

9th March 1937

# **THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

**(Official Report)**

---

**Volume II, 1937**

*(23rd February to 13th March, 1937)*

---

## **FIFTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY 1937**



**PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI.  
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.  
1937**

# Legislative Assembly.

*President :*

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

*Deputy President :*

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

*Panel of Chairmen :*

SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB, KT., M.L.A.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

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

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

*Secretary :*

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

*Assistant of the Secretary :*

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

*Marshal :*

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

*Committee on Petitions :*

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

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

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

MR. M. GHIASUDDIN, M.L.A.

MR. MATHURADAS VISSANJI, M.L.A.

M89LAD

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—23rd February to 13th March, 1937.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>TUESDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		<b>WEDNESDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Members Sworn . . .	905	Demand No. 6-B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and supply of Locomotive Power—	
Questions and Answers . . .	905—10	Construction of Locomotives in India . . .	1020—23
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	910—12		
Statements laid on the Table . . .	912—16	<b>THURSDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Amendment of the Rules of Business of the Assembly relating to the Privilege of Interpellation—Ruled out of order . . .	916—21	Election of Members to certain Standing Committees . . .	1025
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—		The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—		Demand No. 6B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power— <i>contd.</i>	
General Policy of Railway Administration . . .	921—4	Construction of Locomotives in India— <i>concl'd.</i> . . .	1025—41
Control of Expenditure . . .	941—5	Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	
<b>WEDNESDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		Grievances of Third Class Railway Passengers . . .	1041—67
Members Sworn . . .	961	Indianisation of Railway Services . . .	1067—80
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	961—64	<b>FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Questions and Answers . . .	1081—92
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>		Unstarred Question and Answer . . .	1092
Exclusion of Indians from the Wedgwood Committee . . .	965—1000	Attempted Budget Leakage . . .	1092—93
Taking over the management of the B. and N. W., R. and K. and S. M. Railways under State control . . .	1000—19		

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Paucity of Muslims in the Railway Services . . .	1093—1113
Rail-Road Competition	1113—46
Demand No. 2—Audit . . .	1146
Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure . . .	1146
Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and Companies . . .	1146
Demand No. 6-A.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works . . .	1146
Demand No. 6-B.—Working Expenses—Maintenance and supply of Locomotive Power . . .	1147
Demand No. 6-C.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock . . .	1148
Demand No. 6-D.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours . . .	1149
Demand No. 6-E.—Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department . . .	1149
Demand No. 6-F.—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments . . .	1150
Demand No. 6-G.—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses . . .	1150
Demand No. 6-H.—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department . . .	1150

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund . . .	1150
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges . . .	1150
Demand No. 11—New Construction . . .	1151
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works . . .	1151
SATURDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—	
Members Sworn . . .	1153
Presentation of the Budget for 1937-38 . . .	1153—70
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced . . .	1170
Statement of Business . . .	1170
TUESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1937,—	
Members Sworn . . .	1171
Questions and Answers . . .	1171—82
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	1182—88
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	1188—90
Statement laid on the Table . . .	1190—92
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands . . .	1192
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration . . .	1192
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Industries and Labour . . .	1193
Message from the Council of State . . .	1193
General Discussion of the General Budget . . .	1193—1245



	PAGES.
<b>WEDNESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1247—52
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce . . . . .	1252
General discussion of the General Budget— <i>contd</i>	1252—1303
<b>THURSDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Members Sworn . . . . .	1305
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1305—37
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Board of Health . . . . .	1337—39
The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1339
The Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1339—40
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1340—51
The Indian Tea Cess (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1351—52
The Indian Army (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1352—85
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Discussion on the motions to consider and to refer to Select Committee not concluded . . . . .	1385—92
<b>FRIDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Members Sworn . . . . .	1393
The Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the report of the Committee on Petitions . . . . .	1393
The General Budget—List of Demands—	
Demand No. 18—Finance Department—	
Revenue Duties . . . . .	1394—1415

	PAGES.
<b>FRIDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council . . . . .	1415—47
Policy of Protection . . . . .	1415—48
<b>SATURDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Member Sworn . . . . .	1449
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1449—81
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1481—88
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	1488—90
Message from the Council of State . . . . .	1490
The General Budget.—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 20.—Defence Department—	
Indianisation of the Army . . . . .	1492—1522
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council—	
Social Insurance for Industrial Workers . . . . .	1523—39
<b>MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Member Sworn . . . . .	1541
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1541—71
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrest of a Member of the Legislative Assembly and subsequent withdrawal of Proceedings against him—Ruled out of order . . . . .	1571—77
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Board of Health . . . . .	1577
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council—	
Labour Grievances . . . . .	1577—85
Demand No. 17.—Department of Education, Health and Lands—	
Treatment of Indians abroad . . . . .	1585—1615

	PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12—Executive Council—	
Frontier Policy . . .	1615—20
<b>TUESDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Member Sworn . . .	1621
Questions and Answers . . .	1621—36
The General Budget.—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	
Frontier Policy— <i>contd.</i>	1636—48
General Policy of the Government of India	1648—89
<b>WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Members Sworn . . .	1691
Questions and Answers . . .	1691—96
Message from the Council of State . . .	1696
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 21—Department of Industries and Labour—	
Recognition of Trade unions by employers and withdrawal of recognition of Unions in certain cases	1696—1702
Demand No. 12—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	
Policy of Repression	1702—50
Demand No. 1—Customs	1751
Demand No. 2—Central Excise Duties . . .	1751
Demand No. 3—Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax . . .	1751
Demand No. 4—Salt . . .	1751
Demand No. 5—Opium . . .	1751
Demand No. 6—Provincial Excise . . .	1751
Demand No. 7—Stamps	1752
Demand No. 8—Forest . . .	1752

	PAGES.
<b>WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Demand No. 9—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works . . .	1752
Demand No. 10—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses) . . .	1752
Demand No. 11—Interest on Debt and other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt . . .	1752
Demand No. 12—Executive Council . . .	1752
Demand No. 13—Council of State . . .	1753
Demand No. 14—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 15—Home Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 16—Legislative Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 17—Department of Education, Health and Lands . . .	1753
Demand No. 18—Finance Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 19—Commerce Department . . .	1754
Demand No. 20—Defence Department . . .	1754
Demand No. 21—Department of Industries and Labour . . .	1754
Demand No. 22—Central Board of Revenue . . .	1754
Demand No. 23—India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment charges . . .	1754

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 24—Pay- ments to other Govern- ments Departments, etc., on account of Services rendered . . .	1754
Demand No. 25—Audit . . .	1755
Demand No. 26—Adminis- tration of Justice . . .	1755
Demand No. 27—Police . . .	1755
Demand No. 28—Ports and Pilotage . . .	1755
Demand No. 29—Light- houses and lightship . . .	1755
Demand No. 30—Survey of India . . .	1755
Demand No. 31—Meteoro- logy . . .	1756
Demand No. 32—Geolo- gical Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 33—Botani- cal Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 34—Zoologi- cal Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 35—Archæo- logy . . .	1756
Demand No. 36—Mines . . .	1756
Demand No. 37—Other Scientific Department . . .	1757
Demand No. 38—Educa- tion . . .	1757
Demand No. 39—Medical Services . . .	1757
Demand No. 40—Public Health . . .	1757
Demand No. 41—Agricul- ture . . .	1757
Demand No. 42—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department . . .	1757
Demand No. 43—Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India . . .	1758
Demand No. 44—Imperial Institute of Sugar Tech- nology . . .	1758

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 45—Civil Veterinary Services . . .	1758
Demand No. 46—Industries . . .	1758
Demand No. 47—Aviation . . .	1758
Demand No. 48—Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation charged to Revenue . . .	1758
Demand No. 49—Broad- casting . . .	1759
Demand No. 50—Capital Outlay on Broadcasting . . .	1759
Demand No. 51—Indian Stores Department . . .	1759
Demand No. 52—Commer- cial Intelligence and Sta- tistics . . .	1759
Demand No. 53—Census . . .	1759
Demand No. 54—Emigra- tion—Internal . . .	1759
Demand No. 55—Emigra- tion—External . . .	1760
Demand No. 56—Joint Stock Companies . . .	1760
Demand No. 57—Miscel- laneous Departments . . .	1760
Demand No. 58—Currency . . .	1760
Demand No. 59—Mint . . .	1760
Demand No. 60—Civil Works . . .	1760
Demand No. 61—Supera- nnuation Allowances and Pensions . . .	1761
Demand No. 62—Station- ary and Printing . . .	1761
Demand No. 63—Miscel- laneous . . .	1761
Demand No. 64—Grants- in-aid to Provincial Gov- ernment . . .	1761
Demand No. 65—Miscel- laneous Adjustments be- tween the Central and Provincial Governments . . .	1761
Demand No. 66—Expen- diture on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue . . .	1761

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>		<b>WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937—<i>concl.</i></b>	
Demand No. 67—Delhi . . . . .	1762	Demand No. 81—Interest free Advances . . . . .	1764
Demand No. 68—Ajmer-Merwara . . . . .	1762	Demand No. 82—Loans and Advances bearing Interest . . . . .	1764
Demand No. 69—Panth Piploda . . . . .	1762	<b>FRIDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Demand No. 70—Andamans and Nicobar Islands . . . . .	1762	Members Sworn . . . . .	1765
Demand No. 71—Capital Outlay on Security Printing . . . . .	1762	Questions and Answers . . . . .	1765—73
Demand No. 72—Irrigation . . . . .	1762	Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	1773—76
Demand No. 73—Indian Posts and Telegraphs . . . . .	1763	Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1776—85
Demand No. 74—Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research . . . . .	1763	Statement laid on the Table . . . . .	1785—87
Demand No. 75—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour . . . . .	1763	The Indian Soft Coke Cess (Reconstitution of Committee) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1788
Demand No. 76—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships . . . . .	1763	The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . . . .	1788—1833
Demand No. 77—Currency Capital Outlay . . . . .	1763	<b>SATURDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1937,—</b>	
Demand No. 78—Delhi Capital Outlay . . . . .	1763	Questions and Answers . . . . .	1835—55
Demand No. 79—Commuted Value of Pensions . . . . .	1764	Unstarred Question and Answer . . . . .	1856
Demand No. 80—Expenditure on retrenched personnel charged to Capital . . . . .	1764	Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	1856—59
		The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . . . .	1859—1907

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 9th March, 1937.

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

## MEMBER SWORN:

Mr. Arthur Sheldon Hands, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official).

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### PROVISION OF LETTER BOXES ON ISLAND PLATFORMS ON CERTAIN STATIONS.

582. \*Mr. Sri Prakasa: (a) Are Government aware that no letter boxes are provided on the important island platforms at such large stations as Cawnpore, Lucknow and Moghal Sarai?

(b) Are Government prepared to arrange for the setting up of letter boxes at convenient places on these platforms as well?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). Government have no information. The matter is within the competence of the Postmaster-General, United Provinces Circle, Lucknow, to whom a copy of the question is being sent for examination, and any further action that may be necessary.

### PUBLICATION OF THE NAMES OF *MUTAWWIF* AT MECCA FOR INDIAN PILGRIMS IN THE HAJ GUIDE.

583. \*Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if Maulana Abdul Rahman Mazhar is one of the *Mutawwifs* at Mecca for Indian pilgrims to Hedjaz?

(b) Is it a fact that the name of the said *Mutawwif* used to be published in the Haj Guide, published by the Haj Committee, Bombay?

(c) Are Government aware that the name of the said *Mutawwif* has not been published by the Haj Committee, Bombay, in the issue of their Guide for this year? If so, what are the reasons for that?

(d) Are Government prepared either to publish all the names of the *Mutawwifs* for Indian pilgrims, or not to publish any names at all?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) to (d). The name of Maulana Abdul Rahman Mazhar was published in the Guide issued by the Port Haj Committee of Bombay for 1935, but not in the Guides issued for 1936 and 1937. It is usual to publish in the Guide the names of only such

*Mutawwifs* as are recommended by His Majesty's Minister, Jedda, each year. This is done in the interests of Indian pilgrims and Government see no reason for altering the procedure. There is no compulsion on pilgrims to choose a *Mutawwif* from these lists.

#### CARRYING CAPACITY OF THE PILGRIM SHIP "RAHMAN".

584. \***Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the carrying capacity of the pilgrims to Hedjaz, of the pilgrim ship "Rahman" classwise, i.e., I class, II class, and deck passengers?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how many pilgrims did the ship carry as deck passengers when she sailed to Jedda on the 4th January last? How many passengers more did she carry than the allowed number?

(c) If the number of the passengers was more than allowed, what action do Government propose to take against the Company?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) The ship carried 1,601 deck passengers when she sailed for Jedda from Karachi on 2nd, not on 4th, January; this is her allotted number.

(c) Does not arise.

#### Statement.

1st class . . . . .	30
2nd class . . . . .	20
Deck . . . . .	1,601

#### CONSTRUCTION OF THE JHAJJAR-REWARI ROAD.

585. \***Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether Jhajjar-Rewari road (Rohtak District, Punjab) was approved by Messrs. K. G. Mitchell and L. H. Kirkness in their report on road and railway competition?

(b) Were representations with regard to this road made by two of the members of the Standing Committee for Roads?

(c) Were these representations forwarded to the Punjab Government?

(d) Did the Punjab Government approve of this scheme and forward it to the Central Government?

(e) Was this scheme placed before the Railway Board? If so, what decision was given by the Railway Board?

(f) What orders have been passed by the Central Government with regard to this road?

(g) If the Railway Board has not approved of this scheme, what grounds has it given for its disapproval?

(h) Do Government agree with the decision of the Railway Board?

(i) Does Jhajjar-Rewari road run parallel to any railway line?

(j) Does it in any way duplicate the means of communication?

