

23rd April 1936

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume V, 1936

(9th April to 23rd April 1936)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1936



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS

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, BARRISTER-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. ZIAADDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. M. S. ANNY, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME V—9th April to 23rd April, 1936.

	PAGE.		(PAGE.
THURSDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1936—		THURSDAY, 10TH APRIL, 1936—	
Questions and Answers	3737—75	Member Sworn	3969
Short Notice Question and Answer	3775	Questions and Answers	3969—4008
Statements laid on the Table	3775—78	Statements laid on the Table	4009—14
The Representative Laws Repealing and Amending Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	3775—3831	The Andhra Mines (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	4014
Statement of Business	3831—32	Resolution re Import duty on unbroken rice and paddy—Adopted	4014—21
		Resolution re Appointment of a Committee on small and cottage industries—Adopted as amended	4021—63
TUESDAY, 14TH APRIL, 1936—		FRIDAY, 17TH APRIL, 1936—	
Member Sworn	3833	Member Sworn	4065
Questions and Answers	3833—76	Questions and Answers	4065—4121
Statements laid on the Table	3876—80	Unstarred Questions and Answers	4121—27
The Italian Loans and Credits Prohibition Bill—Passed	3880—3902	Death of Mr. Siddhewar Prasad Shukla	4127
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Passed	3902—25	Election of the Standing Finance Committee	4127—28
The Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	3925—34	Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	4128
		Election of the Central Advisory Council for Railways	4128
WEDNESDAY, 15TH APRIL, 1936—		The Representative Laws Repealing and Amending Bill—Debate adjourned	4129—49
Election of the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	3935	The Parsi Marriage and Divorce Bill—Passed	4149—53
The Decrees and Orders Validating Bill—Proposed	3935	The Hindu Women's Right to Property Bill—Circulated	4153—54
The Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	3935—68	The Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	4154
		The Hindu Marriage Validity Bill—Circulated	4154—56

FRIDAY, 17TH APRIL, 1936—contd.	PAGE.	SATURDAY, 18TH APRIL, 1936—	PAGE.
The Arya Marriage Vali- dation Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . .	4156—57	Questions and Answers . . .	4167—83
The Moslem Personal Law (Shariat) Application Bill—Circulated . . .	4157—58	Election of the Central Advisory Council for Railways . . .	4183
The Removal of Civic Disabilities Bill—Cir- culated . . .	4158—60	The Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill— Referred to Select Com- mittee . . .	4184—96
The Hindu Widowers' Re- marriage Bill—With- drawn . . .	4160—61	The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill— Referred to Select Com- mittee . . .	4196—4209
The Buddha Gaya Temple Bill—Introduced . . .	4161	The Payment of Wages Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to . . .	4209—20
The Hindu Gains of Learning (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	4161—62	The Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . .	4220—25
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced . . .	4162	Statement of Business . . .	4226
The Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill—In- troduced . . .	4162		
The Indian Subscriptions Bill—Introduced . . .	4162—63	MONDAY, 20TH APRIL, 1936—	
The Child Marriage Res- traint (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	4163	Member Sworn . . .	4227
The legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill— Introduced . . .	4163	Questions and Answers . . .	4227—44 4250—57
The Child Marriage Res- traint (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	4163—64	Statements laid on the Table . . .	4244—45
The Indian Medical Coun- cil (Amendment) Bill —Introduced . . .	4164	Statement regarding net earnings of certain newly constructed rail- way lines . . .	4245—49
The Muslim Intestate Succession Bill—In- troduced . . .	4164	The Decrees and Orders Validating Bill—Passed . . .	4257—96
The Hindu Disposal of Property Bill—Intro- duced . . .	4164—65	The Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded . . .	4296—4319
The Control of Coastal Traffic of India Bill— Introduced . . .	4165	TUESDAY, 21ST APRIL, 1936—	
The Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill— Introduced . . .	4165	Questions and Answers . . .	4331—39
The Hindu Widows' Maintenance Bill—In- troduced . . .	4165	Motions for Adjourn- ment re— Famine, small-pox and cholera in Berham- pur in Bengal—Post- poned . . .	4339—41
The Hindu Widows' Right of Inheritance Bill—Introduced . . .	4166	Suicide committed by Nani Gopal Chakra- varti, a Bengal De- tenu—Disallowed by the President . . .	4341—44
Statement of Business . . .	4166	Message from the Council of State . . .	4344

	PAGE.
TUESDAY, 21ST APRIL, 1936—contd.	
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee . . .	4344—47
The Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended . . .	4347—51
The Cochin Port Bill—Passed; . . .	4352—54
The Factories (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . .	4354—63
The Indian Aircraft (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . .	4363—64
The Indian Mines (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended . . .	4364—73
The Indian Lac Cess (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . .	4373—99
Resolution re Draft Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works—Adopted . . .	4399—4400
Resolution re Draft Convention limiting hours of work in coal mines—Adopted . . .	4400—05
Statement of Business . . .	4406

	PAGE.
WEDNESDAY, 22ND APRIL, 1936—	
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	4407—09
Statements laid on the Table . . .	4410—13
Motion for Adjournment re Famine, small-pox and cholera in Berhampur in Bengal—Not moved . . .	4413—17
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded . . .	4417—75
THURSDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1936—	
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	4477
Statements laid on the Table . . .	4477—79
Famine situation in Berhampur in Bengal . . .	4479
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended . . .	4479—4514

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 23rd April, 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.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

NOTES IN A TOKYO MUSEUM WITH THE WORDS "DOGS AND INDIANS ARE NOT ALLOWED".

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

- (a) whether they have heard from Japan regarding an alleged notice in a Tokyo Museum that "Dogs and Indians are not allowed";
- (b) what the reply is; and
- (c) whether they will place a copy of the reply on the table of the House?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: (a) Yes.

(b) His Majesty's Ambassador in Tokyo has informed me that there is no institution in Tokyo known as the World Museum. He adds that no such prohibition as was suggested in the Honourable Member's question is known either to the British Embassy or to any local Indians in respect of any class of public building in Tokyo. Moreover, it appears most unlikely that such a notice would be posted on any building at Tokyo, since not only would it be entirely contrary to Japanese customs to use contemptuous language of this kind, but also Japanese feeling is friendly towards Indians.

(c) All material parts of the reply are contained in my answer to part (b).

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 1474 asked by Mr. S. Satyamurti on the 7th April, 1936.

BAN ON CONGRESS ORGANISATIONS, ETC.

(a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement I laid on the table in connection with the answer given by me on the 14th February, 1935, to Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena's question Nos. 272 and 275. I lay on the table a further statement which brings the particulars given in that statement up to date.

STATEMENT.

Statement bringing up to date the particulars contained in the Statement regarding banned organizations laid on the table in connection with the reply given to Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena's questions Nos. 272 and 275 on the 14th February, 1935.

Province.	Number and character of organizations.	
	(a) from which ban has been lifted since 14th February, 1935.	(b) on which ban has been imposed since 14th February, 1935.
Bombay	8 (revolutionary)	
Bengal	1 Do.	13 (Communist).
Punjab	4 Do.	1 Do.
Burma	27 Do.	5 (Revolutionary).

2. The position in the other provinces is the same as it stood on the 14th February, 1935.

Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 554 asked by Dr. N. B. Khare on the 7th April, 1936.

REVENUES FROM AND EXPENDITURE ON THE CENTRAL AND LOCAL PUBLICITY OFFICES RESPECTIVELY, ON STATE RAILWAYS.

Statement showing the receipts and expenditure of Central and Local Publicity Offices on the Indian State Railways for 1927-28 to 1934-35.

(In thousands of rupees.)

RECEIPTS.

	Burma Railways.	Eastern Bengal Railway.	East Indian Railway.	Great Indian Peninsula Railway.	North Western Railway.	Central Publicity Office.
1927-28	22	36	45	78	19	88
1928-29	23	36	36	81	18	2,00
1929-30	24	42	60	73	27	2,36
1930-31	34	26	50	52	23	2,08
1931-32	25	12	48	53	28	1,54
1932-33	26	34	60	56	36	89
1933-34	26	36	35	62	32	84
1934-35	22	39	54	45	36	71

Statement showing the receipts and expenditure of Central and Local Publicity Offices on the Indian State Railways for 1927-28 to 1934-35.

(In thousands of rupees.)

EXPENDITURE.

	Burma Railways.	Eastern Bengal Railway.	East Indian Railway.	Great Indian Peninsula Railway.	North Western Railway.	Central Publicity Office.
1927-28 . . .	*	18	98	70	1,62	4,28
1928-29 . . .	6	82	82	89	1,08	7,19
1929-30 . . .	35	88	1,34	81	1,61	10,46
1930-31 . . .	33	87	79	99	74	10,31
1931-32 . . .	7	53	68	86	30	6,37
1932-33 . . .	6	40	73	63	32	5,02
1933-34 . . .	6	36	66	59	31	5,17
1934-35 . . .	8	36	83	56	39	4,75

* Not available.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 1532, asked by Prof. N. G. Ranga on the 9th April, 1936.

SUCCESSIVE FAILURE OF CROPS IN PROVINCES.

Madras.—The only district in the Northern Circars which has been affected by adverse seasonal conditions is the Ganjam district in parts of which conditions have been unfavourable. The area seriously affected is comparatively small. There has also been partial failure of crops owing to inadequate rainfall in a small area in the Guntur district also.

Bombay.—The agrarian situation in Ahmedabad is not abnormal.

FAMINE SITUATION IN BERHAMPUR IN BENGAL.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): As promised yesterday, I propose to lay on the table a copy of a telegram that I have received from the Government of Bengal regarding the famine situation in Berhampur.

Some Honourable Members: Please read it.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The telegram reads as follows:

"Reference telegram D-102136 of 21st April 1936. Local Government have received no report of death from starvation, suicide from starvation, or from attacks of cholera or small-pox in Union Boards in police stations Khargram and Bharatpura. Test works opened. During current financial year Rs. 90,000 allotted to Murshidabad district for agricultural loan, Rs. 15,000 for test works, Rs. 10,000 for land improvement loan and Rs. 5,000 for gratuitous relief. Scarcity prevails but adequate measures taken. Further allotments will be made if necessary. Situation under control. 36,299 persons attended test works in the Murshidabad district during last week."

THE INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, for certain purposes (regarding fents, etc.) as reported by the Select Committee. The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (c) of clause 2 of the Bill, in the fifth column of the proposed Item 49 (I) (c), after the figures and words '25 per cent. *ad valorem*' the words 'only so long as the Ottawa Agreement remains in force' be added."

It is only recently that the House gave a decision that the Ottawa Agreement ought to be terminated, and yesterday, my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, complained that even now steps are not being taken to give notice to terminate the Ottawa Agreement. Whatever delay may be caused in giving notice, sooner or later notice has to be given. If this Act is passed in an unqualified manner it would mean that independent steps may have to be taken to bring this into conformity with the amending legislation in connection with the Ottawa Agreement. Now that the Bill is before the House, it is desirable to restrict the scope of the Bill by the addition of the words I have indicated in my amendment, so that, when the Ottawa Agreement goes, these preferences will also go. That is the object of this amendment. Mr. Satyamurti has spoken about this and complained that sufficient steps are not being taken to give effect to that Resolution. I adopt all his arguments and say that the addition of the words I have suggested is necessary. Sir, I move.

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

"That in sub-clause (c) of clause 2 of the Bill, in the fifth column of the proposed Item 49 (I) (c), after the figures and words '25 per cent. *ad valorem*' the words 'only so long as the Ottawa Agreement remains in force' be added."

