in 1914—paying somewhere in the neighbourhood of Rs. 1½ crores a year for provisions for the army, and that, at a time when we did not ourselves provide the sepoys with rations. We are now actually spending less than that amount—I think the amount is now about Rs. 1½ crores.

Then, the Honourable Member seemed to think that whatever retrenchment we may have carried out in the last few years was all coming back again because the saving was due purely to temporary causes such as cuts in pay, fall in prices, and so on and so forth. The plain facts are that in 1930, the Defence budget stood at Rs. 55 crores; today it actually stands at Rs. 45½ crores. That is an actual reduction of Rs. 9½ crores. Two years ago, the expenditure was about Rs. 180 lakhs less than it is going to be this year. To that extent it is perfectly true that some of our retrenchments are no longer holding good, but if Honourable Members wish to have an explanation of that increase of Rs. 180 lakhs, I can give it to them. It is mainly made up of about Rs. 70 lakhs on the return in the pay cut, about Rs. 60 lakhs on special expenditure on Quetta, about Rs. 25 lakhs on a return to more normal expenditure on Military Engineer Service buildings, and about Rs. 20 lakhs on an increase in Ordnance supplies, owing to the fact that we cannot go on any longer living on our own fat, as we were compelled to do during the period of extreme financial depression.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: May I interrupt for a moment? You said that the expenditure is now Rs. 9 crores less than it was some years ago. Does that include the loss on strategic railways, does that include watch and ward, and other departments?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am comparing like with like absolutely. In 1930, the heads of our budget were exactly the same as they are now. We have never paid for watch and ward; we have never paid the loss on strategic railways. When Honourable Members complain that the defence Budget ought to be increased by debiting to it the loss on strategic railways, I might equally well reply that on the expenditure side of our budget there are a number of items which appear as receipts under some other heads of the budget. For instance, we pay out about one crore of rupees for railway transport, we pay Rs. 70 lakhs by way of income-tax, we pay Rs. 10 lakhs for customs duty, we pay Rs. 12 lakhs or so to the Printing and Stationery Department. If you add all these figures, you will find that there are nearly two crores which, so far as the taxpayer is concerned, are not real expenditure.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: For services rendered.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, I have already detained the House too long, and I have not said as much as I should have liked to say. I wanted to say a few words on mechanisation, but at this stage I am afraid it is impossible for me to do so.

There is one point I should like to make clear. The Army authorities, just as much as anybody else, recognise that Defence is a very expensive business and that the defence of India costs a great deal of money; but I can assure the House that the Defence authorities are not anxious to add one pie to the cost of that defence beyond what they themselves honestly consider necessary; and even if the cost of the defence of India is large, I can honestly tell the House that they are getting full value for their money.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced to Re. 1."

AYES—79.

Aarou, Mr. Samuel.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury. Mr.
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ba Si, U
 Badrul Hasan, Maulvi.
 Bajoria, Babu Baijuath.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
 Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
 Chuuder, Mr. N. C.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Suthar H.
 Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
 Hans Raj, Raizada.
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.
 Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir
 Sayad Muhammad.
 Mody, Sir H. P.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Syed.
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Chou-
 dhri.
 Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
 Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Sakseena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Saut Singh, Sardar.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodas Daga, Seth.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Thein Maung, Dr.
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
 Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.

NOES—46.

Acott, Mr. A. S. V.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Aminuddin, Mr. Saiyid.
 Ayyar, Diwan Bahadur R. V.
 Krishna.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Das-Gupta, Mr. S. K.
 Dash, Mr. A. J.
 Tajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya
 Ananda.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Grigson, Mr. W. V.
 Hands, Mr. A. S.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 Hutton, Dr. J. H.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Khurshaid Muhammad. Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.

Leach, Mr. F. B.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 MacDougall, Mr. R. M.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Muhammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charau.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur Shyam Narayan.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir
 Nripendra.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir
 Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 32 —HOME DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Now, it is the turn of the Nationalist Party to move their cut on the demand under the Home Department.