(k) Are Government aware that this road, while connecting two important towns, would also provide means of communications to a large number of villagers who have got no other means of communication?

(l) If the Railway Board and the Local Government approved of this scheme, what is the delay in starting work?

(m) When is the construction work to be commenced on this road?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a), (b) and (c). Yes.

(d), (f) and (n). This scheme was forwarded by the Punjab Government along with eight other schemes for sanction in September last but when it was pointed out to them that their existing commitments exceeded their resources, they replied that this road could wait until the main Punjab road programme, in which presumably this will be included, is sanctioned by the Government of India. The consideration of this project was therefore suspended.

(e) and (g). The Railway Board have suggested that the scheme should not be proceeded with because they fear that it will result in short circuiting the railway connection between Rewari and Rohtak via Delhi.

(h) For the reasons stated Government have not yet examined the Railway Board's objection.

(i)—(l). As I explained to the Honourable Member the other day in the course of the debate on railway demands, it is only reasonable in considering road projects that railways should be consulted. As explained above, Government have not yet examined this scheme, but when the programme of the Punjab Government is received, it will be carefully considered with due regard to the points stressed by the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** Did the Punjab Government approve of this scheme?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Obviously: otherwise it would not have been included in their programme.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** Was the decision of the Railway Board communicated to the Punjab Government and did the Punjab Government withdraw this scheme after the decision of the Railway Board?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** The Punjab Government withdrew the scheme, because it was pointed out to them that their existing commitments exceeded their resources. I imagine that they knew the views of the railway authorities. They must have been communicated to them by the North Western Railway, the railway affected.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** Is it a fact that the Punjab Government approved of the scheme, but withdrew it after the decision of the Railway Board?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** They withdrew it for the time being, because they found that they could not afford it. They said it could wait, and it will be included in their main programme which will be coming up shortly.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** Does this road run parallel to the railway or does it in any way duplicate means of communication?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** The Honourable Member comes from the Punjab and he knows the road and railway system of that province much better than I do. I understand, it short-circuits the railway.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** In view of the fact that it does not duplicate means of communication, and in view of the fact that this road will not run parallel to any railway, what objection has the Railway Board to the construction of this road?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I explained that it will short-circuit the railway, but I do venture to suggest to the Honourable Member that it is unnecessary to continue this discussion further, because the scheme is coming up to Government again, and it will then be carefully considered with reference to all the points raised.

**Mr. Sham Lal:** Is it not a fact that the Government of India or the Local Governments do not approve of any scheme which is not sanctioned by the Railway Board?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** It is very far from being the fact. Both the Government of India and the Local Governments frequently approve schemes to which the Railway authorities have objected.

#### COMPLAINTS REGARDING OFFICIAL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTION MATTERS.

586. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what steps they had taken to stop interference by Government officials in districts and sub-divisions in different provinces with the election matters?

(b) Is it not a fact that the Honourable the Home Member received messages by wire from Midnapore, complaining against official interference with election matters in the above district and requesting issue of fresh *communiqué* regarding Government neutrality in the matter? If so, will Government be pleased to state if any fresh *communiqué* was issued at all? If it was issued, will the Honourable Member be pleased to lay it on the table?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the speech delivered by me in October last on the Resolution on this subject.

(b) I received a telegram from the Honourable Member himself and forwarded it to the Government of Bengal. I am not aware whether that Government issued any *communiqué* on the subject.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** With reference to part (a), may I know from the Honourable Member whether this Department or any Department of the Government of India issued any circulars whatsoever enjoining on the Provincial Governments to abstain from absolute neutrality in election matters?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I referred to that in the speech.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** I hope the Honourable Member knows that the debate on that Resolution was not concluded till this Session. May I know from the Government whether after his speech his Department took any steps to inform the Provincial Governments to maintain an attitude of absolute neutrality in election matters?



**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Steps were taken before I spoke. Whether any further circulars were issued after that, I cannot say off hand.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** May I know from the Honourable Member if, after receipt of the telegram from the Honourable the questioner, a Member of this House, any attempts were made to ascertain from the Government of Bengal whether there was actual interference in election matters going on in the district of Midnapore by the District Magistrate?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I received a report from the Government of Bengal that the allegations in the statement were unfounded.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** What action was taken to implement their assurance to this House that strict neutrality would be maintained during the elections?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I have already answered that. I would refer the Honourable Member to the speech I made in October last.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Is it a fact that the licences of two taxi drivers were seized by the District Magistrate of Midnapore for supplying motor cars to the Congress candidate there, and that ultimately His Excellency the Governor of Bengal had to intervene by means of a telegram when the licences were restored?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I know nothing about it.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** May I know if the Honourable Member is prepared to contradict me when I say that the District Magistrate of Midnapore held numerous election meetings in which he denounced the Congress candidates and openly told the people that voting for the Congress candidate would mean setting every household in flames? Is he prepared to contradict me there?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Yes.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to lay on the table of the House the report contradicting me?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I am prepared to state that allegations of that kind were investigated by the Bengal Government who found that there was no foundation whatsoever for them.

#### SUBSIDIES GRANTED TO THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL SHIPPING COMPANY AND EMPLOYMENT OF "DUFFERIN" CADETS.

587. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the nature and conditions of subsidies granted to the P. & O. Shipping Company by Government?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the P. & O. Shipping Company secured from the Government the privilege of carrying mails between India and Europe and England as a subsidy in lieu of taking young Indians as apprentices, who came out of the training ship "Dufferin" apart from other monetary considerations?

(c) Since when has the above Company been enjoying this privilege, and how many such Indian apprentices have been taken by that Company?

(d) In case the above Company had failed to take any such apprentices during the period of agreement, do Government propose to transfer this privilege of carrying mails to an Indian shipping company which will enter into such agreement and give effect to the terms of the agreement?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state the names of Indian shipping companies which take such apprentices without getting any help or privileges from Government in the shape of any subsidy?

(f) Will Government be pleased to state when the present agreement with the P. & O. Company expires?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) No "subsidy" of any kind is granted by the Government of India to the Peninsular and Oriental Company.

(b) No.

(c) and (d). Do not arise.

(e) There is no subsidy given to either British or Indian Companies that employ "Dufferin" cadets unless the cost to Government of training such cadets is to be regarded as a subsidy. To that extent the companies that employ most cadets may be said to receive the greatest assistance.

(f) The Government of India have no agreement with the Peninsular and Oriental Company.

#### EXPORT OF PIG IRON TO JAPAN.

588. **\*Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Are Government aware that almost the entire production of pig iron in India is being exported to Japan?

(b) Are Government aware that this export of pig iron to Japan at a time when heavy re-armament is going on throughout the world has given rise to serious apprehension in the country?

(c) Have Government considered the probability of this pig iron exported to Japan, being converted into ammunition and used against India and other Empire countries in the event of war breaking out?

(d) Do Government propose to take any step in the matter? If so, what?

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

#### CLOSING OF CERTAIN RAILWAY WORKSHOPS AT LUCKNOW ON SATURDAYS.

589. **\*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member state if it is a fact that certain shops in Railway Workshops at Lucknow are closed on Saturdays? If so, which, and since when?

(b) Is it a fact that the shops were closed on Saturdays on account of financial stringency and an assurance was given that the shops shall be opened on Saturdays as soon as finances improved?

(c) Have Government received any representation against closing of shops on Saturdays? If so, what action has been taken?

(d) In view of improvement in railway finances, are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of the aforesaid shops being opened on Saturdays?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I am collecting the information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

#### NEW PASS RULES FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

590. **\*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Have any representations been received by the Railway Board from Railway employees regarding the new pass rules? If so, how many?

(b) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of withdrawing the rules?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) Yes: 2,101.

(b) Certain points brought to notice by the All-India Railwaymen's Federation at their meeting with the Railway Board on the 3rd February, 1937, are under consideration.

#### INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS IN THE PROVINCES.

591. **\*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Will Government state if it is a fact that they issued instructions to the Provincial Governments from time to time regarding the conduct of Provincial elections? If so, will Government lay on the table copies of all such circulars?

(b) Is it a fact that Government issued a circular prohibiting election propaganda through cinemas? If so, was it done at the instance of any Provincial Government?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) In the course of my speech in October last on the Resolution on the subject, I explained the position of the Government of India and the action taken. No other action was taken by the Government of India.

(b) Government have issued no such circular. In response to an enquiry they expressed their view to Provincial Governments that the use of the cinematograph for political propaganda should not be permitted during the recent elections.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What are the grounds on which they said so? What are the grounds for their instructions to that effect, in connection with election propaganda?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Government considered it was undesirable to permit the use of the cinema for purposes of political propaganda by anybody.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Mahtta:** Did the Honourable Member specifically instruct the Provincial Governments that election propaganda meetings also might not be carried on through the cinema?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Local Governments consulted the Government of India and the Government of India expressed their view to Provincial Governments that the use of the cinematograph for political propaganda should not be permitted during the recent elections.

#### INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

592. **\*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will Government state the steps taken by them for accelerating the Indianisation of the Army?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the debate on this subject which took place on March 6th. (Laughter.)

#### ACTION TAKEN ON THE RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A STANDING ARMY COMMITTEE.

593. **\*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will Government state what action, if any, they propose to take on the Resolution of this Assembly regarding the appointment of a standing committee of the Central Legislature to advise Government in the matter of defence?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to Bhai Parma Nand's starred question No. 524, dated the 18th September, 1936, on the same subject. (Laughter.)

#### LOANS ADVANCED TO INDIAN STATES AND OTHERS.

594. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** With reference to the starred question No. 299, dated the 10th September, 1936, will Government say:

- (a) what loans have been advanced to Indian States and others during the years 1930 to 1936, for what purposes and on what terms; and
- (b) what steps, if any, have been taken to recover loans granted before 1930, which are still outstanding?

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

#### SIMLA EXODUS.

595. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** With reference to the answer given to starred question No. 275, on 10th September, 1936, regarding Simla exodus, will Government state:

- (a) whether the investigations about extended accommodation for offices and the Federal Legislature in Simla have been completed and if not, when they are likely to be completed;
- (b) whether it is intended in 1937 or 1938 to keep down in summer any of the attached offices, or Secretariat proper that went up to Simla last year and before, and if so, which;

- (c) whether they propose to continue the move to the extent they have been doing till now; and
- (d) whether they intend to consult formally or informally non-official opinion in or outside the Assembly in this matter?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) Investigations are likely to be continued until the Federal Government is instituted.

(b), (c) and (d). There is no change intended in this year's season. I can say nothing definite as to intentions in future years.

**MAJOR CAWTHORN'S REPORT *RE* SUITABILITY OR OTHERWISE OF KENYA FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF *EX*-SERVICE MEN OF THE INDIAN ARMY.**

**596. \*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Is it a fact that Major Cawthorn, an officer on the active list of the Indian Army, was deputed about 1935 to Kenya with a view to report on the suitability or otherwise of the colony for the settlement of *ex*-service men of the Indian army?

(b) What was the expense incurred by the Government of India on his visit on account of travelling allowance, daily allowance, etc.?

(c) Has Major Cawthorn submitted his report? If so, will Government place a copy of it on the table of the House?

(d) Is it a fact that he has made some derogatory remarks against Indian settlers in Kenya? If so, are Government prepared to expunge those remarks before publishing the report?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) Major Cawthorn, while on leave in 1935, visited several countries in Africa, including Kenya, at the request of their Governments, to report on their suitability for settlement by retired officers of the Indian Army who came under the War Block Scheme.

(b) The Government of India gave Major Cawthorn an honorarium of £50. All his other expenses were met by the Governments of the Colonies concerned.

(c) Yes, but the Government of India do not think it necessary to place a copy on the table of this House. It is a fairly bulky document and is intended only for the information of a particular class of persons. I will, however, lend the Honourable Member a copy if he wishes.

(d) I cannot find any such remarks myself. The author no doubt quotes views on both sides regarding the Indian question, but his object was to describe the position and not to make pronouncements with regard to it.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will he kindly put it in the Library?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I have no objection to putting a copy in the Library.

**ALLEGED MISBEHAVIOUR OF A EUROPEAN PASS HOLDER TOWARDS A PRINCE AT SATNA RAILWAY STATION.**

**597. \*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Is it a fact that on or about the 29th October, 1936, an Indian ruling Prince wanted to travel by the Bombay Great Indian Peninsula mail train from Satna railway station to Bombay?

(b) Is it a fact that the Prince informed the railway authorities three days in advance at Satna railway station to book a first class berth for him by that mail train?

(c) Is it a fact that on the day in question all first class compartments, excepting one, were occupied to the full capacity and that there was only one seat available in a single first class compartment which was then occupied by a European couple who were travelling on a railway pass?

(d) Is it a fact that the Indian Prince was refused accommodation by the European in that compartment and that the European even assumed a threatening attitude?

(e) Is it a fact that even the intervention of the Station Master proved of no avail?

(f) Is it a fact that the said Indian Prince has made a complaint to the Railway Board about this incident? If so, what steps have Government taken to punish the European, who was travelling on a railway pass, for his misbehaviour?

(g) What steps do Government propose to take to avoid a recurrence of such misbehaviour on the part of railway pass holders?

(h) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of inserting a condition in the railway passes issued to their railway servants to the effect that the holder of a pass should make room for *bond fide* paid ticket-holders when so demanded by the Station Master at any railway station?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a), (c) and (e). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Mr. Sri Prakasa's starred question No. 520 on the 6th March 1937.

(b) I understand that on the day previous to that on which the Ruling Chief desired to travel, his Secretary asked the Station Master at Satna to reserve accommodation and was advised that on the arrival of the train at the station, endeavours would be made to provide him with accommodation if it was available.