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I accepted yesterday the amendments moved by Mr. Gauba in respect of this clause on the understanding that those were the only change to be made in this clause. With regard to the question of the effect of the termination of the Ottawa Agreement, I submitted yesterday that, as a result of the termination, the whole question would have to be taken up together, and I added that I could not possibly at this moment accept any of the results of the termination of the Ottawa Trade Agreement, as conceived by Honourable Members opposite, piecemeal. The whole question has to be considered together, and, therefore, Government cannot possibly commit themselves to the amendment which is now sought to be moved. I submit that this amendment is in contravention of the understanding on the basis of which I accepted Mr. Gauba's amendments yesterday. I do hope that the Honourable Member will not press this amendment, but will rest assured with the submission that I made yesterday that the whole of this question has got to be considered together. It will not be concluded behind the back of the House, and that will be the time to consider to what extent effect has been given to the decision of the House with regard to the Ottawa Agreement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): If my Honourable friend will give me satisfaction on one matter, which I think is implied in what he said, I would recommend to my friend not to press his amendment. I would ask him whether these duties to the extent to which they translate in spirit the Ottawa preferences will come under review by the Government of India, as the result of the termination of the

Ottawa Agreement. I quite concede, the Government may then come to us, and suggest these preferences on their own merits. That is a different matter, but I think the House is entitled to a categorical assurance that these duties, along with other preferential duties, will come under re-examination by the Government, when the whole question of Imperial Preference, as the result of the termination of the Ottawa Agreement, is to be re-examined. If that is the position, I do not want that we should do anything to disturb any understanding, which was translated into the vote of the House. I should like to have a categorical assurance on that matter.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Before I answer that question, may I bring to your notice one matter which requires to be considered before this motion can be discussed. If the effect of this amendment is that, up to a certain date, when the Ottawa Trade Agreement terminates, the class of goods to which the 25 per cent. *ad valorem* duty applies will come in at that rate of duty, but that, after that date, the duty applicable to them will be 35 per cent. then this amendment has the effect of raising the charge after that date, and, therefore, is out of order. Subject to that objection, I can assure the Honourable Member, who has just sat down, that the whole question of the preferential duties must be considered as the result of the termination of the Ottawa Agreement.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: In view of what the Honourable Member has just now said, I do not press my amendment.

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

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Azhar Ali.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order. Will you kindly permit Mr. Gauba to move his amendment first, because, if it is accepted, then all other amendments will fall through?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not mind that, if it is likely to shorten the proceedings in that way.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I suggest, Sir, we take it in the order in which these amendments stand; I got notice of this amendment only after we came this morning, and we do not want the matter to be expedited.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I suggest it will save time if the amendments are moved first one after another, but that the speeches may be after the amendments are moved, and afterwards there may be voting.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is quite according to practice. Mr. Azhar Ali.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the words 'Cotton knitted apparel, including' be omitted and the words and brackets 'Sport Shirts (either interlock or without interlock)' be added at the end."

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

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the words 'Cotton knitted apparel, including' be omitted and the words and brackets 'Sport-Shirts (either interlock or without interlock)' be added at the end."

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, for the words 'Cotton knitted apparel' the words 'Cotton knitted fabric' be substituted, and the words 'apparel made of cotton' be omitted."

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

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, for the words 'Cotton knitted apparel' the words 'Cotton knitted fabric' be substituted, and the words 'apparel made of cotton' be omitted."

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the words 'Cotton Knitted Apparel including apparel made of cotton interlocking material' be omitted and the words 'including interlocking materials' be added at the end."

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

"That in sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the words 'Cotton Knitted Apparel including apparel made of cotton interlocking material' be omitted and the words 'including interlocking materials' be added at the end."

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I beg to move:

"That to sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the following be added at the end 'and in the fourth column for the figures '12' the figure '9' shall be substituted'."

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

"That to sub-clause (d) of clause 2 of the Bill, the following be added at the end 'and in the fourth column for the figures '12' the figure '9' shall be substituted'."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, in view of what the Honourable the Commerce Member has said, that in accordance with the Indian Tariff Board report, the 31st March, 1939, is put in, I am not moving amendment No. 10 standing in my name, viz.:

"That in clause 2, the word and figures 'March 31, 1939' occurring in the seventh column be omitted."

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The original Act fixes a certain date in view of the recommendation of the Tariff Board, that the scheme of protection should be in operation during a certain period.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I do not intend to move my amendment.

Mr. K. L. Gauba (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

"That for sub-clause (d) of clause 2, the following be substituted, namely:

(d) For Item 51 (2) the following item shall be substituted, namely:

51(2) Cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material, cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings.

(a) of a weight not exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen	Protective	25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> or 12 annas per lb., whichever is higher.	March 31st, 1939.
(b) of a weight exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen	Protective	25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> or 10 annas per lb., whichever is higher.	March 31st, 1939."

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

"That for sub-clause (d) of clause 2, the following be substituted, namely:

(d) For Item 51 (2) the following item shall be substituted, namely:

51(2) Cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material, cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings.

(a) of a weight not exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen	Protective	25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> or 12 annas per lb., whichever is higher.	March 31st, 1939.
(b) of a weight exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen	Protective	25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> or 10 annas per lb., whichever is higher.	March 31st, 1939."

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: Sir, so far as I am concerned, my amendment is about sports shirts. Sir, this commodity is mostly used by sports people (*An Honourable Member from the Treasury Benches*: "No, no") and boys playing in the fields, and I think the attempt made by this sporting Government to tax these small things, and while it will not affect the boys so very much, it will certainly not redound to the credit of the Government that they thus penalise the poor parents who, after all, will have to provide their children with two or three of these sports shirts at least in a year.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Why not practise birth-control? Why produce so many boys?

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: If the burden of this duty on these small sports shirts is debited to the poor accounts of these poor parents, I think it will be a great hardship on the poor parents indeed. Sir, the question

[Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali.]

is this,—that we are being ground down between two mills,—one is the United Kingdom and the other is Japan. These are the two countries that ought to be benefited by these higher duties. The fact is—I do not want today to enter into any philosophical discussion or discourse on this preferential duty

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: What is the point of the Honourable Member's amendment? Does he suggest that sports shirts should come in under the lower, or the higher, rate of duty?

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: Lower.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: But the effect of his amendment will be that this will be subject to the duty proposed in the Bill, that is, 12 annas per pound,—it will be about 70 per cent. I am only trying to point out that the effect of the Honourable Member's amendment is that he is including sports shirts in this item, which means that they will be subject to the 12 annas per pound duty. Of course, they will also be subject to the same duty under the proposals of Government, but the Honourable Member is arguing contrary to his own amendment.

Mr. J. Ramsay Scott (United Provinces: European): Are not the shirts already included in the material under which they are made?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd (Government of India: Nominated Official): The item "shirts" comes under the head "apparel".

Mr. J. Ramsay Scott: Not under cotton duties? There is a special item given, shirts and all sorts of things with the material under which they are made.

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: If it is considered that I am not speaking according to my own amendment, then I would not say anything further, but I would read out a Persian couplet:

*"Hai Jhooth ke darul Islam hai Hind,
Yeh jhooth ke mulke Lachman-o-Ram hai Hind,*

*Ham sab hain muti-o-Ibadat-a-English,
Europe ke liay bas Aik Godam hai Hind."*

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, when we adjourned yesterday, I never thought that some of my Honourable friends will spring a surprise on the floor of the House today. I oppose every amendment that has been moved on the item of hosiery. Sir, I was surprised when I learnt in the lobby that the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, was an agreed amendment among those who wanted to bring about certain changes. I am surprised, because this point was not raised in the Select Committee by any of those who support today the amendment on the floor of the House. Nobody brought out this amendment in the Select Committee. Why is it, Sir, they brought out these amendments? Is it because that yesterday, when the clock stood at five, the House adjourned and over-night they manufactured an amendment relating to the hosiery industry in India which will not be acceptable to the industry

at all? My Honourable colleagues in the Congress Party have not yet considered these amendments, but I may say on my own behalf that I am opposed to it tooth and nail. What will be the effect of Mr. Gauba's amendment? The Honourable the Commerce Member comes from the Punjab. The Tariff Board report on Woollen and textile industry gives such a glowing picture of the hosiery industry in the Punjab that the industry deserves protection. They manufacture pullovers and other woollen stuff and cotton things. If the Honourable the Commerce Member is a party to accept this amendment, the net result will be that the hosiery industry of the Punjab, the ones situate in Ludhiana, Lahore, Amritsar, and other places, where small power factories have been started to manufacture woollen pullovers, Balaclava caps and mufflers, will all die out. It is well known that Japan manufactures superior stuff from cotton and exports it to England and other European countries. One can find in the very City of Manchester Japanese cotton goods sold much cheaper than English goods. What Japan sends to India in the shape of fents and hosiery is not first class cotton stuff, but it is shoddy goods manufactured to suit the condition of the importing market in India and also to suit the vicious taste of those unscrupulous people that go on sending fents to India. Supposing part (b) of Mr. Gauba's amendment is carried, what will happen? Japan will manufacture these pullovers and heavy goods from shods, there will be no cotton yarn in it at all, they will all be of shoddy material and they will also add some sand and dust to increase the weight and this will pass through the customs barrier under heavy weightage. I see my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, is smiling. He belongs to the Punjab. He has not seen the Calcutta market. If he comes and walks in the streets of Calcutta market, he will see pullovers and other things which, if one shakes there will be one or two ounces of dust and sand coming out, and if one tries to put them on, these pullovers will be torn to pieces in one wear. What is the effect of this amendment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Does the Honourable Member mean that they will make them heavier in order to bring them under the lower rate of duty?

Mr. B. Das: Yes, Sir.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am not at present arguing either for or against the amendment. I want to be clear as to what the Honourable Member means. The difference in the duty is two annas per pound. If they make them heavier, let us say by four ounces, in order to bring them under the lower duty, then they will be paying five annas extra and saving only one anna on the excess weight of four ounces.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, everybody knows that the Japanese are the shrewdest people in the world. They will confine themselves to that limit which the customs tariffs allow. What they will do is this. They will use shoddy materials and materials that will not stand one day's wear even in India. I described yesterday how the Japanese socks and stockings get torn in one day. I do not know if my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, ever used a pair of Japanese socks or stockings.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am a poor man. I always use Japanese goods. I cannot afford to purchase costly British goods.

Mr. B. Das: I believe he had the same painful experience with these Japanese goods. I once purchased a pair, and, in one wear, there were five holes in the stocks, and I had to take it out. Did my Honourable friend have the same experience?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: No, Sir.

Mr. B. Das: Then, my Honourable friend is more fortunate. He is singularly fortunate in doubling his investment in sugar industry, and he is also singularly fortunate in using Japanese socks and stockings without being torn for more than two days. Yesterday I complained and today I complain that we should not deteriorate the standard of the goods that are used. Everybody here pleads for the poor consumer. Even my Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, the idealist that he is, pleaded yesterday for the consumer, and when I heard him speak, I was lulled to sleep by his sympathetic cry for the consumer and I was wondering where I stood! When my Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, was preaching the interests of the consumer in his usual idealist way, in terms of ideology, he forgot the realities of life. Prof. Ranga, coming as he does from Madras, knows that not even a thousand pairs of socks are worn in the whole of Madras, and my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, who hails from Madras, will confirm me in my statement that the poor people in Madras never wear socks.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: They do not wear even shoes.

Mr. B. Das: If they do not wear shoes, they wear *chappals*. When my Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, made that idealist speech, I felt wondering whether it was the heated atmosphere outside or the artificially cool atmosphere inside the Chamber that made him make that speech espousing the cause of the consumers. He seems to have forgotten the essential rights of the consumer, namely, that he must purchase a thing which must have a certain minimum lasting quality and which point I want the House to bear in mind.