Mr. M. S. Aney: The demand has been moved, Sir, and I wish to move the motion that stands in my name, with your permission.

The President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Which one is that?

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is on late list No. 3 at page 2 under demand No. 32, motion No. 19.

Repressive Policy.

Sir, I beg to move the motion that stands in my name, namely:

"That the demand under the head 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

My object in moving this motion is to raise a discussion on the repressive policy that is pursued by the Government, and to censure them for the same. I moved a similar motion last year in this House, and, in so doing, I laid particular emphasis on the fact that there was a change in the political situation in the country and that change demanded a change in the policy of the Government also and that they should stop the policy of repression. I gave a good many reasons in support of my proposition,

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

and I shall try to avoid a repetition of what I said then. The policy of the Government, as it has been explained to this House more than once, for the last so many years, is generally known as the dual policy. By this dual policy what the Government proposes to do is to repress what they consider as elements of lawlessness on the one hand and at the same time make some concession towards broadening the field of democratic institutions in this country. I do not want to enter into the merits at this stage of the wisdom of pursuing a policy like that. By this time, I believe, the Government would have seen that it is better to concentrate on the policy of reform than to think of repression. That will at any rate prove in the long run a wiser and a safer course to pursue. However, as I said, I do not wish to repeat what I said last year.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, one of the Panel of Chairmen.]

I will merely try to explain in very few words what I stated last year.

[At this stage, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) having entered the Chamber, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President.]

Sir, my main reason for bringing forward this motion again this year is this. Last year this motion was carried by an overwhelming majority of this House. I find that during the last twelve months Government has done practically nothing in my opinion to give effect to the opinion which was then expressed by this House in such unequivocal manner.

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. M. S. Aney: You can question it in your own speech if you like, and even if you question it now, I don't mind it. My position is this. Because my statement has been questioned I want to explain in as few words as possible what were the main things to which I drew the attention of the Government last year. By repressive policy I meant particularly the policy pursued by the Government with regard to the following matters.

I demanded then the release of Civil Disobedience Prisoners and Political Prisoners.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): That has been done.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am going to admit what has been done, and to attack only things that have not been done so far.

Secondly, I demanded the repeal of the extraordinary repressive measures which were only justified by exceptional circumstances which existed in the country at a certain time . . .

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi (Dacca c. m. Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): What is the second thing please?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I do not want to repeat, because my time is limited. Repeal of repressive laws is the second thing.

The third thing was the removal of the ban on certain political organizations affiliated to the Congress and which were working in a constitutional manner.

The fourth thing was some relaxation of rules relating to the treatment of political prisoners so that they may not feel extremely miserable when in jail and they may feel that they are being treated as political prisoners in the true sense when inside the jails.

These were the four main points to which I drew the attention of this House in my speech last year.

As regards the first point, I confess even on the last occasion when I made my speech I was told that the total number of Civil Disobedience Prisoners, then undergoing imprisonment, was only 69, and, I am sure, that during the past 12 months, some of them must have already finished their term of imprisonment and gone out, and new Civil Disobedience Prisoners of course have not gone in, and so the number 69 must have come down. I would like to know how many have been released by the Government of these 69 by giving some substantial remissions. So far as that portion of my demand is concerned, I do not think that there is now much ground for me to make any grievance of. But, in that connection, I shall try to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Home Member and the Government of India one point. There were certain men who were convicted of offences involving violence. They began the Civil Disobedience Movement, but, under strong provocation, at times certain things were done and a little violence here and there took place. The cases of those persons were under consideration then. To my knowledge there are prisoners like that still rotting in jail in my provinces. I would like the Government to make enquiries and see how far the Local Governments have considered their cases. It is true, I do not deny the fact, that they were convicted of crimes, involving violence, but if their cases are properly looked into, Government will find that the conditions under which they had committed violence and to some extent abjured their pledge of strict non-violence were such that even a man of extraordinary character would not have stood the test of standing to the pledge of non-violence. If there are cases like that and the prisoners are still undergoing punishment, I think now, in view of the altered position and in view of the conditions that prevail at present, the Government can certainly take their cases into consideration and release them and allow those persons to be free citizens. I do not know what is the number of prisoners like that in other provinces, but in my province, there are cases of certain Gond prisoners in Betul and Chhindwara districts to whom I particularly refer. They joined the satyagraha movement, but, unfortunately, they took up an attitude of retaliation as soon as lathi charges and other things were made. There was some bloodshed and violence was committed. But in view of the long terms of imprisonment that they have already served, I think that Government should take into consideration their cases and release them.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: How many?