(d) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative; as regards the latter part, an allegation to this effect was made in a newspaper report, but has not been confirmed by such enquiries as were made.

(f) The reply to the first part is in the negative: as regards the latter part, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I have given to parts (a), (c) and (e) of this question.

(g) The taking of suitable disciplinary action in each case as it arises should prevent a recurrence of such incidents.

(h) At stations at which pass holders commence their journey, they are required to give precedence to ticket holders. They cannot reasonably be asked to similarly give way at stations *en route*.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** May I know what action has been taken against this particular delinquent?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I have already answered that in reply to a previous question.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** May I know if a berth was reserved at his request?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** No, Sir, there was no time to do so.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** What is exactly the status of a pass-holder? Is it the same as that of the ordinary passenger?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Yes, in all respects except this that at the starting station a pass-holder must give way to a ticket-holder.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Only at the starting station—not at any intermediate station?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Obviously, if a pass-holder has already started his journey, he cannot reasonably be asked in the middle of the night to vacate his berth in order to make room for a ticket-holder who joins on the way.

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

#### REPORT OF THE WHEELER COMMITTEE.

**598. \*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** With reference to the starred question No. 51, answered on the 2nd September, 1936, will Government state what orders have been passed by them on the Wheeler Committee Report? Will a copy of the Report, together with the orders of Government thereon, be placed on the table of the House?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Government have not yet passed orders on all the matters dealt with in the report and are not prepared to announce their decisions at present. I do not think it is necessary to lay a copy of the report and the orders of Government on the table of the House.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** When are orders likely to be passed?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I cannot say; certain matters are still the subject of correspondence with the Secretary of State.

**Mr. B. Das:** With reference to the report that was published in the press that there were two alternative recommendations regarding the recruitment of the Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries, will the Honourable Member kindly say which of the recommendations he has accepted.—namely, whether the recruitment of the permanent Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries will be on a permanent basis, or on the short-period basis as at present?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** The Honourable Member suggests that there are two alternative plans recommended by the Wheeler Committee and reported in the press?

**Mr. B. Das:** Yes.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I do not remember that there were two alternative plans at all?

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will the Honourable Member place a copy in the Library of the House?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** The report has not been published yet. Government have not passed orders on it yet.

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

#### RESTRICTIONS ON INDIANS IN NEW ZEALAND.

599. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House in reply to unstarred question No. 141 (printed in Legislative Assembly Debates, pages 52—59, dated 31st August, 1936), will Government state whether their attention has been drawn to the Press statement of Mr. C. Jinarajadasa, published in the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 17th November, 1936?

(b) Is it a fact that the above Government statement about New Zealand is inaccurate in two particulars, *viz.* :

- “(i) no Indian is permitted to land, if he intends to settle: New Zealand is barred to Indians though not legally but as a matter of fact by the rigours imposed by the customs officials; and
- (ii) even a temporary visitor (for business) must deposit £10 on arrival and that he has to collect a refund of this deposit on the day before the steamer leaves”?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) Yes.

(b) No. As regards (i) the Honourable Member will observe from column 5 of the statement that permanent residence is explicitly excepted; as regards (ii), the deposit of £10 required from temporary visitors is required from all temporary visitors, irrespective of their nationality, and therefore is not a disability peculiar to Indians.

#### LEVY OF AN IMPORT DUTY ON PORTUGUESE CASHEW NUTS.

600. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Have Government received a memorial from the all-India Cashew Nut Merchants Association, suggesting the levy of an import duty on Portuguese East African cashew nut?

(b) Is it a fact that the cashew nut producing season in India is from March to June and in Africa from November till the end of March?

(c) Is it a fact that large quantities of Portuguese cashew nuts are booked to be imported into India before the beginning of the Indian season?

(d) Are Government aware that such heavy imports will affect the prices of the Indian cashew nuts? If so, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of keeping up the price level of the nuts in India by levying an import duty on Portuguese nuts?



(e) Are Government aware that the levy of such an import duty on Portuguese nuts will be an additional source of revenue to the Government?

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

(b) and (c): So far as the Government of India are aware, the Indian crop is harvested in April and May and the factories which prepare the produce for export are employed with it till November. The crop from East Africa then begins to arrive and serves to keep the factories further employed during what would otherwise be an idle season.

(d) The main market for cashew nuts is in the U. S. A., and the price of both Indian and African nuts must therefore be regulated by the prices obtainable there. In this connection the Honourable Member's attention is invited to part (d) of my answer to Mr. Santhanam's starred question No. 445 in the current Session.

(e) No, Sir.

**GIVING UP OF MOVE TO SIMLA AND HOLDING OF THE AUTUMN SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY IN NEW DELHI.**

**601. \*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Do Government propose to take any steps to acquire any land or buildings for housing the new Federal Houses of the Legislature when they come into being in Simla?

(b) Will Government state if they have consulted any authorities or persons in connection with the above?

(c) Have Government worked out the cost of such buildings together with the buildings that may be required to house the staff officially and privately? If so, what are the figures for this as well as for the land and buildings mentioned in part (a) above?

(d) Is there any idea of taking over 'Knockdrin' site or the 'Grand Hotel' buildings in Simla for the purpose mentioned above? Is it a fact that an engineer has been appointed to select a site and prepare the estimate? What is his salary?

(e) Do Government propose to utilise the present Assembly Chamber and the Council of State Chamber for the future Federal Houses of the Legislature, or do they propose to build new Chambers? If the latter, where?

(f) Are Government aware of the great inconvenience caused to non-official Members by holding the Autumn Session in Simla?

(g) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of curtailing their period of stay in Simla and moving down early to Delhi so that the Autumn Session may be held in Delhi early in September?

(h) Are Government aware that Simla is unhealthy being subject to small-pox and typhoid?

(i) Are Government aware that even officials feel great inconvenience in staying at Simla?

(j) Do Government propose to give up the Simla exodus?

(k) Will they at least give up the Simla Session of the Assembly from this year?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) to (e), (g), (j) and (k). Government do not propose to make any change in the present position in regard to the Simla exodus and the holding of an Autumn Session at Simla until the Federal Government comes into being and is able to decide the issues involved. Nor do they propose to take any steps which would commit the future Federal Government to expenditure on account of any increase of official accommodation in Simla consequent on the increased requirements of the Federation. Enquiries have, however, been instituted for the purpose of collecting information to enable the Federal Government to come to a decision on this matter. No Engineer has been specially appointed for the purpose of these enquiries.

(f), (h) and (i). No.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Do I understand the Honourable Member to say that no capital expenditure will be incurred before the Federal Government comes into being?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I have said, Sir, that Government do not propose to take any steps which would commit the future Federal Government to expenditure on account of any increase of official accommodation in Simla consequent on the increased requirements of the Federation.

#### DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

602. **\*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) With reference to the answer given to unstarred question No. 152, on the 8th October, 1936, stating that accumulated arrears of pensions are paid in monthly instalments at Rs. 4 to Rs. 8 per mensem where Government apprehend that a part of the arrears would go to unauthorised hands, will Government please state if they have been, and in future will be guided by this principle in the cases of families of both combatants and non-combatants?

(b) Will Government please also state the authority to withhold arrears of death compensations on mere apprehension as to the probable future use of such arrears and enumerate the categories of such unauthorised hands?

(c) Is it a fact that Government have been granting financial aids from public funds to the families of killed and cent. per cent. disabled soldiers, etc., whose claims do not fall under their regulations, for some purposes, such as, paying of a debt defraying the marriage expenses of a daughter, or for undergoing some special treatment or operation? If so, will Government please state whether, in claims of the category referred to above they have satisfied themselves that during this period these persons have incurred no debt or disease requiring special treatment?

(d) Do Government intend to release the arrears so withheld as in part (a) above on receiving the proof of the aforesaid necessities?

(e) What will become of this amount when the pensioner dies after receiving one or more instalments and where there are no eligible heirs to claim the amount of pension except distant relations not entitled to receive pension under Army Regulations?

(f) Will Government please state whether they will be guided by the principle once established and notified in India Army Order No. 24 of 1927 as regards transfer of a family pension from one heir to another in destitute cases, with effect from the date of first application for such transfer? Do they intend to admit such cases from the date of their orders?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Information is being collected and will be laid on the table in due course.

**RATES CHARGED FOR HIDES FROM ALLAHABAD AND CAWNPORE TO CALCUTTA.**

**603. \*Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the rates charged for dry hides and wet salted cow and buffalo hides from Allahabad to Calcutta and Cawnpore to Calcutta per wagon?

(b) What is the rate per maund if the full wagon is not loaded?

(c) What were the rates in 1912—1914, again in 1915—1919, again in 1919—1923 and in 1924—1936?

(d) Have any variations and changes been made in the rates after the war? If so, what are the changes?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to this and questions Nos. 605 and 606 together.

I have asked the railways concerned for such information as is available or can be obtained without undue labour, and will place a reply on the table when it has been received.

**REDUCTION OF RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES ON HIDES AND SKINS.**

**604. \*Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** (a) Have Government made enquiries into the price levels of hides and skins, between 1914—1919, 1920—1926 and 1927—1936?

(b) Have they made enquiries into the freight rates after the level of prices for cow hides and goat skins went down?

(c) Do Government propose to take early steps towards reduction of freight rates on hides and skins?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to page 8 of the "Index Numbers of Indian Prices, 1861—1931" which gives the average prices of hides and skins and to pages 856, 857, 868 and 869 of the *Indian Trade Journal* of 18th February, 1937. Copies of both these publications are in the Library of the House.

(b) and (c). The question of a reduction in the railway freight rates is a matter for each Railway Administration to examine with respect to conditions obtaining on its line and to make such adjustments as circumstances call for.

**Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** May I know, Sir, when this question was taken up before this date?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I answered that question during the course of the discussion on the Railway Budget.

**DESPATCH OF HIDES FROM LOHARDAGA TO CALCUTTA BY LORRIES.**

†605. **\*Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** Are Government aware that cow hides were being despatched by lorries from Lohardaga to Calcutta for reason of delayed and expensive transshipment at Ranchi?

**ARRANGEMENT FOR EXPEDITING TRANSHIPMENT OF HIDES AND SKINS FROM CERTAIN PLACES TO CALCUTTA.**

†606. **\*Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** (a) Will Government state what arrangement for expediting transshipment of hides and skins at Mokamah yard is made for consignments from Durbhanga and Muzaffarpur and other districts of Tirhoot division to Calcutta?

(b) Is it a fact that during rainy season the consignments reach Calcutta normally in wet condition?

(c) What do Government propose to do to avoid any such damage to skins during rainy season in future?

---

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

**DEMAND No. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—contd.**

**Frontier Policy—contd.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion of the following *cut motion* moved by Mr. Asaf Ali:

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

**Dr. Khan Sahib** (North-West Frontier Province: General): Mr. President, the Frontier policy is discussed every year in this House, and, as far as I am concerned, I have always placed before this House the facts but it makes no difference because facts are not considered by this Government. This Government is an organised conspiracy and are very active in carrying out their deeds for the benefit of the exploiters from Great Britain.

Sir, in order to be able to discuss the Frontier policy properly, I must explain one or two things about the composition of this Government. This Government is composed of *swadeshi* and *bideshi* parts. It would be ridiculous for anyone to deny the gift of speaking of the *swadeshi* section of the Government benches, but they never seem to me to be convincing. They always speak as though they have something else in their minds, which they think it unwise to reveal. They seem to be tantalising and mystery-making. They leave us dissatisfied and still waiting. As for the *bideshi* section of the Government, they are recruited from the United Service Club of Mercenaries of Great Britain. They are especially pro-

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 603.

pared for service in this country, and, as they come from a very reliable stock, they would naturally plead the cause of their benefactors at any cost. They would belong, if left in their own country, to the class of unemployed. They are dumped on this country with fat salaries. They are full of spirits at night (Laughter) and in the morning suffer from the after-effects with swollen heads to muddle up the affairs of this country, and they go on muddling, no matter what may be the result, they are very anxious to keep their prestige. Sir, we are told that the Frontier trouble now in Waziristan is caused by certain effects, but we are not told that the people in the Agency areas wanted to have certain of their grievances looked into. They asked that in the area of Pochi they would rather like to be governed by *Shariat* than *Riwaj*. But the affairs of the Agency areas are wonderful. The treatment which is dealt out to the people in the Agency areas is inhuman; they are treated just like beasts. Some of them are brought by these Political Tahsildars and Political Agents and are tied up; they are made to bend, and large stones are placed over them. These are the methods which are not even practised by barbarians now-a-days.

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): Don't you know what the Italians did in Abyssinia only the other day?

**Dr. Khan Sahib:** Those are civilised people, and their methods are those of the civilised people. These people then left that area as a protest. They went to Khaissora. The Government started constructing a road from Mirali to Khaissora. They brought a few Maliks and the same old story of the thumb-impressions, and thus the trouble started. That is the real cause of the trouble. Why do you want to take roads into other people's territory? Why do you want to take their lands? That is the civilisation they possess. Here we are told that a girl was kidnapped. I do not see the connection. As long as there are boys and girls in this world, this sort of thing will continue to happen. (Laughter.) What has it got to do with the politics of the country? Some soft-headed countrymen of mine forget the whole interest of their country when a little thing like this is thrown at them, and some, for their little self-interest, are always ready to support those who have come from a distance of 6,000 miles to rule over us. They have come here, not only to reduce you to starvation, but to strip you of all that you possess, and still you are deceived by little things like that. I want to tell my own friends that they must not get emotional and they should not be affected by little things like that. As you know, in America, the Negroes are lynched and killed, but have they stopped this practice? No. It is human nature. The South Africans may pass any regulation they like, England may do anything she likes, Europe may do anything, but you will see that the girl who likes the man will usually run away with him. Sir, it is wonderful how things are kept hidden by this Government. Mirali is a camp which is surrounded by barbed wires, with regular guards night and day, and yet 50 rifles were taken away at night and the authorities came to know of it the next day in the afternoon. How did people get into that camp? All these things are arranged. These rifles were taken away from the tribes, and I think it was arranged that they should come in the evening and take them away so that they could create trouble. We have never been told how these fifty rifles were taken away and how they were brought.