But, now, let us examine the problem. I cannot raise a point of order now. This point was never moved in the Select Committee. The second thing that I want to say is that, even looking at it from the consumer's point of view, if he buys Japanese stuff, say a pullover for ten annas, he will find it full of shod with not a single thread of real cotton yarn, but full of dust and shod. He will use it for a week and afterwards his money will be wasted. For a poor man ten annas is as much important and valuable as Rs. 10,000 for my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, or for my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, who, I think, seldom dresses in Indian or Japanese goods. I again appeal to the Honourable the Commerce Member that he should bear in mind the hosiery industry in the Punjab. Bengal at present does not go in for heavier goods as the Punjab does. The Honourable Member knows it well how in Amritsar, Lahore, Ludhiana, these power factories have sprung forth. If he puts this handicap and if the House puts this handicap, the intentions of the recommendations of the Tariff Board on the Woollen Hosiery Industry will be stultified and will put a handicap. Probably the handicap will not be very much felt by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ramsay Scott, because the mill industry, with their powerful resources and organisation, will be able to compete with Japanese goods.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): But what part of India is affected by Mr. Gauba's amendment? The manufacturers of which part of India?

Mr. B. Das: The manufacturers in the Punjab and Bengal. I do hope that Raizada Hans Raj will address the House for the second time now. Once he was compelled by Sir Frederick Whyte to speak in the House to save the honour of the Punjab, and today he must speak to save the Punjab woollen hosiery and hosiery industry from dying out. As I want him to speak, I will sit down opposing the amendment of Mr. Gauba.

Raizada Hans Raj (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I do not wear socks and my wife does not wear stockings. Therefore, this will never affect us, but I have been approached by Ludhiana people and they say that they will not get any work in summer if this amendment is passed. As a plain man and as an honest man, I am bound to oppose it, and I hope the House will follow me.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, I may say just a few words about the amendment which I have had the honour to move. Raizada Hans Raj has stated that the workers of Ludhiana have said that, if this amendment is passed, their factories will close down and there would be no work for them. I am afraid, the Ludhiana people do not know anything about this amendment as yet, because it was only submitted to the House this morning. I am also afraid, my Honourable friend, Raizada Hans Raj, has really not understood the purpose or the meaning of the amendment which has been placed before the House this morning.

Raizada Hans Raj: When I came to this place, I met the Ludhiana people. I do not know who told them, but they told me there that this amendment is coming and they asked me to oppose it.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Though I am bound to say that the Honourable Member did not know himself what the amendment was.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: So far as this amendment is concerned, there is nothing insidious or doubtful about it. If this amendment adversely affected the hosiery industry of the Punjab or any other province, I would be the first not to put it forward. Or, if any proposal went against the protection to be afforded to the hosiery industry, wherever it may exist, whether in the Punjab or elsewhere, I would be the very first person to oppose such a proposal.

Sir, the amendment which is proposed is a very simple one. The hosiery industry wants protection; the Commerce Department has recommended protection by means of the duty set forth in the Bill. But the question is two-fold. There may be certain items which come within the definition put forward in the Bill and which really do not need protection. In the second place, the proposal might amount, so far as certain articles are concerned, to a duty which is greater than the protection which is needed for the particular articles in question. Taking these two or three facts into consideration, Sir Muhammad Yakub, Mr. Ramsay Scott, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, Maulana Shaukat Ali and myself met the Commerce Member last evening and discussed this question. The amendment is the outcome of those negotiations. There are certain Members of this House who are

[Mr. K. L. Gauba.]

really very much agitated over the hosiery clause in the Tariff Bill, and they have tried very hard, as the various amendments on the agenda paper will show, to get a modification of the definition of the terms "cotton knitted apparel" and the term "interlocking material". Sir, my amendment makes no change so far as the definition goes. So far as Government are giving protection to the hosiery industry, my amendment also does not affect that in the slightest degree. The only difference between my amendment and the proposal of Government is with regard to goods which exceed four pounds in weight per dozen. And on these goods two facts seem apparent. Firstly, the protection is not really necessary, and, in the second place, the incidence of taxation on these particular goods would amount in some cases to 120 per cent on the *ad valorem* basis. My amendment, which reduces the duty on weight from 12 annas to 10 annas per pound reduces the incidence of taxation on the heavier goods from about 120 per cent. to between 95 and 90 per cent. Any industry, whichever it may be, if it cannot operate with a protective duty between 90 and 95 per cent. has no claim to greater protection than this. According to well recognised principles, the incidence of taxation for purposes of protection should not ordinarily exceed 75 per cent. on the *ad valorem* basis. The modification therefore still keeps the margin of protection well over 75 per cent.

I will not detain the House much longer. I say that, so far as these goods over four pounds in weight are concerned, the amendment affords ample protection, but is a *via media* to meet all sections of the House. We should, Sir, pass this Bill today in the most cordial spirit. I am as much desirous of protecting the industry, as also consumers, as my Honourable friends on this side of the House. I respectfully put forward this amendment as a *via media*, and I trust it will be accepted both by Government as well as the Congress Party.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I had no intention of interfering in this debate. I have been trying to read this Bill and I have been very attentively and carefully hearing all the speeches, but I found that the more I studied it, the more confused my brain became with these "Fleecy Shirts", "cotton-knitted apparel", "interlocking" or "underlocking" material; pullovers, slipovers, half underpants and full underpants, etc. I do not want that I should plough the sands and then give my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, a chance to show up my ignorance. I have been inundated with telegrams from my constituency and sometimes I was disturbed in my sleep at dead of night, by the telegraph peon, but whenever I saw the word "hosiery" in it, tore the telegram to pieces and paid no attention to it. (Laughter.) But I made enquiries in the way yesterday, when I wanted to buy some new undervests, I went to the market and I went to all the shops near about the Jama Masjid, Katra Barian, Chandni Chowk, etc.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Probably they could not supply the proper size to fit you. (Laughter.)

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I made inquiries, and I found that the articles for which I paid Rs. 7 last year, their price had gone up to Rs. 12 this year. I am, of course, talking of small shopkeepers which now I patronise,

In my old age, I went to Europe and paid for my outfit in Bombay—real swadeshi articles from Katrak and paid for woollen things four times the price that I would have paid in London or Paris. I got the woollen socks and undervests, but I had to pay three or four times more. I wanted to show my sympathy for Indian made articles, but I think the Honourable the Commerce Member and the Member for Industries know that they are not available in sufficient quantities. Now, I want gauze banyans made in India and at as low a price as possible. Will any one kindly let me know where am I to get them? I asked my friend, Mr. Ramsay Scott. I appreciate his interest and keenness. He said: "Go to Mr. Misra." I do not know who Mr. Misra is, where is he? I asked him whether he could get me these gauze banyans to fit me, I admit I am an outsize. (Inter-ruption from Mr. Ramsay Scott.) Good news! He is going to present me with twelve new gauze banyans to fit me; I thank him in anticipation. I shall give him my measurement, I measuer, I think, 52 inches in chest and 40 inches in length. The real fact is that there is something wrong with the marketing, something is also wrong with the quality and quantity of production. I have no objection to my friend, Sir H. P. Mody, and our Bombay and Ahmedabad mill friend who manufacture sufficient cloth to ask for as heavy a protection as they deserve as I wish we could stop foreign cloth as much as possible, but when the production is so poor, I do not know where we stand. Last year, I went to the Industrial Exhibition in Delhi and asked for a dozen cotton white socks to wear. I have not got them so far. I have been to all the shops who make hosiery, and I am going to Lucknow and Bara Banki where, I am told, they make some cotton hosiery. The market everywhere is so poor that even I cannot get them. There was a time when I was flush with money and prices were no consideration. I wanted to look very smart, and I paid any price for what I wanted, but today I am poor. Still the conceit of the old man is there. I must look very imposing and as handsome as possible. (Laughter.) I am not alone now. I have children and grand-children to look after. For what Japan sold me last year at eight annas per pair, I had to pay two rupees this year. Unfortunately Japanese stuff shrinks and I had to give them to my wife and other relatives to wear. So the Honourable the Commerce Member must see that, till the country produces real things on a large scale to satisfy the requirements of the people, foreign stuffs should not be taxed too highly. Where the supply is so limited and inadequate, what right have we to ask the poor man to pay more than he can afford? I have full sympathy with Indian industries, and I would encourage them myself. My friend, Mr. Satyamurti, called this Government a lazy Government. I entirely agree with him that it is a lazy Government and that we ought to punish it for its laziness, and like a good schoolmaster give it a good thrashing every now and then to buck it up; but we people in India are also very lazy in our industries. We cannot produce articles and we want everything to be spoon-fed. The time has come when we ought to shake off our laziness and we ought also to blame our own people for not producing sufficient to satisfy the poor man's requirements in India.

My brother, Raizada Hans Raj, also promises to get me gauze undervests. I will be, I see, very happy to secure them.

I had no intention of speaking on this subject, because I did not want to show my ignorance. I do not know how long ago I spoke last in this House, I thought I would quietly fade away, sleep and wake up in Simla next August. The only subject that had been worrying me now, was

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

about the rickshaw coolies and the rickshaw allowance in Simla. I would speak on that subject, but unfortunately you would not allow me to do so, nor is the Honourable the Finance Member here to hear my special pleadings.

I support Mr. Gauba's amendment, and I hope that every other Member of this House will also support him. It is all very well to talk of industries; we should think of the consumers and of the poor shopkeepers also; they are all our people. The telegrams I had received were from Hindus, Mussalmans and others, and all of them really felt that, if something was not done to produce sufficient quantities of hosiery, their business would go and we should all suffer.

Mr. J. Ramsay Scott: Sir, I am sorry that my Honourable friend, Maulana Shaukat Ali, has not been able to get his hosiery, but I will see that he gets it. I do not think he would take the output of one whole factory, as these sort of things we turn out in large quantities of thirty-thousand dozens at a time.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Question.

Mr. J. Ramsay Scott: Sir, I am not prepared to accept amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6 or 7, as they all relate to breaches of evasion. I am also not prepared to accept No. 8 as it would reduce the specific duty on all hosiery. I am, however, prepared to accept Mr. Gauba's amendment on behalf of the Hosiery Manufacturers of India, and I would like to thank the Honourable the Commerce Member for meeting us last night although he was very tired out after a very exhausting day in the Assembly.

I am accepting this amendment entirely on the representation of several Muhammadan Members who feel that the heavy weight material may be rather heavily taxed, and I trust that, if, at any time, the present protection is not adequate, they will be prepared to meet me in the same friendly spirit as I have met them today. I hope, therefore, that this House will pass this amendment unanimously, thereby showing that they realise the justness of the hosiery industry's claim that breaches should be closed—I am not referring to apparel—and I also hope that in accepting this amendment the House will realise that we are making a sacrifice. I am still a little uneasy on the subject of light weight apparel as Government had the idea that this would weigh two pounds per dozen and fixed the rate of specific duty at twelve annas per pound. The average weight of imports today is $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds per dozen and the protection should, therefore, be Re. 1 a dozen. I hope that Government will watch this position.

Mr. B. Das: Why should Government watch it?

Mr. J. Ramsay Scott: With regard to heavy weight hosiery over four pounds, the average weight is about six pounds a dozen, *i.e.*, Rs. 8-12-0, and, as far as I can realise, that means a duty of over 100 per cent. I do not wish to be greedy, but I think that a duty of over 100 per cent. is excessive, although Japan would ask for 250. Mr. Gauba's amendment brings the duty down to about 90 per cent., and I think that I am not asking the House too much when I ask them to accept it.

I understand that the Punjab and the United Provinces Governments are supporting this Bill, and I wish to thank them, and I hope that the Punjab Training College for Hosiery Workers will go ahead for the hosiery industry which is now a good career for educated middle class young men, and there is no reason why the industry should not absorb these young lads.