Mr. M. S. Aney: According to my information, there are five or six. I am not quite sure of the number, but this is the suggestion I am making. Later on, I may give the correct information. Five or six Gond prisoners in Betul and Chhindwara districts.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Five or six in the Central Provinces?

Mr. M. S. Aney: Yes. Last time I also drew the attention of the Government to the condition of the detenus of Bengal. Sir, the position of detenus of Bengal is something which is extremely deplorable in my opinion, but that is a question on which, unfortunately, I think the Honourable the Home Member is also very touchy. Immediately somebody asks any question regarding the problem of detenus of Bengal, he feels, or he smells, if I may say so, a sympathy for terrorism in those who put the question or speak anything about it. In a way he assumes an air of intense indignation and tries to hush up discussion altogether. I want to tell him—to use the exact language which he used last time in reply to the criticism made by some Members on this side of the House on this point—he said:

“With them I have no sympathy. I say that the Government are entitled to take any measure, even more severe measures than they have taken hitherto, to stamp out this terrible evil.”

There were some other things which he said also, but I do not want to quote them. In order to fortify his position, he quoted an extract from the Royal Proclamation issued by His Late Majesty King Edward VII some years ago. He reminded the House of the words in the Royal Proclamation ostensibly in support of the attitude of the Government of India towards the detenus:

“It is a paramount duty (*that is, of the Government*) to repress with a stern arm guilty conspiracies that have no just cause and no serious aim. These conspiracies are abhorrent to the loyalty and faithful character of the great host of my Indian subjects and I will not suffer them to turn me aside from my task of building up the fabric of civilised security and order.”

I believe there is no person in this House who can take exception to the proposition or principle so eloquently put in here, but the point is this. There is no Member so senseless as to construe this as constituting a charter as conferring unfettered discretion on the executive to treat all those persons about whom they have got suspicion and to treat their life and property, with scant respect. If the policy to stamp out the terrible evil of terrorism from this land, which is no doubt a laudable object, with which every right thinking man is bound to be in full sympathy, results in establishing a reign of terror itself where the liberties and properties of the people are in jeopardy and where the careers and prospects of hundreds of youths are altogether blighted owing to detention without trial for a number of years inside jails and detention camps, it will lead to a situation which is fraught with elements of danger which can be better imagined than described.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghusnavi: Whose speech are you reading from?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am reading the notes I have made. I believe the remedy will prove worse than the disease in that case. The situation in Bengal has become something like that today. None will blame Government for dealing with persons proved to be convicted of terrorist activities, with a strong arm, and even a stronger arm if they choose. They have a right to claim the support of the public in that matter, but the case of detenus stands on a different footing altogether. There is no sanction

of a judicial verdict to justify the conduct of the Government. It is a question of suspicion and the only sanction is the rectitude of the informant who supplies information to the Government in the matter. It is a case of suspicion and indefinite suspicion. I can understand a person being detained on suspicion for some time, but there must be a limit at which the Government ought to be able to make up its mind to produce the person so suspected before a Court of justice for trial under the ordinary law, or they must release him even at some risk. The power of indiscriminate arrest and indefinite detention without trial can be used, and, the public opinion is, it is being largely abused, without proper justification. The situation in Bengal cannot improve unless the Government take courage in their hands and boldly release all those detenus against whom they have no reliable evidence to prove their complicity in the terrorist movement, and place for trial before a Court of law all those against whom they have got such evidence to prove. Even the Government of Bengal think that the mere pursuit of a policy of repression of this nature is barren and fruitless. In order to entirely eradicate the evil of anarchy and terrorism in that unfortunate land, a serious effort is being made by that Government to tackle with the root causes of the evil. If I mistake not, the Government of Bengal has in contemplation a scheme of some kind of technical education.