[Dr. Khan Sahib.]

Now, I come to the Faqir of Ipi. The correct name is Ayupai. They have not even learnt our names properly up till now. (Laughter.) They produce their own names. This Faqir of Ipi is an ordinary man. The Government, in order to magnify his position and status, have given him the title of Faqir. He is Haji Mirza Ali Khan who is the head of the Tura Kheil Wazirs. He is practically the owner of Khaissora and most of the parts of Ipi. Today we are told in the *Statesman* that the Faqir of Ipi is up again. Without any enquiry they say: "Oh! what a terrible fellow this man must be." The Government asked the Faqir to come to Ipi in order to put him in jail, but he refused. It is after this incident that the raids took place. The matter has become so grave that all the tribes have entered into an agreement and they have committed all those raids. Why should they not? If the Government go on interfering with their affairs, why should they not resent such action? Why do you interfere with their freedom? Apart from that, 150 of their people are rotting in the Dera Ismail Khan Jail for the last six months. Has ever the Foreign Secretary cared to enquire why innocent people should be locked up in jail? He told you something about the Afridis. Now, they have come to friendly terms with Afridis. It is not the question of coming to friendly terms, but that the period of earning money in the settled territory is passed. The Afridis only come to earn their livelihood in the winter and go back by the end of March. It is all an economic question. The Government want to starve these poor tribesmen. They would not allow these poor tribesmen to come and live on friendly terms with the people in the settled area. To create trouble, the Government pass this rule that the tribesmen should not come into the settled territory. Apart from that, I will tell you that the Government have got hold of a number of Afridis who have been living with us in the settled area for the past thirty years and put them in jail. This is the sort of justice we get from the Government which I have explained to you so often.

Now, what have these tribesmen done? I think it is quite clear that the two posts of Jalera Algar and Lower Kasora have been attacked, but, before that incident took place, the houses of some of these people who live in the Tochi Agency area as well as the house of the Faqir of Ipi, as they call him, were burnt. Why burn the houses after they have left? What is the good of destroying houses and property? You see, Sir, just to create trouble, they burn these houses and naturally these people get provoked. It is perfectly true that this Government is constantly irritating and provoking the people in the independent territory. (Hear, hear), with the result that these tribesmen, on account of resentment, attack the Government. The Government should take consequences of their action.

The village of Idak was fined on the excuse of feeding the people who attacked that area. Have not Government got enormous troops there? Have they not got scouts, have they not got militia and constabularies, and, apart from that, their regular army for which this country pays to the tune of over 45 crores per year? If they cannot protect the poor people who are in those villages, who are living under their protection, and if they fine the people without any fault, in order to pay for the maintenance of the army and of the scouts, is it not time that they removed the whole army and allowed the Khudai Khidmatgars to be put in charge of that area? They will show you how to maintain peaceful relations with others.

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

**Dr. Khan Sahib:** Then, the village of Dour was also fined Rs. 5,000 because the people from that area migrated. Then, another village was fined, because some of the telegraph posts were damaged. Now, Sir, why do Government want police? Why do they want an army if they are going to make the villagers responsible for the safety of telegraph posts? The Government are responsible for the peaceful administration of the country, for which they are regularly paid. Why should villagers be held responsible for telegraph posts. It is very funny that the Government take money from us and they still want to be protected by us.

One thing more I should like to say about the tribes. The Government are punishing these tribes on account of alleged raids by them. Now, these tribes are all united and they want to fight for their freedom. Another thing is that they are determined to make a republic of their own. They are not going to be frightened by your aeroplanes and other machines. In their own humble way, they have dug up holes and caves and they are going to remain there and come out only at the time when they can fight. They are not going to be subjugated. Their freedom is at stake. Knowing them as I do, they value their freedom more than their lives. **They are not like us.** . . .

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

**Dr. Khan Sahib:** I want one minute more.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot allow it. That is the arrangement arrived at among the parties.

**Dr. Khan Sahib:** Then, I have nothing more to say.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali** (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I can say a great deal on this subject, but there are many reasons why I have got to use very moderate language and why I have to moderate my views so that I may not get excited over a subject on which I feel strongly. I am afraid the Government of India are following a new policy of pussy-foot and quietly, without consulting anybody, have started changing their policy and adopting the method of peaceful penetration to civilise these independent tribes. In this change of policy, the Government, I am sure, are in for trouble both for themselves and for the whole of India.

I know a little bit of Muslim lands, and my Honourable friend, Sir Aubrey Metcalfe, for whom I have great respect, knows a great deal of the world politics and world position. He also knows a great deal about what happened to England since the last Great War. He ought to know by this time what is happening in Europe. How the concord of Europe is gone and how all those who used to combine and rob us are fighting among themselves. I think very soon there is great trouble coming in Europe itself. The nations which have suffered owing to the aggressive policy of Europe will get a chance, and I do hope that our people in India will remember this great lesson. People laugh at me when I

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

talk of peace. But still I am a persistent believer in peace and I will give up in the end only when I feel that it is hopeless to entertain ideas of peace. I am not easily carried away by small incidents that may hamper good relationship or bring in cleavage among ourselves. I still believe in a great future for India and also for England if we follow a policy of conciliation and trust. And, after 150 years of British connection, I think, my people are now and have been for some time fit to carry on all their work in their own country. My friend, Mr. Tottenham, is always a reasonable man, but he has a weak case. Let him look at the frontier and within the frontier of India, he will find there enormous numbers of young men who are physically strong and quite capable of forming an efficient army,—recruits not of the type of Mr. Griffiths whom no recruiting officer would even look at. (Loud Laughter.) And if you want to do well for your Empire, for yourselves and for India, the time has come when you should really teach and train us. We beat you in hockey, we have learnt your cricket and Polo and other games, and we are physically strong and intellectually advanced. Now, you should train us, so that, in case of trouble, we may defend this country against foreign aggression. I can give you five millions of capable men, each one above 6 feet 2 inches in height, with huge chests and powerful muscles, intellectually strong and brainy within six months. When my friends, Captain Lal Chand and Sir Sher Muhammad Khan, come to me, they talk in a different tune. (Laughter.) They also feel the humiliation of their country.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan** (Nominated Non-Official): Do muscle and brains go together?

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** I have got both, thank God (Laughter), and I am 64. Therefore, Sir, if you persist in this policy of trying to go and attack brave people who love their freedom, you are going to create great trouble which may one day lead to a terrible war in which India will be unwittingly involved. There is now an awakening in Muslim lands, and they are not so humble as before, and they will defend themselves. Turkey, Iran, Mesopotamia, Afghanistan, Yemen and probably Egypt and the Hedjaz,—they will all combine so that no European Power may come into their land and get a footing. After all, blood is thicker than water, and if you go on behaving like this, the Afghans and the Pathans, who are one people, will combine, and you will then know what your aggressive policy means. And here, I want to tell my friend, Pandit Malaviya, and my other Hindu friends and everybody else that if any outside Muslim Power wants to attack my country, 80 millions of Indian Muslims will fight for every inch of ground. At the same time, I am in touch with the Afghans and the tribal people, and they have complained to me that we do them a great injustice to think that they will rob us of our independence. I know Afghanistan was conquered by the Mughal kings and by Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Let us now fix a boundary for this country and see that no one from outside can cross that boundary. But by persisting in this foolish policy, you will not be able to subjugate these people, but merely spend crores of money and still fail. I wish the Government of India to form a deputation consisting of my friend, Mr. Desai, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Aney, Mr. Joshi, Sardar Mangal Singh and some others to talk to these tribes, and they will do better work than you are doing by spending these millions there. We do not want this



policy; I want them to stop it and pay more attention to the people of India. Spend money on us and teach us how to fight. We do not want this destructive policy of peaceful penetration which means nothing but ruin to India. Sir, every time I talk of peace, I am told by my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, that people laugh at me. But the time has come when the only policy to pursue is to take the leaders of public opinion here into your confidence and listen to their advice. Then alone will your Empire survive. Otherwise there will be an obituary notice somewhere very soon as follows: "Here lies buried the British Empire, killed by its own affronts." And it will go down unmourned and with no poet to sing about it. Therefore, I will ask my Honourable friend, the Foreign Secretary, to adopt some policy other than peaceful penetration, which will give rise to dreadful results which I cannot foresee.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe** (Foreign Secretary): Sir, although this is the second successive year in which the frontier problem has been debated, I still find myself confronted with a great many misunderstandings and misstatements which have been made by various speakers in the course of this debate. I am, therefore, compelled to restate as briefly as possible some of the more salient facts which appear to be misunderstood. If anybody wishes for a more complete and detailed account of that position than I am able to give in the time at my disposal, I would refer him to the very comprehensive speech on the international and other considerations involved, which was made by Sir Denys Bray in March 1923 (*Opposition cries of "Oh!"*). The position is essentially unchanged since so far as the international position goes, and I will merely attempt now to state some of the facts which it is necessary that everybody in this House should understand.

The position is that we have in the first place British India which is divided by what is known as the administered border from a belt of tribal territory, in which we do not to any very great extent administer. Beyond that tribal territory, there is the Durand Line. The tribal territory extends right up to the Durand Line which is our international frontier with Afghanistan. There is no independent territory of any kind between the administered border and the Durand Line. . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali** (Delhi: General): What about the treaties with the tribes? If there is no independent territory, why have you concluded treaties with them?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe**: By independent, I mean internationally independent. I am perfectly prepared to admit that there is a considerable difference in the amount of administration which we exercise in various parts of tribal territory. In some parts, there is a partial administration, and in other parts, in deference to the treaties which we have with the tribes, we allow them to maintain complete internal autonomy and they run their own affairs entirely. But want of administration is, I maintain, an entirely different thing from independence in the international and legal sense of the word, and I trust that the House will agree with me that that is so. In the whole of that tribal territory, we have responsibilities, not only to Afghanistan on the other side of the international frontier, but also to the inhabitants themselves of that tribal territory who are themselves British protected subjects: that is their judicial state. . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** They do not recognise that fact.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** Whether they recognise it or not is another matter, but that is their status. At any rate, so long as the international frontier exists there, I maintain that it is quite impossible for us to wash our hands completely of all our responsibilities in that belt. I gather from my Honourable friend, who moved this motion, that he thinks in the first place that Government were wrong in ever demarcating the Durand Line. It is, however, obvious that until that line was demarcated, there was no international frontier, which very much prejudiced our ability to maintain our international responsibilities. I do not think that I need go into the merits of the policy under which the Durand Line was demarcated, because whatever we feel about that line, which has been in existence for many years, the fact remains that it is there and that we have treaties with Afghanistan which compel us to take certain action with regard to territory on the Indian side of that international frontier.

The other main point which my friend made was that our policy of peaceful penetration, which has been in force, I think I may say, without contradiction since 1923 and was in fact a new phase of policy introduced at that time, is responsible for all the disturbances and troubles which have taken place on the frontier since that date. He, therefore, advocates that the only sane and proper policy is a complete reversion to the close border policy that was more or less in force until 1923. I think that is a correct appreciation of my friend's position. In the first place, I would say that the Honourable Member is not entirely consistent in his own argument. He says to us that we are always shifting our policy, changing it, and thereby making it extremely difficult for the tribes to know what Government's real attitude is towards them. I am quite prepared to admit that, up till 1923, there was a considerable amount of chopping and changing though on the whole we were inclined to keep to the policy of leaving the tribes to their own devices and not interfering with them. Since 1923, we have been, so far as we can be, consistent in pursuing a policy of peaceful penetration, and surely it would be against the Honourable Member's own suggestions for us now to revert and go back to a policy of complete abandonment of that territory and keep ourselves entirely within the administered area. . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** It is violent penetration: it is not peaceful penetration at all that you are making.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** There is one point I wish to make before I leave this, and that is that the Honourable Member has argued that a great deal of expenditure has been caused by this policy of penetration and that all the financial arguments are on the side of the close border policy. In reply to that I must point out that the figures on record show exactly the contrary. The figures are, so far as we know them from 1895 to 1918—we have not got figures for previous years—the average expenditure on military operations while the close border policy was in force amounted to something like 50 lakhs a year. After 1918, there was a good deal of special expenditure on the penetration of Waziristan and building of roads which lasted up till 1923. From 1923 until 1925, the expenditure on military operations in that part of the world was almost negligible—certainly in Waziristan—and even last year, as has been pointed out, it amounted

only to 12 lakhs: all of that expenditure was due nearly entirely to one operation regarding which I shall have something to say in a few moments . . . . .

**Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur** (South Madras: Muhammadan): Is it not a fact that a sum of 25 lakhs was set apart for the construction of roads alone?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** Roads are not military operations. I would add that while that close border policy was in force and we were spending, as I say, something like 50 lakhs a year on military operations, we found at the end of that period that we had got no nearer to any final solution of the problem. We were doing nothing except having occasional military operations which cost a great deal of money and brought us no farther to any solution whatever . . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** May I have a little bit of information before the Honourable Member proceeds further . . . . .

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** Will you take off time, Sir?

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** It is only with regard to this 50 lakhs which you have just now mentioned: does it include the Malakand and Chitral campaigns? If they do, the average will certainly fall below five lakhs perhaps.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can go on with his speech.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I could not say: that is a question I can hardly answer now without notice. Certainly it included all campaigns and it amounted to 50 lakhs a year on an average.