A start has also been made in making knitting machines in this country, and I think this industry needs Government help to develop it on proper lines. I would like to thank the House and the Select Committee for the kind support which they have given us, and I would assure the House that this industry is doing its best to use only Indian cotton yarns. The industry has made wonderful progress in the last two years, and I have no hesitation in recommending the country to buy Indian made apparel.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I will be very brief this morning. I would like first to protest very strongly against the two principles which the Government of India have adopted in imposing the duty underlying this particular Bill. The first is that they believe—and I think they believe incorrectly—that, by giving over-protection, the prices will go down very quickly by internal competition. I attempted to elucidate my objections yesterday, which I could not develop—I shall develop them on some future occasion in Simla. But I would like to say now emphatically that if you have over-protection on any particular article, then that over-protection will continue to exist for a very long time: political pressure will be brought to bear, and it will be exceedingly difficult for any Government to remove it, even at a time when it is no longer needed.

The other thing to which I strongly object is the imposition of alternative duty—*ad valorem* and specific. This method of taxation falls very heavily on the poor and very lightly on the rich.

The third thing to which I object is putting any duty, whatever it may be, without an impartial inquiry. These are the three principles which I illustrated yesterday, and I stick to them. In the case of hosiery, for example, I mentioned that the duty which the Tariff Board recommended was exceedingly fair and there could not be any room for complaint. Cotton Textile Tariff Board provided 16 per cent. for wastage, 10 per cent. for depreciation (while we know that 7½ per cent. is quite sufficient), eight per cent. profit on the capital—and in these days when the bank rate is three per cent., eight per cent. is really excessive—and finally six per cent. on the working expenses. With these liberal provisions (which nobody in this House can say that they are not liberal) they came to the conclusion that the duty of Rs. 1-8-0 per dozen is quite sufficient to protect the industry. Now, Rs. 1-8-0 has been translated by the Government as equivalent to nine annas a pound. I calculated it equivalent to 9-2/5ths annas a pound, and, according to Dr. Meek's and Mr. Hardy's calculation, it is equal to 10 annas a pound: but it is something between nine annas and ten annas a pound. If you give this protection by weight, nobody can say that this is less because it has been calculated on a very liberal basis: and calculating it on that basis the protection of 10 annas a pound is more than sufficient for any class of goods. Sir Homi Mody said yesterday that protection is always given in the interests of the consumer. This reminded me of a story. A certain person was delivering a lecture in great

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

style: some one objected and said "My friend, you are not speaking correctly: you are telling a lie." Then, the first man turned round suddenly and said that I believed you when you were telling lies, why do you not believe me when I am telling a lie? That is the position of Sir Homi Mody when he forcibly said that protective duty is all in the interests of the consumer. We on this side say that it is a tax on consumer for the benefit of industry.

Protection was given to only two articles last time, that is, undervests and socks and stockings. It was over-protection because it was 33 per cent. higher than what was due to them on the recommendation of the Tariff Board. In this Bill they are demanding two things: one is that instead of giving protection to two articles, they demand protection to an indefinite number of articles. Besides, you are giving them not only protection but excess protection. My objections are two-fold. One is that this thing is being done without an inquiry: there ought to have been an inquiry whether these other things should be included or not: and if the enquiry showed that they should be included, then I would not hesitate to include them. My second difficulty, which is a real difficulty, is that the word "apparel" used in this particular Bill cannot possibly be defined; and even in this compilation of the Sea-borne Trade of India, I notice that Government themselves use the word 'apparel' in two different senses: first, there is the heading on page 81 of the report, called apparel, and under this large number of articles are included—even second hand clothing and lametta which nobody. . . .

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is entirely wrong. I pointed out to the Honourable Member on another occasion that the heading finishes long before "second hand clothing" is reached: as a matter of fact there is gold and silver thread in between.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What I say is that there is a bigger head in apparel in which all these things are included, and another and narrower heading called apparel: this word "apparel" is used in the restricted sense the second time, I am reading from Sea-Borne Trade, and I was given to understand that the Commerce Department will use it in the restricted sense and they will not give an extended definition which might possibly be given to it. That is my apprehension. . . .

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have already explained in what sense this expression will be used in connection with this matter.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: After what the Honourable the Commerce Member has said, my apprehension in this particular matter is now removed: I hope it will always be used in this sense by the Customs Officers.

I also apprehend that this incidence of taxation bears very heavily on certain classes of goods. We gave protection to two articles at the figure of 12 annas a pound. The weight duty of 12 annas a pound works out to be 69 per cent, and, in some cases, 70 per cent. *ad valorem* duty. So, really speaking, we have given protection to the extent of 70 per cent. *ad valorem*, but here in this case in certain classes of goods, it works out, as I mentioned last time, to 113 per cent., 137 per cent, and even in

certain cases to over 200 per cent. I do not want to give the complete list, but it is evident from the figures that I have before me that the duty in certain classes of articles works out very heavily, from cent. per cent. to 200 per cent. Therefore, I say that if you give protection, it must be reasonable protection—protection which was recommended by the Cotton Textile Tariff Board. But do not give excess protection in the interests of the industry itself, because in that case there will be a tendency to its becoming slack and inefficient.

There is one more point to which I would like to draw especially the attention of the House, and that is the protection to the cottage industry. There is no doubt that we have a double problem before us: protection to our mills as against foreign imports, and protection to our cottage industries against our own mills. We have really to protect cottage industries, and here I feel the force of the point raised by the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party in his note of dissent that a portion or whole of the duty we may collect from a protected article, ought to be spent in improving that particular industry.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: Does the Honourable Member include in that what would have been the revenue duty if there had not been a protective duty?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I understood that the intention of protection is that the Government relinquishes duty altogether on protected article. When an article is protected, there will be no import, and, therefore, no income to the Government at all, or practically *nil*. This is what is said: that the income whatever it may be should be spent in improving that industry. The point which I would like to emphasise is this, that in order to protect your cottage industry, something must be done for yarn, because the mills pay no duty on it because they make their own yarns. The cottage industry has to purchase foreign yarn and pay a duty ranging from two to three annas per pound and, therefore, something ought to be done to protect the cottage industry against the mill industry by giving some kind of bounty for the yarn or by reducing the duty on yarn which is used as raw material by the cottage industry. This is a very complicated problem, Sir, and we cannot solve it just at present.

My friend, Mr. B. Das, raised a question as to why these amendments were not made in the Select Committee. My friend left the Committee before the question of hosiery industry was taken up, and therefore he was not an eye witness to what actually happened. The fact is that this matter was taken up at such a late hour that we were all in a hurry and the subject could not be discussed at length; the Committee did not have sufficient time to discuss all possible amendments to this particular motion. My own individual opinion is that we ought to reduce the quantum of protection to the figure recommended by the Tariff Board, that is, from 12 annas to 9 annas, not only for the things recommended by them, but also for undervests, socks and stockings, and if we want to include any other article in this Bill, it ought to be included after impartial inquiry. Therefore, these are the two fundamental points that I want to emphasise, to reduce the quantum of protection to the figure recommended by the Tariff Board, and (2) not to include any other article without a formal inquiry by the Tariff Board, but it will tend to prolong the discussion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to reply to the debate now?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I shall reply at the end, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, this Bill has excelled in surprises. It was brought to us very late. It was placed before the Select Committee the day before yesterday, and we saw the Select Committee's Report yesterday, in which I find this—"We accept the proposal contained in sub-clause (e) of clause 2 of the Bill as introduced, though some of the Members thought that it should be left in abeyance until the Tariff Board had further inquired into the subject". Again, Sir, I find this Report is signed by the Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar, the Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, Mr. Dow and my friend, Sir Homi Mody; and I find, Sir, that none of the three official Members has appended any dissenting minute on this matter, and even my friend, Sir Homi Mody, says:

'I agree with the Report with the exception of paragraph 2 relating to Staple Fibre.'

Now, Sir, when we come this morning, we are presented with this amendment, and I do submit that the House is entitled to some explanation, as to how and why this amendment came into being, and I find, Sir, already there is an atmosphere of "accepting this amendment". To the extent to which it shortens the debate, I agree, but I think that we must get some information from Honourable Members representing the Government, as to their attitude in this matter. I want to explain, Sir, the present position. You will find in the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act under 51(2) Cotton Hosiery,—the following, namely—Cotton undervests, knitted or woven and cotton socks or stockings, protective duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem* or 12 annas per pound; whichever is higher. Then, Sir, 52, says: Apparel, Hosiery, Haberdashery, Millinery and Drapery, not otherwise specified, preferential revenue 35 per cent *ad valorem*, which is the standard rate of duty, and 25 per cent *ad valorem* if the article is the produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom or a British Colony. Now, Sir, I recognise that the definition, as in the original Bill as also in the amendment, includes apparel which means Cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material, cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings. Therefore, on the categories of materials which are not included in the original 51 (2), but which are included for the first time, specific duties are being imposed, and I accept it, but so far as the differential duty between the two classes of articles, namely of a weight not exceeding four pounds per dozen 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, or 12 annas, whichever is higher, and (b) of a weight not exceeding four pounds a dozen, 25 per cent *ad valorem* or 10 annas, whichever is higher, I want to know what is the reason behind it. Two of my Honourable friends, the author of the amendment and Mr. Ramsay Scott spoke on that, and I listened to them very carefully, and the reasons they gave were these. Mr. Gauba suggested that certain items may not need protection, that is the first "fact", the second "fact" is the duty may be greater than what is required. Therefore, in view of these two or three "facts", that is to say, he merely surmises that certain items may not need protection, and the duty suggested in the Bill may be greater than what is required, and therefore he

says he would commend the amendment to the House. I thought my Honourable friend, Mr. Ramsay Scott, would place more materials before us. He said "some friends in this House did not like this proposal in the Bill. I am content to accept it as a compromise in the hope that if this duty is not protective enough, they will oblige me later on". I do suggest, Mr. President, that to ask the House to accept an amendment on one set of theories, and another in a spirit of—I take what I get now in the hope that those who are against it today may be with me tomorrow—is not treating the House fairly, or even honestly. So far as Government is concerned, this duty is protective both in the original Act and in the Bill as it stands now. The object of the duty is clearly protective. Therefore, we are entitled to know on what information the Government propose to act. If they accept this amendment, I do not know how they are going to justify it, on what information they act to see that the protection contemplated in clause (b) of 51 (2) is ample for the purpose of protecting the industry. Then, Sir, I want information specifically on one or two points. What is the amount of import today of the class of articles mentioned here, dozens of which are more than 4 lbs. in weight? What is the extent of consumption in this country of those kinds of articles, and what is the extent of manufacture? And, taking all these facts into consideration, are Government satisfied that this 25 per cent. *ad valorem* or ten annas per pound whichever is higher is ample enough protection for that purpose? If not, Sir, what is the basis on which this 10 annas per pound is recommended to the House

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): I believe it has been 90 per cent.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am told it (the extent of protection) has been about 90 per cent. and cent per cent, and so on. I am ignorant about that matter, and therefore I want some enlightenment on it. Is protection to be governed by the need of the industry if you want to protect or by fancy percentages? At that rate, the Government can lay down, whatever the need of the industry may be, they will give no more than 50 per cent. If Government want to protect an industry, they must protect it. There is no use asking the consumer to pay, without adequately protecting the industry. It is a double injury to the country. You first of all make me pay more, and do not help the industry, this "protection of 90 per cent" does not appeal to me. Either say you want to protect the industry or do not want to protect it. If you want to protect it, you must give it adequate protection. If you think, on the whole, the cost of protection is so high that the country cannot afford it, then do not play at protection. To play at protection and say that we give 90 per cent is simply absurd. The whole object of protection is, you will protect the industry effectively for the time being, and at the end of the stipulated period of years, when the industry is able to stand on its own legs, you will gradually reduce the protection, and ultimately the industry will go without protection. Therefore, all this argument is a camouflage, if Government's objective is to give protection in the true sense. I should like to know, with regard to articles which now come under 51 (2) and 53, what is the average weight of dozens of articles which are now imported. That will give some indication to the House, as to how the protective duty on a differential basis is likely to work. Then my Honourable friend;