An Honourable Member: They have already given effect to that scheme.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am not wrong in mentioning it. It is intended to partially meet the problem of the unemployment of educated youth. The success of such a scheme will largely depend upon the spirit in which that scheme will be received by the youths whom it concerns most.

An Honourable Member: They have received it very well.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I do not know about that. Therefore, I appeal to the Government of India that they should impress on the Government of Bengal the advisability of creating a proper atmosphere for the success of a scheme like that by taking the steps I have suggested before. During the last year, I do not find any substantial steps taken by the Government either towards the release or bringing to trial before proper Courts of the 1,600 detenus in Bengal and elsewhere.

Turning from the case of the detenus, I shall refer to a few other matters with which I shall deal briefly. I find that the Government of Bengal is peculiarly anxious that no public man from other provinces should go and discuss any question with regard to the political situation there. If anybody goes there he has to do it at great risk. During the last one year we have had at least two or three prosecutions for sedition against persons who have gone and delivered lectures on the present political situation there. They want to make this a secluded area as against all other public men outside the province. My friend, Mr. Ruikar, has been prosecuted there and sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment the other day. I am not saying here anything as to whether the prosecution was justified or not or whether the conviction was right or wrong. That is not my point. My point is this. Similar speeches made in other provinces would not have been taken notice of by the Provincial Governments for the purpose of launching any prosecution at all but the Bengal

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

Government will not allow any public man from other provinces to come and do that thing. I consider that a policy of repression. They are trying to smother the voice of free criticism in this ruthless way. There is another way pursued by the Government of Bengal with regard to those whom they suspect. There is method of internment, and also a counter method which is called externment. A man living in a particular town or a particular district is asked to go out of that district. In that way, hundreds of persons, who are otherwise enjoying liberty, are not allowed to go back to their own district and carry on their professions and earn their livelihood in an honourable manner. In that way also, several hundreds of men are, I am told, suffering today. My information is there are a number of people suffering like that today. They cannot earn their livelihood. No charges have been framed against them and they have not been told what the charge against them is. That is another way in which repression is going on in Bengal.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got one minute more.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Then, Sir, in that one minute I shall only say this. There are other things to which I referred last time, for example, the removal of ban on institutions. Only a few days ago, questions were asked in this House with regard to the jirgas and the Congress organisations in the North-West Frontier Province and I intervened with an interjection asking the Honourable the Home Member what are the activities which he knows in which these organisations have been engaged after February 1935 up to this day, which will justify the continuance of the ban on these institutions. The reply was that the question has been already answered. That was the reply given to me. My point is this. Government have no justification to continue the ban and yet the Local Government, in its haughtiness, in its superior zeal for prestige, is not willing to do it and the Honourable the Home Member does not want to bring home to them the necessity of removing the ban in order to allow these bodies to function. Similarly, the ban on the Hindustani Seva Dal still continues there. Now, I shall leave aside those things, for there is no time. A man like Barrister Savarkar who has served his full sentence is kept in Ratnagiri and not allowed to move about for the last 12 years. He has been carrying on popaganda only of a social and religious nature in the Ratnagiri district. The Government knows it but the suspicion in the mind of the Government is so deep-rooted that his open activities for the last 12 years are not sufficient to eradicate that suspicion and he is not allowed to gain the freedom to which he is entitled. I shall conclude my speech by saying only one thing more. The whole attitude of the Government, with regard to the repressive policy, is more or less born of a strong distrust and suspicion of the people. They are anxious to bring into existence a ponderous structure known as provincial autonomy. The new reforms consist of provincial autonomy and a superstructure which will be raised upon it later on, which will be known as the Federal Legislature. Is Government going to base this structure on the sandy foundation of suspicion? If they are going to do that, a slight rise in the state of popular feeling will wash away the fleeting foundations of that structure. If the Government want to have this structure on a stable basis, they must make an attempt to remove distrust and suspicion and that can be done only by responding to