Well, Sir, apart from attacking the whole policy of penetration, I think  
12 Noon. that certain Honourable Members, particularly the Member from Peshawar, suggested that Government have pursued that policy in a very aggressive and provocative manner. To that point I should like now to reply in some detail, with particular reference to the only important incident which took place during last year, that is, since we last debated this subject, and in dealing with this, I must ask the House to observe the very close connection between events beyond the administered border, that is in tribal territory, and events within British India itself. In May, 1936, that is just about a year ago, a certain Hindu girl was abducted by a Mussalman in Bannu . . . . .

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): What was the age of the girl?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** The age has been found by the Judicial Courts to be 15, that is, she was definitely under the age of consent in law. Certain judicial proceedings followed,—first of all, a criminal prosecution against the abductor of the girl, and also a civil suit by the girl's parents for the restoration of the girl to their custody as legal guardians. While these cases were actually being tried in Bannu, the gentleman whom I still venture to call the Faqir of Ipi who was living, not in the Tochi country at all, but in the Daur country, started a violent agitation among the tribes that Islam was in danger . . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** The construction of the Gandala road is responsible for that campaign.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalf:** Sir, do you wish me to be interrupted or can I have my say?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There should be no interruption; let the Honourable Member proceed.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalf:** As I was saying, the Faqir of Ipi started an agitation amongst the tribesmen that Islam was in danger, and a *lashkar* of 4,000 men assembled in the lower Khaissora valley with the intention of gaining the sympathy of the Tochi and Waziri tribes in order to bring pressure upon Government in connection with these two cases. Action was taken by the political authorities who pointed out to the tribes the folly of their behaviour, with the result that the *lashkars* dispersed for the time being and the Faqir withdrew himself to another part further down the valley. He did not, however, cease from this agitation and continued to say that he would in no circumstances make peace with the Government until the Hindu girl had been restored to her Muslim abductor, until the Shahidgunj mosque in Lahore was restored to Muslims, and until Government gave an undertaking in writing that they would in future refrain from interference with religion in India. There is a letter to that effect on record sent by him to the Political Agent at Tochi. Nothing more happened until in May, 1936, the Moslem accused in the Bannu case were convicted, and in the civil case in September an appellate order was passed by the Judicial Commissioner of the North-West Frontier Province consigning the girl to the custody of her Hindu parents. The last event was the signal for a further attempt on the part of the Faqir of Ipi to rouse religious excitement among both the Mahsuds and Wazirs, and the position became so critical that all the Maliks, the responsible people among the Tori Khel, told the local authorities that, unless Government did something, there would be serious trouble created by the Faqir of Ipi. Therefore, after anxious consideration, Government decided to carry out a flag march, not a hostile march in any way, but merely a march in order to demonstrate that Government had troops available, and that it was better for the tribes to keep quiet in the Khaissora Valley. That was done at the express request of the responsible elements among the Tori Khel people. What happened on the march of those troops through the Khaissora valley is wellknown, and I need not repeat it. It was all published in the press at the time.

The subsequent operations were necessitated in order to punish the attack on Government forces, and eventually, as Honourable Members know, a road was built, and there were certain fines imposed. It was hoped that thereafter,—the Tori Khel had ceased to take any interest in this matter and only wanted to be left alone,—that the Faqir of Ipi himself would recognise that there was no use in carrying on this agitation and that things would settle down. However, on the 6th and 7th of February, two murders took place which also have been fully reported in the press. They were both entirely unprovoked. In one case, an officer was travelling on duty in his motor car with his Scout orderly, and both were shot dead by a single man whose identity must be known to the local people, but has not yet been divulged; in the other case, an officer was going actually to pay the monthly pay to the *Khassadars*,—a thing which they all intensely value,—and he and two *Khassadar* guards who were with

him were shot dead by a gang who deliberately lay up on the road in order to shoot this officer and get the money. These events have raised the political temperature to an unfortunate extent, and the Faqir has again started trouble. Whether he instigated the murders or not is not known. I make no charge against him on that matter, but at any rate the murderers still remain unpunished, and the Faqir is still busily engaged in telling everybody that Islam is in danger. Now, why is Islam in danger? Not because of anything which is going on in the tribal territory, but purely because of something which he claims to have happened in British India. My Honourable friend from Peshawar alluded to a complaint of Government having refused to allow these people to be governed by *Shariat* and said that they should be allowed to have their own law. Of what I know nothing. We do not, as a matter of fact, administer any form of law in the Khaissora Valley, and I, therefore, do not know how such a demand could have been made. But I would like to point out to the House again that the only demands which have been made by the Faqir and continue to be made are the following: Firstly, that the Hindu minor girl should be restored to her Muslim abductor by taking her away from her Hindu parents to whom she has been consigned by the order of the highest court in the North-West Frontier; secondly, the restoration of the Shahidgunj mosque to the Muslims in Lahore, and, thirdly, that Government should in future refrain in British India,—mind you, not in tribal territory,—from interference with religion. Now, Sir, I ask you, are those demands regarding which any Government would be justified in entering into negotiations with any Faqir in the tribal territory? What they are asked to do is to upset, by executive action, a decision taken by a Judicial Court, and I submit that it would be impossible for us to negotiate on that basis, or indeed to do anything but to take all necessary measures to prevent the Faqir from carrying on this agitation, and that we are doing. I have quoted these facts in some detail, because I wish to make clear to the House that in this case, which, as has been pointed out, has cost Government 12 lakhs of rupees during last year, there has been no question whatever of Government being aggressive. The aggression throughout has come from the *mullahs* of the tribal territory who have attempted to impose on the Government a course of action in British India which would be contrary to all principles of reasonable Government.

Now, Sir, there is one other point during these, and indeed also in our troubles with the Afridis. So far from being aggressive, we have, I may venture to say, been extremely mild. We have done everything we can to meet the point of view of the tribesmen, and in no case have we been aggressive or provocative. In fact, I think we have been rather slow to take action where action was needed. That policy is, I know, in accordance with the opinions of a large number of Members of this House. It is also, I would say, entirely in accordance with Government's own feelings. The last thing that they would wish to pursue is aggression. But that policy of remaining on the defensive has its own dangers. What I want to make clear is that if you give to the tribes the impression that you are not willing to use the forces which are at your disposal, if you give them the impression that Government's hands are tied by political feelings in this country, there is a serious danger of far worse troubles than any that we have hitherto seen, and I hope that is a point which the House will bear in mind when they come to decide what vote they will take on this motion.

[Sir Aubrey Metcalfe.]

In conclusion, I would reiterate what I have already said last year. that this is a problem of real complexity and difficulty. The Government of India do not claim to be absolutely right. What we do claim is that this is the best policy which we have been able to devise and which anybody has been able to suggest, for dealing with this problem. The alternatives as I see them are, firstly, that which is advocated by my Honourable friend, the Member from Delhi—that we should revert to the close border policy and leave the tribal territory to stew in its own juice.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Try to consult us any way.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** We are constantly consulting the House. This is the second year in succession that we do so.

**An Honourable Member:** What about the Standing Committee?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member does not want to be interrupted.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I do not mind, Sir; it only shortens my time. I was referring to the close border policy with all its disadvantages, and I hope that I have persuaded the House that that is not a policy to be adopted. The other policy, as I said, and in a way the more logical policy, would be to advance right up to the international border, to conquer, to disarm and to administer. That I may say now is not a policy which the Government of India favour at present, nor have they any intention . . .

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** Afghanistan is quite strong and can give you a good lesson.

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** . . . of undertaking it at present, and I do not think it is necessary for me to tell the House the arguments against it. There are financial arguments, there are political arguments, and there is I know a strong feeling in certain quarters of the House and in the country that that would not be a suitable policy. But, at any rate, the Government of India have no intention of adopting it at the present moment. The only remaining policy is, I maintain, the middle one, which we are attempting consistently to follow, and, on the whole, with success. You are bound to get some set-backs, and time,—what is, after all, thirteen years? Thirteen years is not a very long time in the history of this country. The frontier problem has been in existence for, well, how long?—a century. It has always been the trouble with India, and if we have, as I maintain, made real progress in thirteen years, I consider that we have done well.

There is one more thing I want to say before I sit down, and that is, that this problem will not be solved by easy votes in this Assembly advocating one policy or another. It is a problem which will remain and will still fall to be solved by any Government which comes into being at the Centre as the result of constitutional developments. What the present Government of India are trying to do is to make things so far as possible easy for any Government which may come in future, and I trust that the House will realise this when they give their vote today on this question. (Applause.)

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

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—63.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.  
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.  
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.  
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.  
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
Bhagavan Das, Dr.  
Chaliha, Mr. Kuladhar.  
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.  
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.  
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.  
Chunder, Mr. N. C.  
Das, Mr. B.  
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.  
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.  
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.  
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.  
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.  
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.  
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.  
Ganga Singh, Mr.  
Gauba, Mr. K. L.  
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
Giri, Mr. V. V.  
Govind Das, Seth.  
Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.  
Hans Raj, Raizada.  
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.  
Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury Muhammad.  
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.  
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.

Jinnah, Mr. M. A.  
Jogendra Singh, Sardar.  
Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.  
Khan Sahib, Dr.  
Khare, Dr. N. B.  
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
Laljee, Mr. Husenbhai Abdullahbhai.  
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.  
Mody, Sir H. P.  
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.  
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.  
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
Raghbir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.  
Ranga, Prof. N. G.  
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.  
Santhanam, Mr. K.  
Sham Lal, Mr.  
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.  
Sheodass Daga, Seth.  
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.  
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.  
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.  
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.  
Sri Prakasa, Mr.  
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.  
Varma, Mr. B. B.  
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.

NOES—44.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.  
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.  
Aikman, Mr. A.  
Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.  
Bansidhar, Rai Sahib  
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
Bhide, Mr. V. S.  
Buss, Mr. L. C.  
Chanda, Mr. A. K.  
Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.  
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
Gidney, Lieut-Colonel Sir Henry.  
Griffiths, Mr. P. J.  
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
Hands Mr. A. S.  
Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
James, Mr. F. E.  
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.  
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.  
Lalit Chand, Thakur.  
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.

Mehta, Mr. S. L.  
Menon, Mr. K. B.  
Metcalf, Sir Aubrey.  
Morgan, Mr. G.  
Mudie, Mr. R. F.  
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.  
Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.  
Naydu, Diwan Bahadur B. V. Sri Hari Rao.  
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
Parma Nand Bhai,  
Rau, Sir Raghavendra.  
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
Sale, Mr. J. F.  
Sarma, Sir Srinivasa.  
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar Sir.  
Spence, Mr. G. H.  
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.  
Verma, Rai Sanib Hira Lal.  
Witherington, Mr. C. H.  
Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The next cut motion will be moved by the Leader of the Opposition—No. 152 on page 13. Mr. Desai.

### *General Policy of the Government of India.*

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai** (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

In making this motion before the House, I am fully conscious that a great deal of the ground has already been covered by the specific matters which have been raised appertaining to the different Departments of the Government of India, and it is somewhat of an irony, Sir, that having regard to the Constitution, under which we are called here, we can only raise issues of this nature by attempting to cut down and refuse to vote the salaries of men who by themselves are not guilty of the wrongs which we hope to raise by means of this motion, but it appears that, having regard to the fact that most of those who are guilty of this have their salaries thoroughly secured for them under the Constitution by being made non-votable, it is only through others that the convention has been established that we are obliged to raise a motion of this kind and I have heard at least an argument which is so specious that it is necessary to pay attention to this at the outset. When we refuse a vote, they say: "Oh, you are cutting the pay of poor clerks. We are immune, and, therefore, your vote does not affect us"—an argument so specious that I trust that it will not be raised again.

This is the second occasion, Sir, when I have the honour to raise this general question before the House, and it is, I believe, the duty of every opposition even in self-governing countries, either at the beginning or the end of the year, to review the general policy of the Government for the time being. It might well happen as it does happen in self-governing countries, that it has a larger significance than that which is attached here. The significance in those countries is that if the Government is defeated on a vote like this, perforce, they have to surrender the administration into the hands of their opponents. They have therefore here at all events a comfortable assurance that the result of the vote would neither be so disastrous as to deprive them of their salaries nor so disastrous as to make them surrender the administration but nonetheless the House would be wanting in its duty if we did not review the administration of the previous year in order that we may understand to what extent those who have the administrative machinery in their hands have done well or ill by the country and in doing so I do not apologise for giving you a general review of some matters which have already been discussed, because when you review a general policy it is inevitable that things which have been specifically discussed must, at all events, be mentioned and it would be my purpose to point out to this House that whether you look at it from the point of view of their attitude in the sense of the approach to the questions for the amelioration of the condition of this country or their attitude in the matter of a response to the vote of this House or their attitude in regard to the raising of the well being of the country. In every single test, it would be my duty to point out to the House that the machinery of the Government last year failed. To begin with, what was the last vote of the House? What are you doing with our monies.