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Mr. Gauba, also talked of a *via media*. A *via media* between what extremes I should like to know. If it is a case of importers of foreign goods, I have no sympathy with them. I can understand the consumers' point of view, but the importers have no right to any sympathy at the hands of any Honourable Member of this House. They can live, so long as this country does not become self-sufficient in the matter of her own industries. Therefore, we have no right to listen to the plaintive cries of importers. (An Honourable Member: "Question.") At that rate, let us become hewers of wood and drawers of water and may the tribe of importers increase! Therefore, we must examine this question from the point of view whether the industry deserves protection, and whether according to the canons laid down by the Indian Fiscal Commission and accepted by the Government, the case for protection is amply made out.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The Tariff Board recommended only nine annas a pound.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am glad that my Honourable friend reminds me of that. There, I want the Government to give us some explanation, as to why they came forward with this Bill and then accept this proposal. They said, with regard to apparel there would be 25 per cent. *ad valorem* or 12 annas per pound, and in the Select Committee did not change their mind. I do not know what happened between the time that my Honourable friend signed this report as the Commerce Member of the Government, and the time last night or this morning when this amendment was sprung upon the House, to make this amendment acceptable to him. Some facts must have emerged, and if, on the whole the Government had sufficient facts in their possession or sufficient reasons to recommend the Bill to the House, unless something has happened since then to convince them and to convince this House that this reduced duty should be levied, I submit the House is entitled to stand by the Government's original intention as expressed in the Bill as introduced, as also in the Bill as amended and recommended by the Select Committee for consideration by this House. My Honourable friend, Maulana Shaukat Ali, I am sorry he is not here, talked of socks. I want to tell him that he won't get any benefit even from this increased weight. I do not think that any kinds of socks ought really to weigh more than four pounds by the dozen, and it seems to me he made much fun of socks, presenting them to his wife

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It won't apply to socks at all.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It won't apply from the very nature of the thing. I should like to know what is the kind of garment which this is intended to lower the duty on, and, if so, will it not benefit my amiable neighbour Japan? She is very clever and unscrupulous, and she can use this to dump Japanese goods into this country. I am surprised that my Honourable friend, Sir Homi Mody, quite well swallows this. He has signed the Select Committee's Report; he did not dissent on this. May I know from him what has happened between the time when he signed the Report and now, and as to why he does not oppose the amendment?

Sir H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): As a compromise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is what I object to. This country is being thought of as a football at the hands of a few general importers on the one hand, the British manufacturers on the other, the Indian capitalists on the third, and Government and myself as the humble victims of this conspiracy.

An Honourable Member: You have knocked us out all right!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yesterday practically all sections of the House were a party to that amendment. I am sorry that the European Group was not represented, but my information was that all other groups were represented.

Mr. F. E. James: You did not even circulate the amendment.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is not my fault; it is the fault of the office. I suggest, even assuming that something wrong happened yesterday, one wrong does not justify another. Therefore, let us not multiply these wrongs.

Mr. F. E. James: One swallow does not make a Satyamurti. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Nor a James. (Laughter.) I would like to ask my Honourable friend what "dozen" means. Does it mean same size, or different sizes? How are they going to work this "dozen" business, four pounds per dozen? Can they be all sizes, or are they to be of the same uniform size? And can they put different kinds of articles, or should they put the same kind of articles? These are matters which I think will be relevant in considering the working of this preference. But, above all, one point I want to make, and it is this. I agree that, to the extent to which we give protection, we ought to encourage the smaller and cottage industries, at least as much as we encourage the large industries. Are Government satisfied that the lower level of duty they recommend is not likely to hinder the smaller and cottage industries? My own feeling is that this amendment is the result of a hasty compromise, not based on any facts, but owing to the anxiety to get this Bill through, on a hot morning or afternoon on the 23rd April. I submit it is not fair to this House, it is not fair to this country. By all means, if there are facts to justify this, and my Honourable friend can satisfy me that, with this lower duty, on articles of weight exceeding 4 lbs., of ten annas per pound, you are giving ample protection to the industry concerned, I personally shall have no objection. But it seems to me that today it is a case of Government accepting this, in order to ensure a smooth passage for this Bill. I do feel that, on the points that I have raised, namely, the effectiveness of the protection for the purposes for which this clause is sought to be amended, the extent or the amount of material imported, manufactured, and consumed in this country, of the category of weights per dozen exceeding four pounds, and also the average weight of dozens of articles now imported under this category not exceeding four pounds per dozen, as also the manner in which this dozen or this weight are to be

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

calculated—these are matters on which Government ought to satisfy the House. If they do not, I think the House will be well advised in standing by its own Select Committee, and by the Government's original proposal. I have heard nothing to justify this except "compromise, compromise". Compromise, but between whom, and for which purpose? We get no light on that. I, therefore, hope that some light will be forthcoming which will satisfy the House. Otherwise, I trust the Government will stand by their own original proposal, both when they introduced it and in the Select Committee, and that the House will stand by Government in this matter.

An Honourable Member: Let the question be now put

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I rise to a point of order, Sir. I submit that this amendment is not in order. The original proposal of Government related only to cotton knitted apparel, and cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings were not in issue at all. The proposal, as it found place in the Bill, was to the effect that the duty on cotton knitted apparel should be raised and the present scale should be substituted by another providing a lower duty, an *ad valorem* duty along with a specific duty. I would refer to paragraph 4 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons, under the heading Cotton Knitted Apparel. There are two classes of goods that are mentioned here. One is "cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material", and another "cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks or stockings". I am reading from the Bill itself, under sub-clause (e). If you will be pleased to look at Item 51 (2) in the Schedule you will find that cotton undervests, knitted or woven and cotton socks and stockings are subject to the same duty today to which they were subject before the Bill was introduced.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's argument is that this enlarges the scope of the Bill.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes. What the Bill actually contemplated was an increase in the duty on cotton apparel alone and no change whatsoever in the duty that was levied or leviable on cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings. It substituted the scale of duty applicable to these fabrics for the present duty for apparel.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The original Bill has the same words.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What was contained in the original Bill was only a convenient way of expressing what the Government wanted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): In what way is the scope of the Bill sought to be enlarged?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The amendment seeks to make a change in the duty levied on cotton undervests, cotton socks or stockings but there was no proposal whatsoever for any change on cotton vests, knitted

or woven and cotton socks and stockings. There was no proposal from the Government or any amendment in the rates of duty charged on these. The Bill only says that the duty on cotton apparel will be the same. That is the duty on these articles as it was levied at the date when the Bill was introduced. That was only a concise way of expressing that view. The Bill could as well have said that the duty on cotton apparel will be as specified in column 4 of 51 (2). It said no more than that, so that the whole case was restricted to the duty leviable on cotton apparel.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the article that has now been added?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: If you will be pleased to look at Mr. Gauba's amendment, it says: Cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material, cotton undervests, knitted or woven and cotton socks and stockings.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): All these things were there.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What I am submitting is this, that so far as cotton undervests, cotton socks and cotton stockings go there was no proposal for any change in the duty, nor was there any proposal for any new levy being made on these articles. The only proposal that was before us was restricted to cotton apparel. You will see that there are two groups of articles that are covered by this clause. One is cotton knitted apparel, the other undervests, socks and stockings. Now, the Bill proposes a change in the rate of duty levied on cotton apparel and no change whatsoever in the rates of duty levied on other articles. If it had not committed itself to this form of expression, all that the Bill meant to say was this that the rates of duty for cotton knitted apparel will be the same as are leviable under Article 51(2). Suppose we had got a proposal in that form. Would it have been open to us to say that the duty on cotton undervests, cotton socks or cotton stockings would be reduced?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Why not?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Because that would not have been the issue. 51(2) has a certain scale of duty and the Bill says that the duty on cotton knitted apparel will be increased and charged accordingly.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The amendment proposes that it be reduced.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: It would have been open to us to say that the scale prescribed in 51(2) will be amended to this extent so far as cotton apparel is concerned but we could not then have made any proposal for reducing the rates of duty levied on the articles mentioned in 51(2). In fact, there was no discussion about these other things. My submission is that this amendment goes beyond the scope of the Bill. The Bill contemplated a variation only in the rates of duty on cotton apparel and no variation in other articles. The proposal in the Bill as originally introduced and as reported on by the Select Committee comes only to this, that the rates on apparel will be charged in accordance with

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

the rates as they were mentioned in article 51(2) and that was the only question to be considered but instead of putting that in that form they thought it would be more convenient to group all these together and to put them under 51 (2) but there was no proposal whatsoever for any change in the duties regarding the articles which originally formed part of 51(2). I therefore, submit that this amendment is not in order.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In the first place, there is a definite proposal that the duty on undervests and socks may also be reduced from 12 annas to nine annas. There is a definite amendment to that effect. The second point which I want to say is this. This thing will not affect the old thing. This will affect only those vests which are more than 4 pounds in weight and they really belong at present to that category which pays only 35 per cent.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It is for the Honourable Member who moved this amendment to reply. It is not a Government amendment.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: I do not think that my amendment really enlarges the scope of the Bill before the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The point is that knitted apparel is not to be found in 51(2).

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It was in the original Bill. So far as the definition of these goods is concerned, the definition in the Bill and the definition in the amendment are exactly the same.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think there is any validity in the point of order. The articles mentioned in the amendment are exactly the same as in the original Bill, and the Chair does not see how it can be said at all that there is anything in the amendment which seeks to enlarge the scope of the Bill. All that it does is that it seeks to reduce the duty.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, a question has been raised with regard to the ethics of settling the scale of protection by means of a compromise. Before I go on to explain what the attitude of Government with regard to this amendment is, I may point out that only yesterday, in spite of Government saying that the compromise proposed, in the opinion of Government, would not be effective to secure the degree of protection that had been found necessary for the textile industry, the House put through a compromise and Government accepted that compromise, but it was a compromise between different sections of the House. I shall not enlarge on that point. I do not think any hard and fast rule can be laid down by which Government must be governed in these matters. The Honourable Member who raised this point, however, went on to raise some very legitimate queries about this matter and asked for certain information which might help him and other Honourable Members to make up their minds with regard to this question on its merits. I quite agree that Honourable Members are entitled to take up one of two positions. They can either say: "We are satisfied that the interests that

are concerned have looked into the matter, and have arrived at an agreement and if they are satisfied about this compromise, we are", or Honourable Members may say, "that may be all very well, but the responsibility rests upon the whole House and we have got to satisfy ourselves that what is put forward as a compromise is a fair compromise and does secure the objects we have in view." To that position I have not the slightest objection. Honourable Members are entitled to ask Government to give them as much information as Government may be in a position to give in order to enable them to make up their minds with regard to the merits of the proposal that is before the House. Now the position is this. Under the Tariff Act as it stands, socks and stockings and under-vests are subject to a duty of 25 per cent. or twelve annas per pound, whichever may be higher. It is sought by the Bill now before the House to add to that category certain other articles, and the original proposal of Government was that to these additional articles the same rates of duty should apply, that is to say, 25 per cent. or twelve annas per pound, whichever may be higher. Now let us see, so far as the question of weight is concerned, how do these two categories of articles stand? I think it would be useful to examine separately the position with regard to weight per dozen of articles to which this duty already applies, and of articles that are sought to be added to that category? I might say that out of the articles that are sought to be added to this category by this Bill, the most important, at any rate that considered most important by the hosiery industry is sports shirts. No doubt the hosiery industry has made representations with regard to certain other articles also, and they too are being included in this category. With regard to socks and stockings, Mr. Satyamurti has already pointed out that there is no variety of socks or stockings which would weigh as much as four pounds per dozen. Therefore, this consideration of weight will not apply to socks and stockings at all. They will continue to be subject to the duty of 25 per cent. or twelve annas per pound. Now let us take under-vests. With regard to undervests, the information we have been able to obtain is this. Japanese under-vests imported into this country have, so far as our information goes, been of thirteen different qualities and the average weight of each of these qualities is as follows: 1.5 lbs., 1.75 lbs., 2lbs., 2.25 lbs., 2 lbs., 1 lb. 9 ounces, 2 lbs. 3 ounces, 2 lbs. 8 ounces, 1.75 lbs., 1 lb., 1 lb., 1 lb. So far as under-vests are concerned, therefore, the House might take it that the weight consideration would not arise with regard to them either. All qualities of under-vests will continue to pay duty at the old rate, that is to say, 25 per cent. or twelve annas per pound. Now let us take, out of the new categories sought to be added, the most important, that is to say, sports shirts. The average weight of sports shirts imported from Japan has been found to be three pounds, and three pounds seven ounces per dozen. So that there also the old rates of duty will continue to be applicable. Japanese fleecy under-vests and Japanese pull-overs are what are known as heavy-weight garments. Their weight on the average will be above four pounds.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why do you reduce it then?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am coming to that. To them the new scale of duties will apply, and, on an average weight of six pounds per dozen instead of paying Rs. 4-8-0, they will

[Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.]

pay Rs. 8-12-0 per dozen. So that with regard to the articles that are already subject to this duty, the amendment will make no difference whatsoever. With regard to the articles now sought to be added, it will not affect the most important categories but it will affect others. It has been asked—why are you willing to accept a lower duty in respect of these articles? As has been sought to be explained by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ramsay Scott, these are heavy-weight garments and, therefore a specific duty would work up to a very much higher level if it were levied at the rate of twelve annas per pound than is necessary for adequate protection to this particular industry. That is always, Sir, a relevant consideration in these matters. If I had the slightest doubt that a duty at the rate of ten annas per pound would not give adequate protection to the Indian manufacturer of these articles, I would not countenance for one moment the suggestion that the scale of duty in respect of these articles should be reduced. Sir, I am not an expert in these matters, and the House is entitled to know what consideration has prevailed with me—apart from the question of average weights which I have already mentioned—to induce me to accept this amendment. The consideration that has prevailed with me is this. The Honourable Member who represents in this House the interests of the hosiery manufacturers has assured me that this is a case of real hardship, and that on the present figures that some slight relief in this respect is entirely justified. That being so, Government are willing to agree to relief being afforded from this very heavy duty in the case of heavy articles to the extent of two annas per pound.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Are these heavy articles manufactured in India and in any large quantity?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: They are manufactured in India certainly, but I could not give the exact quantities at such short notice. Now let me deal with one consideration which has been put forward, that if you adopt this method of giving relief in these cases, all sorts of tricks might be played by importers of these goods from foreign countries so as to take advantage of the lower scale of duty. I think that apprehension is without foundation, because the difference is so slight that it would not be worth while for anybody to raise the weight of the articles in order to get the benefit of the lower rate of duty. Therefore, I am entitled to submit to the House that that apprehension is entirely unfounded and that no such consideration need rule the minds of Honourable Members in coming to a decision on this amendment. For these reasons Government are prepared to accept Mr. Gauba's amendment and I hope that in view of what I have said the other amendments will not be pressed to a division.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

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

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

The amendments were, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

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

"That for sub-clause (d) of clause 2, the following be substituted, namely:

'(d) For Item 51 (2) the following item shall be substituted, namely:

51(2) Cotton knitted apparel, including apparel made of cotton interlocking material, cotton undervests, knitted or woven, and cotton socks and stockings.

(a) of a weight not exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen

Protective	25 per cent.	March 31st
	<i>ad valorem</i> or	1939.
	12 annas per lb.	" "
	whichever is	
	higher.	

(b) of a weight exceeding 4 lbs. per dozen

Protective	25 per cent.	March 31st
	<i>ad valorem</i> or	1939."
	10 annas per	
	lb., whichever	
	is higher.	

The motion was adopted.

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

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

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

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, I beg to move:

"That sub-clause (2) of clause 1 of the Bill be omitted."

Sir, sub-clause (2) of clause 1 empowers the Governor General in Council by notification to bring this Bill into operation. It says that the Bill can come into force on such date as the Governor General in Council may, by notification in the Gazette of India, appoint in this behalf. But as soon as the Governor General gives his assent to the Bill it comes into operation under the General Clauses Act. It is open to the Governor General to give his assent on a particular date and from that date the Bill will take effect. Therefore, the further provision in sub-clause (2) of clause 1 is unnecessary. I fear there may be inconvenience if that sub-clause is allowed to stand. Section 21 of the General Clauses Act says:

"Where, by any Act of the Governor General in Council or Regulation a power to issue notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws is conferred, then that power includes a power exercisable in the like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions, if any, to add to, amend, vary, or rescind any notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws so issued."

Sir, under section 21 it might be open to the Governor General also to cancel a notification issued under sub-clause (2). Thus the Governor General has the power to bring the Bill into operation as also to cancel

[**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.**]

the Bill; if that is the interpretation of sub-clause (2) and if that interpretation is accepted, it would be open to bring it into effect and also to repeal that without notice to the House. Under the Interpretation Act as prevails in England, I find there is a difference of opinion with respect to this clause but so far as section 21 of the General Clauses Act is concerned, I am not able to find any authority which says that this should not be applied with respect to the whole statute. In the absence of sub-clause (2) it is open to the Governor General to bring this Bill into operation as soon as he gives his assent to the Bill. This sub clause is, therefore, not necessary and if this sub-clause is retained, it might also empower the Governor General to rescind the Bill as and when he chooses. In these circumstances, I do not think it is desirable to have a clause empowering the Governor General in Council to rescind the operation of this Bill as and when he likes, after so much labour and energy has been spent in passing this Bill. It is not necessary to empower or to clothe the Governor General in Council with a particular power of this kind. After all if such a power is given to the Governor General in Council, it might be that some junior officer in the department, not even a senior officer, but some subordinate officer might have the ear of the Government and at his instance the whole thing may be upset. Thus, I say, Sir, it is not desirable to keep this sub-clause in view of the provision of section 21 of the General Clauses Act. Without this sub-clause the Bill can be brought into operation on the day on which the Governor General gives his assent to it.

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

"That sub-clause (2) of clause 1 of the Bill be omitted."

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: This provision is there for the purpose of administrative convenience but if the Honourable Member is so suspicious of Government's intention, I have no objection to its being taken out.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: It is not a question of suspicion, but it is a question of safeguard.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is: "That sub-clause (2) of clause 1 of the Bill be omitted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. G. H. Spence (Secretary, Legislative Department): In view of the fact that this amendment has been adopted, there is a consequential amendment. I beg to move:

"That clause 1 (1) be re-numbered as clause 1."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is: "That clause 1 (1) be re-numbered as clause 1."

The motion was adopted.

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

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill "

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Mr. F. E. James: Sir, I apologise to the House for intervening at this stage so close to the end of the Session, but I feel I cannot allow the Bill to go by without expressing on my own part some very definite misgivings in regard to both the manner and method of presentation of the Bill and its passage through this House. The trouble began last Saturday when there was a conspiracy in this House on the part of certain parties to say nothing on the question of reference to Select Committee. The reference to Select Committee was then carried and the Select Committee met for four hours on the following morning,—one of the hottest days in the year,—and after a long wrangle they emerged tired but completely defeated by the Bill. Two members of the Select Committee told me immediately after the meeting of the Committee that they had no idea what had been finally settled there; there was not enough time to give proper consideration to a Bill of this nature, which is a complicated Bill and deals with three specifically different items and affects very important interests in this country.

Then, Sir, the report of the Select Committee was presented to the House on Tuesday. We had copies of that Committee's report late on Tuesday evening and the motion to take the Bill into consideration was moved on the following morning. Then, Sir, the trouble really began. I may say that the Bill as it emerged from the Select Committee was very different from the Bill as it originally went into the Committee. Even in the Select Committee Government began to jettison some of their cargo and they carried it on the whole day yesterday. During the discussion as I brought to your attention yesterday morning, there were all sorts of informal consultations, and finally an amendment was moved which was not circulated to the House but was accepted by Government, Government thereby throwing to the wolves another of their principles which they laid down when the Bill was originally introduced, in order to put the Bill through by a certain time. My real complaint is that this Bill, which is a very important Bill, is taken up at the end of a very long session and there has not been adequate time to deal with it. I am most unhappy about the results of the Bill as it leaves this House, and I believe that if the House had had more time, if the Select Committee had had more time, Government would not have adopted the policy of jettisoning the various items in the Bill, some of which I consider very important, merely for the sake of placating opponents, so that they might get an agreed Bill through within a space of 48 hours.

Then, Sir, we find that this morning the same process has been going on. Conferences were held but fortunately in these conferences we were asked to be represented, and we are of course extremely grateful to the dominant parties in this House for consulting us in this matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But we were not asked.

Mr. F. E. James: But the result of these conferences was the amendment which was brought before the House this morning and which my Honourable friend Mr. Satyamurti very rightly criticised as being a radical change in the proposals as they emerged from the Select Committee. Why were not these things considered in the Select Committee? I venture to suggest that if the Select Committee had had adequate time to meet and was not rushed on that fateful Sunday morning, there would have been a well considered report which might have met some of the points which have subsequently been dealt with by this House. What is the total result? The result is that owing to the fact that there are three main items contained in this one Bill, Members have been put in the position of having to accept in regard to one item something that is entirely unsatisfactory in order to save interests which come under another item. And my two complaints with regard to this matter are, first, that an important Bill of this nature should not have been taken up at the fag end of a long session, although I know that there are considerations which might perhaps be almost unavoidable in this instance; and secondly, that if protection is going to be given to any particular industry or if it is going to be extended to an industry, then each item should be dealt with in a separate Bill, so that Members are not put in the unenviable position of having to accept something they do not want under one item in order to preserve something that they do want under another item. I suggest that that is not the proper way of dealing with legislation in this matter. It embarrasses Members and I think the net result is that, certainly as far as this Bill is concerned, in at least one item, Members of this House have had to agree to less than was really just to the industry, because they were anxious not to jettison the whole Bill. Yesterday, even on Sunday, Members were faced with the unpleasant alternatives either of accepting something or of hearing somebody say, "Well, if you do not do that, then we will withdraw the Bill." They were yesterday also put in the position of having to accept something they did not want or of jeopardising the Bill. The very amendment to which I raised not a technical but a general objection yesterday put me in the position that if I raised a technical objection the Bill could not proceed. I felt very strongly about that particular amendment and yet what was I to do? Therefore I take advantage of the third reading to raise this complaint on the floor of the House and to beg Government that in future when they are introducing tariff legislation along these lines they should pay attention to two main necessities; one, the necessity for dealing with one item or industry in one Bill and not including three protective items in the same Bill; and secondly, the necessity for giving ample time both for the meetings of the Select Committee and for the further consideration of the report of the Select Committee at the hands of this House. Only in that way will our tariff legislation be sane and reasonable.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Sir, another important Bill is now being placed on the Statute-book through the skilful steering of the Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan. I do not agree with Honourable Members when they say that this is the fag end of the Session. I strongly protest against the use of the word "fag end" of any Session of this Assembly. As long as the whole business put down on the agenda of a particular

Session is not closed, no period of the Session should be called the fag end. My complaint is that before the programme of the Assembly is finished, Honourable Members, both on the Treasury Benches and on the opposite Benches, show some signs of uneasiness and do not want to exert themselves, and, therefore, they want to go away and say that this is the fag end of the Session. If we are here to do public work, we should not mind whether it is hot weather or cold weather, or whether we have to sit here for three months or four months or five months. Therefore, Sir, I submit that no period should be called the fag end, and I quite agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. James, when he says that sufficient time ought to have been given to important measures like this. Sir, it is, however, very satisfactory that this important measure is now being placed on the Statute-book in a manner which is, more or less, acceptable to everybody. Sir, I am not against compromises; really if we want that the work of this House should be done in a way which would be acceptable to everybody, these compromises are necessary and nobody should be ashamed of coming to any compromise. On the other hand, I am really very glad that in the course of the debate on this Bill I found that my Honourable friends, the Members of the Congress Party, have also shown a spirit of reasonableness and co-operation. I am glad that the appeal made by His Excellency the Marquis of Linlithgow has not fallen on deaf ears and that wisdom is dawning upon my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and his colleagues on my right

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): and darkness is descending on the knight!