the various demands made on the floor of the House with the aid of an overwhelming majority. The repeated rejection of these demands can only perpetuate this suspicion which will prove in the end a canker and eat into the very vitals of whatever reforms you may have in mind. Suspicion begets suspicion. Trust begets trust. Suspicion and slavery go together. If you want to build a temple of peace, build it on the foundation of trust. It is for you to choose the way. The path of trust will lead to a condition of mutual cordiality, harmony and happiness between India and England. The path of suspicion will lead to chaos and anarchy. It is for you to choose the way. We have shown you what the difficulty is and we have tried to explain to you the way in which you can get out of this morass. I expect that next year at least there will be a better response to our demands if we carry this cut this year and in that expectation I ask all my brothers here to vote for the cut I am moving.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Cut motion moved.

"That the demand under the head 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ancy. My Honourable friend has detailed at considerable length his arguments, his point of view and the reasons by which he supports this motion; so I will not traverse them over again. I propose to cover a different ground, in a different way. I know, Sir, I lack the moderation and sobriety of Mr. Ancy, and, when I am on this subject of repression by Government, I must tell you that I feel it impossible to speak either with moderation or with restraint. (Laughter.) I find my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Craik, uttering something which I cannot catch, probably he means that that is just what is expected. But, Sir, do Government really realise the volume and intensity of public feeling in this country over the repressive policy, which they have systematically pursued all these years throughout this continent of India in general and in Bengal in particular? I am sure, the blood of any honest Indian will boil in indignation over this policy of wholesale demoralisation of the people. I will try, however, to avoid using strong language. What are the criteria . . . (Interruption.) I could not follow the Honourable the Law Member. What did he say?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The blood is always boiling.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Sir, if their blood has gone down to such a temperature that it cannot be raised, and I know there are Honourable Members on that side whose temperature has so much fallen that it cannot be raised even by powerful stimuli, if their temperature has gone down to that freezing point, we still maintain normal.

Now, about the policy that the British Government are pursuing in this country. From our early boyhood, we have been taught to value four things, being bred on English literature, English history and English constitutional law. These are the four great things,—freedom of association, freedom of speech, including the liberty of the press, freedom of movement and freedom of thought. Of course, in no civilised country freedom of thought has been banned. I will show how this freedom of thought also has been banned in this country. It is no use going into what will be called debatable questions, as to whether there has actually

[Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.]

been a policy of repression going on. I know there will be differences of opinion. Some friends on that side, particularly I believe my Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Sarma, will at once jump up. Sir, I will take specific instances, I will place instances which cannot be or have not been disputed or denied. Let us take the question of the freedom of movement. My Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, telling a lot about it,—about what happened with some people in distant provinces, I will come nearer home. Sir, yesterday, I narrated the case of my Honourable friend, Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, and how he, in his own constituency, was treated. Let me now take the case of my friend, Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena, who is also another Honourable Member of this House. Sir, as you know, a committee was formed by the Congress Party to investigate the question of oppression and repression in Bengal, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Saksena, as the Secretary of the Committee, was asked to go to Bengal and gather the facts. My Honourable friend went to Bengal to visit certain districts. Now, it cannot be said that Mr. Saksena had any object of addressing any political meetings or carrying on any political propaganda. Neither is it contended that Mr. Saksena has any record of terroristic activities behind him or any inclination towards terroristic activities, but what did we find? As soon as my Honourable friend, Mr. Saksena, reached Comilla, he was at once served with an order purporting to come from the District Magistrate saying that he was to leave the district of Comilla within 24 hours. Sir, is it to be seriously argued that Mr. Saksena is such a dangerous man, such a pestilential creature that his presence, even for a few hours, would have polluted the entire atmosphere to such an extent that the entire administration of the country would have collapsed? Sir, that was what we found in the case of my Honourable friend, Mr. Saksena, last summer. When we used to talk of the repressive policy which is being pursued with such intensity in the province of Bengal, I know there were a few friends who really did not believe that such things could actually take place under a civilised Government in a province like Bengal. Sir, I believe, my friend, Mr. Saksena, when he came back, came back a sadder and wiser man, and he saw things with his own eyes, how Bengalis are being subjected to a process of slow political death

Mr. B. S. Sarma (Nominated Non-Official): Without inquiry, he came to that conclusion?