in dealing with the frontier question? It was pointed out to them at all events during the last two years until the vote was taken a few minutes ago that this policy of encroaching upon the liberties of others is a nemesis which, though small in itself, will some day, overtake the fate of the empire itself (Hear, hear); but they seem to think that so long as you can find a phrase by which you can justify or at all events irresponsibly speak before this House and say, "we are following a policy of peaceful penetration", in other words, all you have to do is to coin a phrase, such as "close-border policy", "open-door policy", "peaceful policy", "penetration policy", "violent policy", I do not know which it is, it is all right. Sir, I remember reading the life of Bernard Shaw, and a critic of his says that while speaking of an Englishman he was right in averring that an Englishman would do anything, so far as his political conscience is concerned, if only so long as you can give him a formula to suit the particular conclusion he wished to arrive at; and I think it is never more clearly illustrated than what we find every day in this House in so far as matters of moment are concerned; and therefore to the extent that the House can influence them, they say, "we consult the House", but I would like my friend to tell the House or I would have liked him to tell the House before he concluded, that he would be careful in the immediate future. Did he ever tell you to what extent he and his Government were careful in listening to the debate of the House and finding out that they might enter on a better policy? For however much they may pretend to be the trustees, it is with my money that they are playing, it is with my men they are playing, and it is with my ultimate fate that they are playing. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, these pretences have been played too long and too often, for indeed more successive changes must come from time to time in the administration and the constitutional machinery of this country and it is only when the final stage has been reached that we won't hear the oft-repeated tale of advice without following another man's advice. Sir, consider the Indians overseas. The House recorded its vote yesterday in a manner in which there is unmistakable sign of acquiescence of the Government for indeed while we stand for the principle for which we stand, the action is entirely in their hands by reason of the constitution under which the Government of India is carried on, and we have lived to see that; and I wish here to state one point more which I did not mention yesterday that when, within certain limited areas, the Bill was passed by the South African Parliament that Indian settlers may be allowed to own lands, the Agent of the Governor General, Sir Raza Ali, called it an epoch-making measure. Sir, that is an accurate clue to the mind of the Government of India in its relation to the Indian people. They realise that you must be driven out from the main ground, taken into a corner, and if there is a mitigation in some slum, a right to acquire property, they call it an "epoch-making measure". Have they ever thought in terms in which they ought decently to think, namely, in terms of Indians as human beings, that is, so long as they were not allowed to remain on equal terms in the country which they in their turn admittedly serve in order to raise their prosperity, there is no alternative but that the Government of India can not defend themselves? The policy there of mitigating evils, asking us to be content with small mercies and calling all that "epoch-making measures" equally shows the great aspiration the Government of India have, the great concern which they display about raising the status of Indians in countries where it is their obvious

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

duty so to do. That is so far as outside India is concerned. Coming nearer home, how do they manage our affairs in the rest of the parts of the administrative machinery? I have not yet heard in this House that, judged by the common standard by which the Government of every country tests its value to the people of this country,—food, clothing, shelter, education and the wiser use of leisure, and means for that purpose, I have not yet heard a single Member on the side of Government during the last three years to tell this House and through the House the country that the earning capacity of the Indian has been raised by a single rupee.

**An Honourable Member:** By a single pie.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** The rupee is, after all, a measure of expression; though I quite agree that, knowing what we do of the poverty of this country, I would accept gladly the amendment that they have not even stated if it has risen by pie. After all, if the Government does not exist for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the masses of the people, if they merely exist for the purpose of satisfying themselves that they are an efficient administrative machinery, that they exist for themselves and we, in turn, exist for them (Hear, hear), that is a position that we cannot accept, that no party, realising their responsibility to the country, would ever accept. Have they ever told you to what extent education has made any material progress in the country, to what extent, if any, nation-building has made progress in this country? Indeed, in the previous year, out of the largeness of the heart and due to the plenitude of the purse of my friend, Sir James Grigg, he got up and said, "we are now becoming solicitous, we have ample funds, and will grant a crore of rupees for the purpose of village uplift". I do not know to what that is a compliment, but, to whomsoever it was so, it came out of a heart which generally sits more or less covered to the woes of the Indian people; he is concerned only with the treasuries of the rich and of the richer masters that he serves, and as regards the use of that crore of rupees, well, the less said about it, the better.

In the first instance, it could not go round with any modicum of relief; and he must have realised that. When we come to the next year, the tale of woe begins. At all events, the budget shows that in times to come that largeness of the heart would not be able to expand itself for the simple reason that he dare not encroach upon the spheres of action of others of his friends who are getting more and more avaricious every day and in particular my friend, Sir Aubrey Metcalfe. The fact, therefore, remains that the odd crore of rupees which they raised are already expended in advance and so far as the future of the country is concerned, it may well take care of itself. We could not very well be proud of a Budget which provides nothing so far as the poor man is concerned, so far as his means of livelihood are concerned, so far as his clothing and shelter are concerned, so far as the improvement of his health is concerned, or so far as education is concerned. I will not detain the House by the somewhat debatable issue on which we have a definite opinion as to the imposition of a sugar excise duty, but I will only say this, that on the admission of Sir James Grigg himself, it will kill a few of the factories which have been raised under the very protection which was part of the discriminating protection policy of this Government. It is, therefore, for

him to bring things into being and it is also for him to murder them at his pleasure. That is the kind of argument which seems to justify the imposition of a sugar excise. He says: "I have brought into being fourteen children, but I think three of you are very unhealthy. I am going to kill you". Sir, if that is the way in which economics work, then I make a present of that economics to him, but I am quite certain that he has a greater sense of propriety and a greater sense of humour than to bring into being things only to kill them afterwards. We do realise that if means for the purpose of raising taxation are to be devised, it is a far better measure to cut down your expenditure rather than to kill the three children however lean they may be. But there is the other side of the account to which they never look. The only question is: "raise what you can and spend every pie, so that nothing would be left", keeping everybody helpless, crippled; and I do not know what successive Governments are going to get except the same continuous load of national debt, and I had it from my own friends from overseas that if we ever attempted to re-pay the debt by some process which we have raised in England, they are most unwilling and they would be very unhappy if we paid and that for a very simple reason. It is this excuse for the maintenance of vested interests and the power, the almost decisive power, which they always claim and the voice of Assemblies like this so long as constitutions of this kind are devised. But for that excuse, many of them indeed would have had nothing to say in the administration of this country. They may, therefore, well remember that national policy can be turned to purposes other than those to which they are at present turned in order that you may remain and continue the depredations with which the country is only too much familiar.

When you come to other branches of administration, we know that the Federal Railway Authority is going to come. But whether it comes or not, for the last three years we have been saying: Let us be self-sufficient, at all events, in the matter of every part of being able to run our railways. I remember very well an account given by the Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan when he said: "Yes, it will cost an outlay of some 98 lakhs of rupees for the manufacture of locomotives". He also said that he had counted the return. The parts which can be and must be bought from outside and which we are unable to manufacture here for reasons best known to himself would cost about 20 per cent. over the price which is now paid in foreign countries. But he forgot that it was not the return on that 98 lakhs of rupees which is the real issue. Of course, clever lawyer that he is, he confined himself to that issue. He ought to remember that one crore added to the 800 crores already sunk in this country will make India self-sufficient in emergencies and otherwise and, even apart from emergencies, in order that we may be able to train our children in many applied arts and science and mechanics. When it suits their turn, they want to raise every branch of industry in their country, but the truth to be told is this that they have maintained certain factories in foreign lands which can be turned to purposes of preparations for war before or during the course of its progress. Those machineries and those factories must be run and in the peace time they can only be run by orders from abroad as well as in war times they can be turned to other purposes. It is that high efficiency which they wish to maintain. Otherwise, there is no reason why by adding one crore of rupees to 800 crores it is not possible to begin the policy by means of which we may be able to manufacture things. I remember very

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

well a question which was addressed to me by an Englishman some ten years ago with a touch of irony. He said: "When we are gone from your country, who will run your trains?" I said: "I understand your question but I also want you to understand that I realise its significance and the realisation is this that each time you would not train the Indians to do what they ought to do, you would make their inability an excuse for your own continuance". If that is the line of policy which is to be pursued, I do not wish to pursue the matter. I have had a few words to say about the Railway Policy and I do not wish to repeat them. But it is the point of view which is of greater importance to me than the actual single item. Why is it that the Member in charge of the Railways is unable to tell us plainly as he should? Why does he not say: "Yes, it is true it will cost 20 per cent. more, but what does it matter? What difference is it going to make if we spread this 20 per cent. over 800 crores? I wish to raise factories in this land so that my youngmen may begin to acquire the deftness, the art, and the skill, so that the necessity of the foreigner to remain always with me may, at all events, some day cease in a very short period of time". (Hear, hear.) But he dare not say that. Of course, he would not acknowledge it here. He justifies it on other and different grounds being undoubtedly the victim to a policy for other people's purposes. That, Sir, is the story which may well be added to by other matters which have already been the subject of discussion before this House.

When you turn to other matters so far as I can see them, I should like to know what has been done with reference to it during the whole course of the strike on the Bengal Nagpur Railway. Did it ever occur to our friends on the other side that there may be the poor man's, the employee's point of view notwithstanding any questions of economy or otherwise? We have been told: "But you say the same tale over again". But if the evil persists, it is the evil which is responsible for the complaint and it is no use saying: "Why are you complaining every day". In fact, the very fact that we have to complain year after year is a testimony to the perverseness with which the administration in this country is being carried on in a different way to what it must be carried on from the true and general national point of view. So, it is no use telling me why I am moving these cuts every year instead of your asking yourself: "Why are we making it necessary that these cuts should be moved every year?" Indeed, you may be tired of being told that you are doing wrong, but I wish sometimes that you would get tired of doing the wrong itself. (Hear, hear.) For, indeed, very often I am asked why is it we are not tired of bringing up this question every year, and sometimes men are taken aback by this question because they do not think deeply enough occasionally. My own friends say: "Oh, but why do you want to move this cut every year?" The only answer that I can give to my friends and to those who sit on the other side of the House is that it is you who make it necessary for me to move this cut every year, it is you who are the prime cause of the trouble and not those who want you to call to account for what you do. Therefore, I make no excuse whatever for what we have done so far. I admit that it has been my regretful duty to move these cuts during the last two years when I have sat on this bench. But what have my friends on the other side done? We carried a vote which was perhaps one of its kind in the history of this House where we were given a promise that

the vote of the House would be carried out by those who are in charge of the responsible government, I mean the vote on the termination of the Ottawa Agreement. I have no doubt that the formal notice has been given, but what has happened since? A year has gone since the vote has been taken and yet I take it that negotiations and negotiations and negotiations are going on very much on the same lines on which the Government of India Act was sought to be changed some years ago. Ten years have passed: so they appointed the Simon Commission. They took three years on that, they took three years more on another Conference and two years more on drafting and I take it they will take three years more on the Act being brought into operation. That is the policy by which many things are done in the letter but not in the spirit. And I take it that the manner in which this matter is pursued would certainly not be worthy of a national government for I know that if they ever took our point of view they would know how to negotiate about it, how to go about it and how to get the best advantage by pressing the matter home and not by proroguing and proroguing as they have had to do during the last year.

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

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Very well, Sir. And so far as the Home Department is concerned, I do not wish to trouble the House inasmuch as there is a special cut to be moved by the Nationalist Party under the head of "Repression". But I will ask a question as to what was it that led the Government to pass an order excluding Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the man who is universally respected in his own province, during the period when they said they were trying to give a chance to the men and women of that province to express their will as to what form of Government they will take. Judged, therefore, by every correct standard and so far as we on this side of the House are able to judge and so far as any dispassionate and reasonable test can be applied, failure is writ large on the administration of the last year. Undoubtedly they have kept up their administration, undoubtedly they have carried on what may be called the policing of this country but can they point to any substantial act for the well being and the improvement of the condition of the people without which every administration must be said to have failed. (Applause.) Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, my reason for joining in this debate is not so much to censuring the Executive Council as to bring home to them as well as I can within the few minutes at my disposal the unsatisfactory manner in which they are administering one of their Departments. I refer to the Civil Aviation Department. The advancement of the Civil Aviation Department is one which, I am sure, appeals to every Member of this House. It is a department which, in times of emergency, can help our defence, it is a means by which internal communications in India can be greatly facilitated, and it is a service which is of daily growing importance to every country in the world. It will surprise this House if, by a comparative statement, I show how India

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

lags behind every other country in the development of its civil aviation and its air transport subsidies. I have with me a statement from which I shall refer to a few of the countries and compare them with India. It is said, Sir, that comparisons are odious, but they are very often informative and I trust that by making these comparisons, I will supply this Honourable House with information that is needed in support of my contention. Let me take Poland, it has a total civil aviation vote of over £400 thousands and a direct air transport subsidy of £226 thousands. Let us take a small country like Czecho-Slovakia, it has a civil aviation vote of about £170 thousands and a direct air transport subsidy of £82,000. Then, take Australia, it has a civil aviation vote of £214,000 and a direct air transport subsidy of over £125,000. Now, let us come to India, a sub-continent, which will swallow up all these countries put together both in size and population, India has a civil aviation vote of £120,000 of which sum, roughly speaking, 17 lakhs is spent in direction, etc., and 7 lakhs in direct air transport subsidy.

Now, Sir, this international comparison will show to the House how India lags behind in the progress of civil aviation in the world. As I examine the blue books supplied us by the Government, I find that the total amount in the Demand for Grants under the head "Civil Aviation" is Rs. 24,81,000. This is swallowed up very largely to the extent of 13 lakhs. I think, in the maintenance of the Direction and just over seven lakhs is given to direct air subsidies. If you examine this head carefully, you will find that these subsidies are expended on payment of grants-in-aid to Imperial Airways, financial assistance to National Airways, contributions to Posts and Telegraphs, additional grants-in-aid to Imperial Airways, additional grants-in-aid to Empire Airways, etc., etc. This comes to a total about seven lakhs. Now, Sir, on a careful examination of the composition of the Civil Aviation Department, one finds there are at least 45 to 50 officers whose duty it is to control the aerodrome, inspect instruments, flying clubs and other branches of this Department. But, Sir, with this large staff in the Direction, one is rather surprised to see so many staff and inspection officers for such little supervision work. To me it seems that the Government of India pay a large sum of money for their Staff Officers, but they are devoting very little money—indeed practically nothing—to developing her internal air services, and it is on this particular point that I desire to draw the attention of Government and the Honourable Members of this House. Sir, it was in 1935 when my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir asked the Honourable Member in charge of this Department a supplementary question, and the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce promised that, should a sound proposition be placed before the Government for the training of Indians in aircraft in India, such a proposition would receive most favourable consideration for financial support. That proposition was placed before the Government, who, at that time, were not disposed to assist it. The promoters, however, have proved that the proposition is today a working success. That proposition, Sir, is to be seen today in the Aeronautical Training Centre of India, Ltd., which is an entire Indian concern, with a rupee capital and a representative Indian Directorate. It has been successfully functioning for 18 months, and, I believe, to the satisfaction of Government Inspectors and Government Visitors, who, I understand, are pleased with the progress made at the Centre. Except for four scholarships given to a like number of wireless

operators, no further subsidy or help is given to this Aeronautical Training Centre, New Delhi, by Government. None in this House would deny that aircraft engineers are a very essential personnel of any aviation development and aircraft. It is no use spending money year after year on your air pilots, it is no use spending money on your grounds, when you do not spend enough money on your internal services. This is the chief point I desire to stress and bring to the urgent notice of the Government of India.