Sir Muhammad Yakub . . . and I hope that they will show the same spirit of co-operation on future occasions.

Sir, this Session was more or less the Session of Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan. Nearly all the important measures that we discussed belong

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it relevant?

Sir Muhammad Yakub: It is for the President to judge.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is the fag end of the Session, the Chair supposes. (Laughter.)

Sir Muhammad Yakub: If irrelevant supplementary questions of my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, can be allowed, I may, when we are
 1 P. M. now going to rise, be allowed to pass just a few remarks. I was saying that this was really a Session of Sir Muhammad Zafrullah. Nearly all the important measures which were brought forward before the House belonged to his department.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: What about the Companies Act, the Mines Act, the Factories Act?

Sir Muhammad Yakub: I am probably voicing the feelings of everybody in this House when I say that the way in which he has steered all the Bills, the persuasive manner in which he has advanced his arguments . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Especially Ottawa!

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Especially, Sir, his convincing defence of Ottawa . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: . . . , which the House rejected!

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Of course if the House was not reasonable . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of order, Sir, my Honourable friend cannot say that the House was unreasonable.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is going a little too far.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Very well, I will not say that the House was not reasonable. If the House could not appreciate his arguments, then he is not responsible for it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of order. I am sorry that, at the fag end of the . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is casting reflection on the House though the Chair is sure the Honourable Member does not mean that.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I may say that all this is far more embarrassing to me than to Honourable Members.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: I am really very glad that this contentious measure was passed with the consent of everybody, and, with these remarks, I will say good-bye.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I rise, Sir, to echo all the sentiments expressed by my Honourable friend, Mr. James. I cannot express that satisfaction which my Honourable friend to my right expressed . . .

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Because the millowners of Bombay could not get all they wanted.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: As a matter of fact, Bills of such importance, involving very conflicting interests, ought not to be brought at the fag end of the Session. We were sitting for nearly three months, and it might have been made possible to bring this measure a little earlier when we might have had more time for its consideration and discussion. Sir, this Bill seeks to give protection in three different directions, for silk yarn, for fents and for hosiery, and with conflicting interests in matters of tariff, it is very difficult to deal with three different items in the same Bill, and that my Honourable friend the Member in charge must have realised. These different interests are undoubtedly represented in this House and they all pull in different directions. And when they all pull in different directions—on three different questions of tariff—it nearly becomes impossible to get the measure through in any reasonable length of time. Sir, I express

dissatisfaction at the way in which the industry in which I am interested has come out of this question. We have practically had to sacrifice everything in order to get some protection for other industries. If a compromise had not been effected on fents, it is possible that hosiery would not have got any protection just now, as the Bill might have been withdrawn. In consideration of that fact and in order to give that protection to hosiery and silk, we have sacrificed protection which we really deserve and which the industry was promised on several occasions—and which the Honourable Member tried to give and let it be said which all my friends in the House wanted to give. But due to force of circumstances, that protection was not given, and, therefore, it is the textile industry which comes off worst out of the industries that were attempted to be protected in this Bill. Under the circumstances, I repeat that I echo all that my Honourable friend, Mr. James, said. If we had had more time, it was possible that that protection which the Honourable Member desired to give and which he very kindly said he would again consider if it was found necessary at a future date, might have been given just now. Under the circumstances I for one am not at all satisfied with the results of this Bill. I again repeat that we accepted it due to force of circumstances, but I do trust that the Honourable Member will bear one point in view, namely that in future he will not bring three items of protection in one Bill. We have found from experience that matters are made ten times more difficult due to this fact. If there had been three separate Bills, we should have been able to help the Honourable Member much more successfully in placing on the Statute-book measures which Government really desire to do and which the whole House desire to assist Government in doing. I would again appeal to him and to the department which he represents not to make this fatal mistake again which has cost the cotton mill industry at any rate the protection that he was anxious to give it, and I can only express the hope that if he finds that the textile mill industry deserves the protection that he desired to give it just now, he will bring in another measure at no distant date.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, I endorse the complaint that Mr. James has made in regard to the procedure that has been adopted in order to rush this measure through this House. He will, I trust, now appreciate that there was some use in referring this matter to the Select Committee instead of getting the Bill summarily passed by this House without any examination whatsoever. So, so far as the reference to the Select Committee is concerned, he must, I think, feel thankful to those who insisted on such reference. The questions raised were certainly of an important character and I agree with the previous speakers that they deserved greater attention at the hands of the Members of this House on the floor, here as well as in the Select Committee, and perhaps if we had been able to devote more time to the consideration of the measure, we could have improved it further. Sir, I will not enter into details, but I have really a genuine grievance with respect to Mr. Gauba's amendment of today. It seems that Government entered into an understanding with certain Members of this House as to this amendment. There were certain other persons who had tried to place their views before Government in the Select Committee and who had tried to deal with the measure there on its merits according to the best of their lights. I think it is very unfair on the part of the Government to enter into an understanding which varies or modifies the unanimous decisions of the Select Committee or the decisions of a majority, without even letting the others know that it was thinking in a different line; and I

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

believe that had the Government taken care to consult other members of the select committee the amendment would have come to the House in a better form than that in which it was put. Whatever be the view as to the matter being in order—and as you were pleased to hold that it was, I have nothing more to say on the subject—the question remains that no Member in this House up to the time this amendment was sprung upon us this morning, had any intimation whatsoever that any question as to the present scale of duty on under-vests and socks and stockings being adequate or inadequate

Sir Muhammad Yakub: The same thing was done with the Ottawa amendment: it was also not shown to anybody.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: If the Ottawa amendment had been agreed upon by the Government, I think Sir Muhammad Yakub's complaint would have some force

President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair wants to point out to the Honourable Member that no objection was taken that sufficient notice was not given: if it had been taken, the Chair would have taken notice of it and shut the amendment out.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The difficulty was exactly the same as was mentioned by Mr. James: I am not in any way making any complaint against the Chair

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No objection was taken.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: If any objection had been taken at this stage, the whole thing would have stood over. I am not inclined to take mere technical objections on matters of this importance. (Interruption.) If there is going to be a dialogue across the table, I can well sit down

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member may be allowed to go on without interruption.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: So far as I am concerned, I do think that the Government have gone beyond what anybody could have conceived or imagined in accepting a lower duty than that which had been in force so far, in respect of certain articles included in the Tariff Act such as under-vests. Without having given any indication or inkling of their mind to anybody up to the very last moment, and it is very unfair that they should have done so.

As to the attitude of the Congress Party, it is not affected by anything extraneous or inconsequential. We are here to serve our country according to our lights. If the Government is prepared to give priority and precedence to the interests of this country as against every other country, including the United Kingdom, if they behave as the true and faithful servants of India and choose to promote the interests of India even where they happen to be in conflict with the interests of the United Kingdom, I think the occasions for clash and conflict will be diminished to a great extent. As to whether any person, howsoever eminent he be, will be able to induce such a frame of mind in them, it depends on his ability and strength and on their own

capacity for adaptation. If they demonstrate such an attitude, we will welcome it. We on our part have never behaved in a different manner from what we did in connection with this Bill. If anything it was the benches opposite, the spokesmen of the Government, who used to assert and reiterate in the past that whatever emanated from this side would be resisted by them as they would not co-operate with us in any case. So, I think the boot is on the other leg; and if there are in future a larger number of occasions for agreement than there have been in the past, it will be so not because we were unreasonable in the past but because of a salutary change towards a more reasonable and responsive frame of mind in the occupants of the benches opposite . . .

Mr. F. E. James: Why do you not raise the social boycott?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I do not know whether I will be in order in discussing the matter or if the rules of the House will allow us to discuss it here and now . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Ratim): That matter need not be discussed now. It has nothing to do with the Bill.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I will be glad if my Honourable friend, Mr. James, tables a resolution on the subject and gets it discussed on the floor of the House. I repeat: that we are prepared ever to do the best we can only with one dominant and sole objective before us, and that is the moral and material welfare of this country, and the acceleration of the day of independence and complete freedom of this country. Whoever is prepared to help and co-operate with us in that respect, will receive our hearty response; but if there be any reserve in any quarter, if the desire be not to promote the interests of this country but to use this country as a tool for promoting the interests of any other country, then we will not be to blame for the consequences.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, may I say a few words . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, in replying to the debate on this motion, I shall endeavour to confine myself to matters that are relevant to the third reading of this Bill and the criticism that has been put forward in connection with "the manner and the method", as has been described, of placing this Bill before the House. Two complaints have been made by Mr. James and Sir Cowasji Jehangir. One was that the Bill was placed before the House at the fag end of the Session. The other was that three items were jumbled together in the Bill and that they should have been brought forward in separate Bills.

Now, neither of these two Honourable Members went on to suggest what should have come before the House at the fag end of the Session in place of this Bill. Should the Ottawa Agreement have been discussed at the fag end of the Session? Should the Railway Budget have been discussed at the fag end of the Session? Should the general budget have been discussed at the fag end of the Session? What is the measure that these Honourable Members would have kept for the fag end of the Session when their minds were tired and when they were looking forward to enjoying the cool sea breezes at Bombay or Madras or the cooler breezes of Ootacamund . . .

An Honourable Member: Or of Simla!

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I could have mentioned several.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: But the Honourable Member did not mention any

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: You never asked me: I could mention several even now.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: As a matter of fact the suggestion really implies this: that Honourable Members are prepared to consider critically measures brought before the House up to a certain date in the year or while the temperature is below a certain degree or up to a certain number of sittings: but that beyond that number of sittings, or when the temperature goes above or below certain degrees or when a certain date has been reached, they are not prepared to give that consideration to the measures that come before them which they would have given to them if they had come before them earlier in the Session

Sir H. P. Mody: The dividing line may be 110 degrees.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is the implication. I have far too much respect for Honourable Members to believe that anything that may come at any time before them would not get their best attention and that they would not be prepared to sacrifice their physical comfort or private interests in order to continue the performance of the public duty that they have taken upon themselves as Members of this House. Again it cannot be said. (Interruption). Will the Honourable Member let me finish? I did not interrupt him when he was speaking. Let me say this, that Government would always be prepared to sit from day to day as long as required, in order to afford a reasonable opportunity to Members if they wanted to consider

Mr. Sri Prakasa: And keep up their voting strength by bringing in new Members every day!