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: How could he make any inquiries? It is your bosses who stood in his way. But, was not this one executive fiat enough to reveal to him the realities of the situation?

Now, turn to another great man, the Rev. Ottama of Buryna. Sir, the Rev. Ottama had been to our district. Now, everybody knows that he has no personal or political axe to grind and he, as the President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, wanted merely to address certain meetings on religion and on the cultural unity between Hinduism and Buddhism, and other social matters. I had also the privilege of addressing meetings with him and the meetings were purely for the discussion of religious or social matters. In some districts, the matter went on quite well, but in some districts in the Province of Bengal, particularly in Jessore, the hot-headed District Magistrate and his deputies at once

served a notice on him that he should leave the district and that he was not permitted to make any speech. Later on, he went to Barisal, and I happened to be there on professional business at the time, but I was told that, as soon as he landed in the district town of Barisal, a gentleman came and said: "Here is an order from the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police asking you to leave Barisal and asking you not to make any speech at all". Sir, the Rev. Ottama, who is a Buddhist monk, was going to preach nothing but religion

An Honourable Member: He did not preach religion

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): He was speaking on terrorism, communalism, and so on

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Sir, he did preach religion. Sir, this is the kind of freedom of movement we have got in this country. I only give a few instances which cannot be challenged. I am not going to quote numerous instances which occur every day in our experience. Daily, the executives are piling repressive measure after repressive measure, until they have wiped out the last vestige of liberty which we happened to possess in this land, and they have reduced us to this helpless position that the most elementary right of citizenship, the least modicum of individual liberty that we possessed is all made to depend now on the fickle breath of executive favour! The press is gagged, public voice stifled and political life strangled. Sir, this state of affairs is absolutely intolerable. Sir, I am one of those who never believe in eleemosynary politics, I do not believe that, if I can get a chit from the Honourable the Home Member, everything will be set right in Bengal. I believe that if we cannot succeed in changing the policy of the Government by making appeals, we will give this matter an exposure to an extent that if they have any sense of self-respect, any sense of honour or prestige still left in them, they will try to correct themselves. That is the utmost we can do. Beyond this, we are powerless at present.

Take the question of freedom of speech; there have been so many penal laws on the Statute-book, that, practically, we cannot open our lips, unless it be a chat on the value of potatoes or market commodities. Even religious meetings are banned under the pretext that they will create communal trouble. That is going on everywhere. Take the question of freedom of association. We had already a crop of repressive laws, and, to crown them all, in the last Simla Session, we had the Criminal Law Amendment Act certified by the Viceroy in spite of the clear verdict of the House to the contrary. According to the Government's own admission, the Civil Disobedience Movement is in a state of suspended animation or in abeyance, call it whatever you like. The Civil Disobedience Movement is not there, the terroristic activities, even according to the Honourable the Home Member, are on the wane. Even today, in answer to certain questions, the Honourable Member himself admitted that the situation has much improved. May I ask why, in spite of these things, after the lapse of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, it has been placed permanently on the Statute-book by certification? By one single stroke of the pen, every vestige of right has been wiped out. We now stand in this position that for any little thing that we want to do, we have to depend on the favour of the executive. I raise my emphatic protest against this.

[Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.]