Now, let us see of what use is such a subsidy to the internal services of India. The internal air services, if properly subsidised and developed, could be used, not only for the commercial development of the country, and not only as a means of offering employment, but for the purpose of internal defence whenever an urgent necessity arose. An here I would like to draw the attention, I hope, of the Secretary, Defence Department, that there is no reason why the Military Air Force should not join in the creation of a Aeronautical Training Centre for its needs as also for supplying its Reserve Air Force in a national emergency. I admit the Empire Air Mail scheme which is to come into force on 1st October this year will give better facilities for external communication and will lead to a slight increase in employment, but should not India look for her supplies nearer home first? If its own internal air services were encouraged to a similar extent, would not this materially assist in the industrial development of this country? Would not this create a large market for employment and would this not build up a reserve of pilots and skilled engineers for defence purposes both for the Army Indian Air Force and its Reserves? To all these questions there can be only one answer, and that is, yes. The Government of India—I speak subject to correction—have granted nearly one crore for a Capital works programme to be spent on the preparation of aerodromes and landing grounds. This year's budget shows that the estimates for civil aviation, especially regarding staff, have increased considerably within the last year or so, and yet there is no appreciable increase in flying activities. Why? Are Government making preparations for considerable internal air expansion? If so, then it should pay immediate attention to the very essential which make such expansion possible, namely, the training of personnel. Aerodromes or landing grounds can be prepared within a short period, pilots take longer to train, but ground engineers take years of hard practical experience before they can be entrusted with work of any magnitude. A medical man has to undergo training for several years before he has sufficient experience and is considered fit to treat the lives of human beings and is not a ground-engineer just as responsible for human life, for in his hands lie the lives of many people and any mistake on his part would be very serious indeed.

Sir, the aerial development of India today is in a similar position to that of England in 1929. In that year, the first aeronautical technical school was founded in England by one who foresaw that skilled engineers would be required to develop aviation, and the development which has taken place in England would not have been possible without the establishment of such centres of instruction. Sir, this is what India is in very urgent need of today. That is to say we must develop our aviation on right lines,—commercially and for defence purposes—which will not only supply India with transport facilities but will create a war reserve in times of national emergency, a nucleus from which the army could indent for its engineers and officers, and air pilots.



[Sir Henry Gidney.]

I also desire that the Defence Department should increase the Indian air force in this country which today consists of only one squadron of about 87 Indian airmen and 25 British airmen with about 5 officers. I submit that we have established a suitable air centre in India,—one which certainly has been working most satisfactorily for the last 18 months and which could quite easily, in time, if adequately assisted, supply the entire Civil and Military air needs of India. Sir, a promise was made in this House that if sound proposals were placed before Government for the establishment of a centre to train Indians in aviation it would receive Government support. We have gone beyond the stage of proposals, the undertaking is today well established, the centre is well equipped and staffed and there are approximately 80 trainees under skilled instruction, but Government have not given it any material assistance whatever. I understand that, in conjunction with the Defence Department, Government are considering a very important scheme for starting a large aeronautical training centre for the development of its internal aerial services also as a supply of its Reserve Air Officers. If the capital and recurring expenditure which is being made by Government, under the heading of Civil Aviation, is being expended with the object of building up internal services in future, then it is their bounden duty to assist the only thing possible, to develop these services more than they are doing today. Indeed I repeat that the development of these services has not received the attention that it urgently requires. The Flying Clubs in this country are subsidised but, as in England, they have failed to produce the skilled personnel except in very rare cases. The grant given to the Flying Clubs in India is about Rs. 1,25,000,—a speck in the ocean. As in England, the only sure way to produce the required number of operatives is through a centre organised to train those who are taking up aviation commercially.

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

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** I have very little more to say.

Sir, surely an enterprise which is training such a large number of young men to fit them for careers in life is as much, if not more, worthy of financial assistance than undertakings such as we see today the Government is subsidising and whose main object only seems to be to create air-mindedness and as we know; air-mindedness is the forerunner to air-groundedness and this is what India needs today. But how can we help such an enterprise. Its equipment and upkeep is costly, any engineering school is similarly placed, and the fees are high in consequence, and the period of training is long. For the most part, therefore, only those whose pockets are similarly long can afford the training for such a career, but we can safely assume that they will not be content to work for any length of time in operative capacities but will require higher remunerative employment. We must assist, therefore, the more needy who are prepared to remain as engineers for many years until such time as their capabilities are rewarded by promotion to higher grades. This can be done by a subsidy to assist in reducing the fees or by scholarships or assisted scholarships to selected candidates. Many scholars who have been trained in this manner could be enlisted in the Indian Air Force which, up to the present, has had



many difficulties in the recruitment of its personnel, or they could form the backbone of a reserve scheme for defence purposes whilst serving in their respective capacities in internal air services. The Empire Air Mail Scheme which has been lately placed before the Standing Finance Committee states that the Air-Services will be Indianised; suitably qualified Indians are available to fill the posts. I ask: how can the services be Indianised without facilities being available for their training up to the highest level so that all grades of employment can be filled? I submit with all the emphasis at my command, that it is the bounden duty of this Government as has been done by all other Governments in the world, to support any sound undertaking which has been established to give Indians the opportunity for acquiring training so as to fit them for careers in aviation. The Aeronautical Training Centre of India, Ltd., is such an institution—its existence has now proved itself to be a national necessity to enable aviation to be Indianised as it is developed—and I submit Government should financially assist it in the interests of India and so place her on a level with other nations in the air-world of today and not allow her to remain in the background as she is today.

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

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: I, therefore, plead, before I sit down, that the Honourable Member in charge of this Department who, I know, is very much interested in India's aerial development, will give his most careful and early consideration to the vital necessity of developing the internal air services and a suitable training Centre and so place India in a better position in the air-world than she is today.

**Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. This motion has been moved to give vent to our extreme dissatisfaction to the policy which the Government have been pursuing and the way in which they have been administering this country. It is not directed towards any individual Member, but is aimed at opposing the whole policy of the Government of India, as represented by the Executive Councillors in this House.

Sir, our grievances against the executive of this country are numerous, and it is really very difficult within the limited time at my disposal to deal with all of them. I should like to discuss only those few which are of vital and momentous importance, both to the people of India and its administration.

Sir, it will be admitted by all, and even by the Government, that the most important thing for any Government in India is to ameliorate the condition of the poor agriculturists. The prosperity of the people of the country as well as of the Government above all depends mainly on the growth of agriculture. May I inquire from the Government what effort has been made by them to do anything in this direction? In my opinion, the simple answer is, "Nothing so far". So much money is wasted every year on the appointment of committees and commissions connected with agricultural problems and even a department of Agricultural Research

[Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan.]

Council has been established, but with what result? The condition of the peasants remains exactly what it was before. No attempt is made to give relief to them either by raising the prices of their produce or in any other form. Unless the condition of the agriculturists is improved through a substantial increase in the prices of their commodities, there can be no real solution of India's essential problems. In this year's budget too, an attempt has been made to penalise the agriculturists by the imposition of an extra excise duty on sugar. It is bound to adversely affect the poor peasants who have undoubtedly been helped by the creation of a large sugar industry in the country. Besides being detrimental to the interests of the agriculturists, this enhancement of excise duty on sugar without a corresponding increase in the import duty is sure to hit the sugar industry very hard and might help to eliminate some of the recently established factories from the field. The sugar industry is still in its infancy, and to burden it with extra taxation is a sheer short-sightedness on the part of the Government. Internal competition is already proving a set-back to this industry, and an increase in the excise duty will simply be disastrous to it. I strongly and emphatically protest against this proposal of additional duty on sugar.

Sir, another factor on which the prosperity of this country depends is the development of industries. The Government have done very little in this direction. No technical knowledge worth the name is being imparted to our youngmen. Industrial schools and colleges are not opened in adequate numbers, with the result that even for small necessities of life we have got to knock at the doors of foreign countries. Is it fair or proper for this Government even to deny us the facilities for starting new industries and thus force us to remain in a perpetual bondage?

Another thing, Sir, with which I charge the Executive Council is that they have hopelessly failed to solve the unemployment problem of this unfortunate country. The Government know that almost all the civilised countries of the world are moving fast to tackle this important problem, but our Government whose executive is not responsible to the elected representatives have disregarded the unanimous demand of the people of this country to do something in this matter. Their mentality appears to be that so long as they get their fat salaries which are not subject to the vote of this House, they need not take any substantial step to improve the lot of India's educated sons, whose apathy at present can better be imagined than described. The Government have not even cared to give effect to the recommendations of such an important document as the report of the Unemployment Committee presided over by an eminent man in the person of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who is a former Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. The report which has been produced by him is a rousing call to the Government to solve the difficulties of the educated unemployed, but they have made up their mind not to give any heed to the national problems confronting the country and its people. Questions are often asked on the floor of this House and the attention is drawn to this unemployment problem, but every endeavour of ours fails to move the Government to do anything. What a pity!

Sir, all our resolutions, motions and our valuable suggestions are ruthlessly thrown into the waste paper basket, and yet they want our cooperation. Unless they change their mentality there can be no cooperation.

and no understanding between them and this side of the House. People outside the House fully realise this, and unless the Government mend their ways and listen to the advice that we from this side of the House give to them, I am sure there can be no satisfactory solution of the problem confronting this unfortunate land of ours, and there can be no real working of the New Constitution.

Sir, with these words, I resume my seat.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it cannot be denied even by the hard-hearted Government that we have at present, that India is in distress. There are two reasons for this, as indicated by my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in his very able and eloquent speech which we always admire so much. One is the low prices that are now prevailing: they have to be raised. The other is the problem of unemployment. The Government have turned a deaf ear to both these points. Their attention has often been drawn to these, but no answer comes. They are proverbially irresponsible. There is no doubt they feel glad at their irresponsibility, but the time will come when they shall have to repent and see that this irresponsibility is done away with and they pay more attention to public demands. We have been raising these issues every year the only result is that they swallow all the censures that are thrown at them: they do not resign and they do not give any sound reasons which would satisfy the public: they say they are not able to go beyond the constitution. But so far as their constitution is concerned, the point is whether in practice, they actually have helped the country consistent with the present constitution? What have they done for unemployment? Have they done anything to save any money for the purpose of taking more people in their employ? They are feeling very happy with the large salaries they get. When we ask in this House that their salaries should be reduced, the reply comes that there is their great grandfather sitting in England who has given them this legacy, and they should continue to enjoy it. What is done in England itself? The Members of the Executive Council draw huge salaries here much more than ministers in England get. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can resume his speech after lunch.

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

---

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

---

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai**: Sir, before we rose for lunch, I placed before the House two important factors to be considered, one was with regard to the incapacity of the purchasing power of the people, and the other was the failure of the Government to solve the unemployment problem. To these two questions, which cannot be under-rated a very satisfactory reply is very necessary from the Treasury Benches, and I shall be interested if they

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

can convince the House that they have really striven in that direction to raise the purchasing power of the people and to solve the unemployment problem, or at least that they have made an attempt in that direction. I shall wait for an answer, and I am sure that, as facts stand, they cannot justifiably say that they have done what they ought to have done in these two matters. They are not powerless, they may be powerless in not getting their salaries reduced, because that question is in the hands of the Secretary of State, but with regard to these two questions it is in their power to give us assistance. On these two questions, Sir, we have now got the very weighty opinion of the Leader of the Opposition. That opinion cannot be trifled with nor can it be treated in a light-hearted manner. His opinion is with regard to increasing the purchasing power of the people that Government have done nothing, they have not succeeded in raising the people's purchasing power even by a pie more. On the other hand, my own view is that instead of increasing the purchasing capacity of the people they have decreased it. I am sorry, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member is not in his seat . . . . .

[At this stage, the Honourable the Finance Member entered the Chamber.]

I am very glad he is just coming in. When he came to this country and took charge of his office, I am sure, he came obsessed with the idea that India was too rich, India had hoarded gold, and that it should be drained out of this country. Now, Sir, let us see if he has not succeeded in it. He has absolutely succeeded . . . . .

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra** (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): He has already drained half of the gold.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Not satisfied with draining away most of the gold available in the country, he is now jealous of our silver. It was stated that the gold which was drained out of the country was surplus gold, because I heard the Honourable Member in one of his speeches to say that, because the people were purchasing small coins, he deduced that there was a surfeit of gold with the people. He is so jealous that he does not want to leave anything to enable the people to buy even their very necessities of life, and now his second attempt is to impose a duty on silver. What will be the effect of it, I ask. Silver is kept by people, if some have any silver at all, for the rainy day, and to conform to the customs and manners of the country to wear some silver ornaments, but even that little silver is proposed to be drained away. Now, I ask is this exploitation or not? Take away all the gold, take away all silver, give no help in raising the prices and in solving the unemployment question. Sir, these are very clever exploiters, but there is one thing that we feel about this, and that is, they cannot disguise their character. Therefore, we must tell them plainly that we can no more be deceived by these sinister methods.