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: On the other hand I well remember the pallor that spread over Sir Cowasji Jehangir's countenance when it was suggested to him that the Bill might have to stand over till the next Session in order that greater consideration might be given to its provisions. He was most anxious, more anxious than anybody else here, that the Bill should be passed at this Session. Now, it would have been quite easy to take the Bill up at the beginning of the next Session, if it could have been held over till the next Session. I conceive that it is no valid objection to a Bill that Government have not introduced it very early in a particular Session. The objection would arise if it is taken up at a stage when the House has not enough time to devote any attention to its details: but that could easily have been remedied by a postponement of the discussion and consideration of the Bill to the next Session. As I have said, however, there was nobody more anxious in this House than Sir Cowasji Jehangir that the consideration of the Bill should be finished during this Session. It is most unfair of him, of all persons, to suggest that this measure should not have been brought forward at this stage. It seems to me, that so far as certain sections of the House are

concerned, nothing that Government does can be right in their eyes. If Government had said that the consideration of this measure should be postponed till next Session, I am quite sure there would have been protests from all sides and Honourable Members opposite would have said that we were not treating these industries fairly, that the industries would be ruined during the interval and that the Government were being callous.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: That is a good reply to my friend Sir Muhammad Yakub and his fulsome praises of the Commerce Member.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: With regard to the objection that too many items were put together in this Bill, again I am prepared to consider the suggestions of Honourable Members to the extent to which they are possible of acceptance in order to facilitate the consideration of such measures by the House, but when these suggestions are sought to be reinforced by arguments which all of us know will not stand examination for a second, I feel, I must take exception. Sir Cowasji Jehangir told us that he had given way on fents because he was anxious on account of the hosiery industry. Nothing of the kind. He felt no concern for the hosiery industry. He was apprehensive that the provision relating to fents might be defeated altogether, and he was willing to accept half a loaf, or a quarter of a loaf or, as one Honourable Member said, even the crumbs in the interests of the textile industry which he represents, and not on account of any tender solicitude that he has for the hosiery industry. There was no doubt at any time that the House would have any hesitation in accepting the provision relating to the hosiery industry.

It was said that there had not been sufficient time to discuss this measure and the blame for this, somehow or other, is sought to be laid on the shoulders of Government. The various time limits with regard to the Select Committee and the consideration of the measure in the House were accepted by Government at the suggestion of the various parties, and Government have tried in every manner to facilitate the consideration of the measure by the House. After Government have made every effort to meet the wishes of various sections of the House, I do protest against the attitude adopted by some Honourable Members that Government are to blame for the very facilities that they have afforded. I might, however, add that whenever it is possible for Government to introduce legislative measures at an early stage of the Session, they will certainly do so, and that they will keep in mind the criticism which Honourable Members have put forward in this connection. I do not accept the position that if Government had made each of the items contained in this Bill the subject matter of a separate Bill, the textile industry would have secured a better measure of protection than it has succeeded in securing. I have already said that Government consider that the actual provision accepted by the House with regard to fents is not likely to prove quite effective, and I do not desire to take up a position where I might have to defend the contrary. I do not think that if this provision with regard to fents had been contained in a Bill which dealt with fents only, certain features of that provision would have been more acceptable to certain sections of the House simply because they were the subject matter of a separate Bill. Does the Honourable Member who has raised this objection consider that in that case the Congress Party would have raised no objection to the measure . . .

Sir H. P. Mody: You keep on trying.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: But how far is this process of a separate Bill dealing with a single item to be carried? In connection with the clause dealing with fents, there would have been complications over each sub-item and each column of each sub-item. I suppose the Honourable Member's suggestion is that there should have been a separate Bill dealing with each sub-item and each column of each sub-item inasmuch as it was embarrassing for some of the Honourable Members to have to discuss the whole item together. Again, Sir, I might assure the House that if on any occasion Government feel that so many conflicting considerations are likely to arise with regard to a set of tariff proposals that it would be more convenient for the House to deal with them in separate groups or categories, Government will bring them before the House in separate Bills, but supposing the necessity arises on a certain occasion of a general revision of the Tariff Schedule affecting a large number of articles, I suppose the suggestion in that case would be that there should be as many bills as there are items or sub-items to be dealt with

Mr. F. E. James: It is ridiculous.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am glad my friend says that that would be ridiculous, and, therefore, I presume the suggestion is that where it is feasible and practicable to do so, Government should adopt that method. I am sorry, Sir, that I should have had to meet this kind of general criticism at this stage of the Bill. In view of the fact that the Bill has been accepted by the House as the result of certain compromises in a more or less agreed form, it would not have been necessary for me to say anything on the third reading, but as Government have been blamed for something which they had done to meet the wishes of one section or another of the House, I felt bound to protest. (Applause.)

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

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, in spite of what has fallen from my Honourable friend Sir Muhammad Yakub, I do not propose to move the motion standing in my name.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, I understood that every section of the House wants this matter to stand over. It was the result of a conversation between the Honourable the Finance Member, who, I am sorry to say, is not here, and some Honourable Members, and he left the place under the impression that this matter will not be taken up by the House, and I would ask the House not to insist on taking up this matter now.

The Assembly then adjourned *sine die*

CORRIGENDA.

In the Legislative Assembly Debates, Delhi Session, 1936—

(1) Vol. I, No. 2, dated the 4th February, 1936—

(i) page 130, last two lines, for " associated " read " associated ".

(ii) page 135, line 22, omit the comma after " However ".

(2) Vol. I, No. 3, dated the 5th February 1936, page 193, in the last line of the answer to part (a) of starred question No. 80, for " subsidy " read " payment ".

(3) Vol. I, No. 4, dated the 6th February, 1936, page 298, line 11 from the bottom, for " relating the same " read " relating to the same ".

(4) Vol. I, No. 6, dated the 10th February, 1936—

(i) page 428—

(a) in the last but one line of the endorsement, for the comma after " Army Headquarters " substitute a semi-colon.

(b) in the last line of the endorsement for the comma after " Army Headquarters " substitute a semi-colon, and insert " and " before " the ".

(ii) pages 514 and 515, in the subject-heading " THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL—(Amendment of section 60) " for " (AMENDMENT) " read " (THIRD AMENDMENT) ".

(5) Vol. I, No. 8, dated the 12th February, 1936—

(i) page 619, line 3 of the answer to part (a) of starred question No. 298, for " Conference Lines " read " Conference Liners ".

(ii) page 635, line 8 of paragraph 3, for " School " read " Schools " and in line 2 of paragraph 4(c) insert a comma after " demonstrations ".

(iii) page 636, line 3 of paragraph 6(d), delete one comma after " Officers ".

(iv) page 642, line 2 of part (c) of starred question No. 329, for " Pension Committee " read " Pensions Committee ".

(v) page 644, line 7 of the answer to parts (b) to (d) of starred question No. 332, for " Indian " read " India ".

(6) Vol. I, No. 9, dated the 13th February, 1936—

(i) page 726, part (a) of starred question No. 384, in clauses (v), (viii) and (ix), for " Director " read " Directors ".

(ii) page 731, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 389, for " Probelms " read " Problems ".

(7) Vol. II, No. 1, dated the 17th February, 1936, page 924, line 4 from the bottom, for " Stores " read " Store ".

(8) Vol. II, No. 2, dated the 18th February, 1936, page 982, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 543, for " Bye-Products of the Coal " read " Bye-Products of the Indian Coal Industry ".

(9) Vol. II, No. 4, dated the 20th February, 1936—

- (i) page 1261, in the first line of part (d) of starred question No. 701, *for* "completed" *read* "compelled".
- (ii) page 1265, line 6 from the bottom, *for* "peasantly" *read* "peasantry".
- (iii) page 1295, line 4 from the bottom, *insert* "from" after the word "coming".

(10) Vol. II, No. 5, dated the 24th February, 1936—

- (i) page 1399, line 22 from the bottom, *for* "oven" *read* "even".
- (ii) page 1412, line 7 from the bottom, *for* "bodes" *read* "bodies".
- (iii) page 1419, line 14, *for* "Peninsular" *read* "Peninsula".

(11) Vol. II, No. 6, dated the 25th February, 1936—

- (i) page 1443, line 9, *for* "monopoly" *read* "monopoly".
- (ii) page 1497, line 9, *for* "aws" *read* "was".
- (iii) page 1504, line 20 from the bottom, *for* "ao" *read* "as".
- (iv) page 1541, line 3, *insert* "are" before the word "these".

(12) Vol. II, No. 7, dated the 26th February, 1936, page 1578, in the subject-heading to unstarred question No. 180, *for* "Scarcity o" *read* "Scarcity of".

(13) Vol. II, No. 8, dated the 27th February, 1936—

- (i) page 1708, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 897, *for* "Objectional" *read* "Objectionable".
- (ii) page 1709, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 898, *for* "Hitler" and "Gandhi" *read* "Gandhi" and "Hitler", respectively.

(14) Vol. III, No. 4, dated the 6th March, 1936, page 1992, line 11 from the bottom, *for* "24th February" *read* "25th February".

(15) Vol. III, No. 6, dated the 10th March, 1936, page 2260, in the Division List under "Noes" *for* "MacDongall, Mr. R. M." *read* "MacDougall, Mr. R. M."

(16) Vol. III, No. 7, dated the 11th March, 1936, page 2346, *insert* the words "The Assembly divided" before the Division List.

(17) Vol. IV, No. 3, dated the 20th March, 1936—

- (i) page 2920, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 1374, *for* "Peace" *read* "Piece".
- (ii) page 2957, in the last line of paragraph (f), *for* "dealt" *read* "deal".
- (iii) page 2964, in the subject-heading "THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL" *for* "SECOND" *read* "THIRD".

(18) Vol. IV, No. 4, dated the 23rd March, 1936, page 3047, in the footnote, *for* "No. 1434" *read* "No. 434".

(19) Vol. IV, No. 10, dated the 30th March, 1936, page 3464, line 20 from the bottom, *insert* double quotations, before the words "to mention here".

(20) Vol. IV, No. 13, dated the 8th April, 1936, page 3688, in line 2 of the answer to part (b) of starred question No. 1482, for "I am not prepared to endorse" read "I do not endorse".

(21) Vol. V, No. 1, dated the 9th April, 1936, page 3827, line 28 from the bottom, for "votse" read "votes".

(22) Vol. V, No. 2, dated the 14th April, 1936—

(i) page 3838, in line 1 of the answer to part (d) of starred question No. 1555, for "shall explain" read "explained".

(ii) page 3932, line 12, for "duly" read "duty".

(23) Vol. V, No. 4, dated the 16th April, 1936—

(i) page 3989, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 1644, for "Macheria" read "Macherla".

(ii) page 3995, in the subject-heading to starred question No. 1651, for "Ten Sterling" read "Ten Million Sterling".

(iii) page 4030, line 20, for "sik" read "silk".

(24) Vol. V, No. 7, dated the 20th April, 1936, page 4318, line 4 from the bottom, for "hunderweight" read "hundredweight".

(25) Vol. V, No. 8, dated the 21st April, 1936—

(i) page 4362, line 8, for "Billotiose" read "Billotiose".

(ii) page 4370—

(a) line 17, for "manageer" read "manager".

(b) line 30, for "amenmdment" read "amendment".

(iii) page 4375, line 10 from the bottom, for "co" read "to".

(iv) page 4387, line 4 from the bottom, for "Kuladhar Ghaliha" read "Kuladhar Chaliha".

(26) Vol. V, No. 9, dated the 22nd April, 1936—

(i) page 4411, in the subject-heading to the statement laid on the table in reply to starred question No. 1405, for "Manager" read "Managing".

(ii) page 4412, in the subject-heading to the statement laid on the table in reply to unstarred question No. 603, for "Muslim" read "Muslims" and insert "Railway" after "North Western".

(iii) page 4427, line 17 from the bottom, for "9 annas" read "9 2/5 annas".

(iv) page 4429, line 18 from the bottom, turn the line up side down.