I will now turn to another thing. I will turn to the question of detenus, people detained without trial for a number of years in my province. I understand my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena, has got a Resolution on the subject which will come up for discussion very soon, and, therefore, I will defer my detailed observations to that occasion.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The discussion has begun on that Resolution.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: If it has begun, I will not prolong it. I believe, there are at the present moment as many as 2,000 detenus, some of the best flowers of the youth of Bengal silently languishing for years, in the different detention camps and jails in Bengal. Sir, I believe there has not been any outbreak of terroristic activities during the last three years. Why then are they not released? How long are their agonies to be prolonged?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I would ask your indulgence for a few minutes more, because, after all, this question of repressive policy is one which solely concerns my province of Bengal. I can give you this assurance that nobody else from Bengal, belonging to my Party, will take part in the debate. There are only five minutes more left to adjourn the House, and I shall finish by that time. Besides these detenus in jails, there is a class of prisoners, they are living like prisoners, who may be called home interneers. They are interned at particular places at the houses of their relations. No allowance of any kind is granted to them. There is another class of detenus, I mean externees who are under the orders of externment from their native place, and the result is that they also do not get any allowance. They have to hang about constantly dogged by the police. Besides, there are a number of women detenus who have been detained for four years and more, and they have not been brought up for trial by Government. May I ask the Government whether they apprehend that if these ladies are released, Government would collapse or that the Heavens would fall over their heads?

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

I will now come to the question of indirect repression by elaborate espionage—the hounding by the C. I. D. and the police—which has made the ordinary existence miserable

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already spoken for 15 minutes.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I would ask your indulgence for a few minutes more. I have got so many things to narrate, because my Province is the most affected by these repressive laws.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There may be other Members desiring to speak. The Chair cannot allow the Honourable Member any more time.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: In that case, I will conclude by saying that this policy of repression, which the Government have pursued, will not pay them in the long run. They have alienated every section of public opinion in the country. I can understand the position of the Honourable the Home Member. But, I am afraid, he is kept absolutely in the dark about all that is taking place in Bengal in connection with the detenus. I notice that he is supplied with very meagre data

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Therefore, I would appeal to every section of this House, at least to the elected Members of this House, to realise the most miserable plight of my unfortunate province, Bengal, a province which in tears, a province which in distress, appeals to every sister province for sympathy and support, and I hope they will, in sympathetic response, support this motion and give the Government a censure which they richly deserve. (Applause.)

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: Mr. President, I have listened to the speech of the Mover of this cut, my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, with very great care. In his excitement, without giving specific reasons and in absolute ignorance of the facts prevailing in Bengal, he stated many things. I will only take up what he said about Bengal and give him some facts to prove that what he and what the Honourable Member, who followed him, said about Bengal is not correct. Sir, the first point that the Honourable the Mover of this cut motion made out was that, last year, when he moved this motion, he wanted the release of the civil disobedience prisoners. The Honourable the Home Member said that they have been released. So they have got no grievance whatsoever on the first point.

Then, his second point was the repeal of the repressive laws. No sane person, who wants law and order to be the first thing which a Government should administer would suggest the repeal of the repressive laws. On the top of that, only the other day, this House has made it abundantly clear by its vote that it does not want the repeal of the repressive laws. He said what a serious thing it was to detain the detenus of Bengal without giving them a trial purely on suspicion without nothing on record to show that they should be so detained, and that for a number of years. First of all, as regards the detenus in Bengal, I can give the House my own experience

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Your own experience as a detenu?

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: My experience about these detenus and the way they are treated by the Government of Bengal. Sir, during the last three years, we have seen—I have seen—the Government of Bengal did

[Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi.]

show me the records of certain detenus where I had my own suspicion or where the parties came to me to approach the Government to bring the matter of their sons, or their brothers, or their nephews to the notice of the Government. I can give you a number of cases which were brought to the notice of the Government of Bengal. The special officer who deals with the cases of these detenus is Mr. S. N. Roy, and I can tell this House that the parents of the detenus, the friends of the detenus in Bengal are in every case fully satisfied with the way in which their cases are being dealt with. (*Cries of "No, no" and "Question".*)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can continue his speech tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 12th March, 1936.