Now, Sir with regard to the question of unemployment what have they done? Have they really opened out new avenues of employment? Educated people are now thrown on the streets being hard up for making a living. Have the Government done anything for those people? Yes, they have done one thing, and that again is exploitation in another form. And

what is that exploitation? If there are two or three posts vacant, they advertise that fact. Then what happens? Exploitation comes in. They say, in their advertisement, that every candidate should send a rupee with his application. Sir, thousands and thousands of rupees are collected in this manner from these poor unemployed people by the Government. And what is the result? The result is, the poor applicants find that there were only 2 or 3 posts vacant and they have been filled up, and all the other applicants have been pilfered of a rupee from every one of them. Is that the way to solve the unemployment question? I submit, Sir, that on this question Government ought to be more serious. I would suggest that instead of giving high salaries, they ought to reduce the salaries of their highly paid servants, and in this direction Government have not done anything so far . . . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got only two minutes more.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I thought I had ten minutes more. Anyway, I shall have to run up at a speed of 30 or 40 miles . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Half a minute is gone.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** No, I am proceeding.

They follow the policy of the penny wise and pound foolish. I will illustrate it. Have they curtailed the pay of any high official or reduced the allowances, the Lee Concessions and other extras that they get? But when we say that the pensions of inferior servants are low and should be revised, what is the reply given to us? —“No, we will not proceed in that direction at all. It costs much”. The other day, a Resolution was brought up by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, who is always alert for the labourers . . . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member's time is up.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I have just come to the poor man's case and I am sorry my time is over. I will only conclude by saying that the Government are not helping the poor at all, they are exploiting us and they sit fat over the fees that they get.

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): We are discussing the iniquities of the Government of India. I shall not discuss the iniquities of the Home Department, nor those of the Department of Education, Health and Lands; poor as they are, they do not get any money to spend! I would like to deal with the spending departments like Commerce, Railways, Industries and Defence, and I will show to the House how Government incur extravagant expenditure but do not try to develop the economic resources of India by encouraging manufacture of those articles though they spend huge sums of money on purchases from year to year.

I take the Defence Department first, which spends to the tune of Rs. 50 crores per annum. Out of that amount, it spends on the purchase of stores, foodstuffs, armaments and mechanised appliances to the extent

[Mr. B. Das.]

of 15 to 20 crores. Excepting hay and wheat, barley and rice, and probably ghee, which is mixed with fish oil that is imported from foreign countries and brings a further gain to the Finance Member in the shape of import duties, most of the articles that the Military Department needs are purchased from abroad. It is true that it places an order of a crore of rupees with the Indian Stores Department, but out of that crore, only 20 or 25 per cent. are spent on articles of Indian origin and the rest are specified articles which must be British material. Again officers get special allowances for clothing and this must be of British manufacture. I was provoked to a speech after the speech of my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, when he demanded more expenditure on civil aviation, the second line of defence to the Air Force and the army in India. I was surprised not to hear one word from him why aeroplanes or parts of aeroplanes or even the wings of an aeroplane are not manufactured in India. I would like to hear from my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, whether his Department has got any scheme whereby these new appliances, such as aeroplanes that are being more and more used whether in the army or in the civil department, are going to be manufactured in this country partly or fully.

Then, I come to the second spending department, the Commerce Department and the Railway Department. The railway expenditure is Rs. 90 crores, and to the tune of 50 crores happen to be the working expenses. Out of this, they spend nearly 15 to 20 crores on the purchase of stores and equipments. Of course, they are buying at present a few appliances in India such as rails and wagons. My Leader this morning pointed out that no steps had been taken by the Railway Member to manufacture locomotives in India, and my Leader condemned the Government for that. The railway officials, engineers as they are—unfortunately I belong to that profession,—always like to get hold of any new invention in appliances and use it on Indian railways. In spite of the different workshops that these railways have, I pointed out the other day while speaking on the railway budget that these useless workshops make no attempt to manufacture these appliances. I will here cite the instance of Japan, how Japan at present manufactures every article that Japan needs, be it in the armament, be it in the railways, or be it in industries. Japan purchases very little machinery abroad. When Japan did not possess the brain which it does possess now, she took the electrical machineries and other appliances to pieces and manufactured similar goods; and afterwards began to manufacture slowly and intelligently all her needs. To acquire knowledge the Japanese sent their youths abroad. Even when they purchased cannons from Vickers, they said to Vickers: "You must train up the Japanese youth to manufacture those cannons and armaments". When they bought ships, the Japanese youth learnt shipbuilding. That is my charge against the Railway Member. Now, as to the Honourable the Commerce Member, the Commerce Member can give an impetus to Indian ship-building. All of us are familiar with the fact that when the East India Company came to India they used a large number of ships manufactured at Calcutta and Bombay, and those Parsi houses which manufactured ships are no more now. They do not manufacture even a 50-ton sailing boat today. What is the use of having an Indian Navy or developing our own coastal shipping when we cannot manufacture any ships, and for that I lay the blame at the door of the Commerce Member.

Then, I come to my Honourable friend in charge of Industries and Labour who is in charge of various spending departments and who is the unfortunate Member in the Government of India that has to meet all our charges as to why the Indian industries are not properly developed. My Honourable friend is in charge of the Postal Department which spends Rs. 12 crores annually. India can produce a Sir Jagadish Bose or a Sir C. V. Raman, but the Postal Department workshops cannot manufacture the flimsy appliances that the Postal and Telegraph Departments use. My Honourable friend may say that at any rate at times these telegraph instruments are being repaired here. I do not want repairing; if India can produce great physicists, India can design and manufacture most of the telegraph appliances, and an effort should be made and it has not been made. Then, I come to the Indian Stores Department of which my Honourable friend is in direct charge. The Indian Stores Department has done its work under the circumstances, I should say, well. It at present purchases nearly Rs. 5 crores worth per annum, but I think it should purchase more. The Defence Department does not like to place its full complement of orders through the Indian Stores Department. I am glad to see the Defence Secretary here. The Defence Department likes to purchase, through the War Office, every bit of armament barring the rifles that is needed. Why should India spend Rs. 20 crores on armaments and mechanised processes and not try to manufacture and repair these things here? My Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, is also in charge of the Stationery and Printing Department. Why should the army officers order special stationery from England through the Stationery Department I cannot understand, nor does my Honourable friend, Mr. Tottenham. I then come to Broadcasting and Civil Aviation, two luxury departments. It is true that one likes to see Indians getting air-minded. It is true that one likes at times to hear the horrid noise that the radio makes in the evenings to spoil the peaceful minds of citizens of India. (Laughter.) I do not suggest here that we should all go in for luxuries such as the radio and aeroplanes, but our wealthier people will soon use them more and more to fulfil their business and social engagements. Instead of motor cars, they will use aeroplanes to attend to their business. My friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, will probably be the first man to use an aeroplane. We do not know how to manufacture these things, and the Government have failed miserably in this respect, for they are the largest purchasers of motor cars, tanks, aeroplanes and mechanised appliances which the Defence Department use and they have made no effort to manufacture these. I would like to hear from the Government, particularly from the Member for Industries and Labour whether they have any co-ordinated policy as regards the manufacture of railway appliances, military appliances and engineering appliances. They or their British masters are spending 300 crores per annum which, of course, includes the expenditure of the Provincial Governments, the Army, the Posts and Telegraphs and the Railways, and I want to know whether they have got any co-ordinated or definitive policy by which they want to make India self-contained in the matter of these things. After the Great War, England went into huge capital expenditure to provide for unemployment and our Government went into extravagant capital expenditure on the railways to place orders in England and have brought the railways on the brink of bankruptcy. They spend 30 to 40 crores on the purchase of stores, machinery and appliances from England. Are they here in India only to supply these orders to the British armament firms and to other British manufacturers, or is

[Mr. B. Das.]

it their policy to make India self-contained? This vote is intended to censure the Government for its failure from year to year to comply with our demands. I will illustrate this by citing instance, the Howrah Bridge order—the biggest blunder of the year. Could they not buy Indian steel sections from the Tatas? No. It is not the policy of this Government or the Government of Bengal or the Bridge Commissioners or the Port Commissioners of Calcutta to encourage the use of Indian steel. Yet steel is a key industry? It is on these grounds that I condemn the iniquities of the spending departments of the Government of India.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan** (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, as has been recognised even by the critics of Government with regard to the constitutional aspect of the question at any rate, the position is illogical. The complaint reiterated time after time from the Opposition Benches is: "Here is a Government which will not take our advice, at any rate in all questions and which, when it does not take our advice, will not vacate office". That I am afraid is inherent in the position. It will be recognised even on the other side that so long as matters continue as they are from the constitutional point of view, two things must be admitted, one, that though Government do and should on all occasions give due weight to the views of Honourable Members and modify their policy to the extent to which it might be feasible to do so, nevertheless the responsibility for Government must continue where it resides till constitutional changes shift it elsewhere, and, secondly, it follows that where Government, in the exercise of that responsibility, come to the conclusion that it is not feasible or practicable in the best interests of the country to accept in its entirety or in part the advice given by Honourable Members opposite it cannot be made a grievance that they have not vacated office. If by our vacation of office, Honourable Members opposite could bring about a change in the character of the Constitution, there might be some ground for a grievance, but so long as the constitutional position continues to be what it is, I am afraid there would be no room for a grievance of that kind. I am not suggesting that Honourable Members opposite should not exercise their right to criticise. Being of the opinion that Government had not in matters where they had departed from their advice chosen the right path, they would naturally continue to insist that their advice should be accepted unless good grounds exist to the contrary. This brings us back to the position from where we started. Honourable Members presumably base their advice on what they consider good reasons, and any other reasons that might be urged cannot possibly have any weight with them. Nobody will deny that the position is illogical. It is said: "You, being in a secure position, do not treat the advice given you with due respect. You do not attach to it the weight that it deserves". That, I suppose, is very largely due to the feeling that when advice is not accepted, as Government are not bound to vacate office, they must have been indifferent to the advice. But then let me put it the other way also. Government have repeatedly tried to place their point of view before Honourable Members where they have differed from them. Honourable Members are not disposed to treat on such occasions a difference of opinion as an honest difference of opinion; there are always allegations of ulterior motive on this side for whatever decision is taken. The only conclusion drawn is that not being in the ordinary constitutional sense a responsible Government, the Government do not attach any value or



weight to the advice given to it from the opposite Benches. Repeated efforts on the part of Government to explain the position do not seem to carry much weight with Honourable Members opposite. Knowing that when Government are unable to accept the advice tendered to them from the Opposition Benches it is due to one or the other of the factors to which I have made a reference, either because the suggestion is not practicable or feasible or that Government, if they accepted it, would be abandoning their responsibility with regard to some matter or the other, do not Honourable Members realise that there would at least be equal reason for the feeling on this side that very often such advice is tendered because Honourable Members know that they would not be called upon to carry into effect their own advice and that it is being given only as a convenient stick to beat Government with, in case of their failure to carry it out . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** No, that is not right.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** If I were to accept that declaration of the Opposition's feelings or motives in the matter, I would be equally entitled to ask that Honourable Members should accept the explanation given on behalf of Government that we on this side are not influenced by ulterior motives in adhering at our decisions. Both the Opposition and the Government being placed in that position is it right then to say, "we go on giving advice, but Government Members have the comfortable feeling"—I think that was the expression used—"that as refusal to accept our advice is not likely to result in any reduction of their salaries or in their being turned out of office they need not attach any weight to it". I am trying to emphasise that if that kind of thing, questioning the motives of Government is to be permitted, if honest differences of opinion are not to be recognised, Government might be disposed to believe that advice is often tendered with the comfortable feeling that those tendering the advice are not to be called upon to make their advice good.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Do try once!

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Honourable Members will have the opportunity of trial very soon. Now, with regard to a good many matters, it is quite easy to agree upon ideals, it is quite easy to agree upon what should be the ideal state of affairs and, no doubt, unless those ideals were kept in view, no progress would be made, but it would be illogical and unreasonable to expect that in all spheres of human activity the ideal should be completely attainable in practice within a limit of time which Honourable Members opposite might choose to set. The result of the present position is that the standard which is sought to be applied to Government by which they are sought to be judged tends to become unduly high. "We cannot turn you out, but the only justification of your remaining would be if you were to attain the standard of perfection we are setting before you and which we ourselves cannot be called upon to attain". Now, that does not take into account any of the practical difficulties that would stand in the way of any Government with regard to every one of these matters.

Again, it is to be noticed that in criticism of this general character no distinction is made between matters for which this particular Government is responsible and matters for which other Governments might be

[Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.]

responsible, I mean the distinction between Central and provincial subjects. For instance, this morning at the very start the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition began with asking: "What have you done for the education of the masses, what have you done to secure better conditions of health for them, what have you done to raise their earning capacity, and so on?" There are two replies to it. One is the obvious one that I have already indicated that the Central Government cannot be criticised for any alleged lack of enthusiasm in these matters as they are not, under the Constitution, primarily responsible for them; the other, which is on the merits, is that a good deal has been done in these directions. But, then, one is afraid that on the other hand, the criticism may be, "Ah, but these things have been done by Provincial Governments". But if the Central Government is to bear the discredit for lack of activity in certain fields and if it is not a valid plea with regard to such criticism that these fields are not primarily the responsibility of the Central Government, then that Government might be permitted at least to take credit for what has actually been done in those fields. Either this kind of criticism is relevant with regard to the activities of the Central Government or it is not. If it is not relevant, it requires no reply. If it is relevant, whatever has been done by the Provincial Governments or the Central Government becomes relevant in reply. The illustrations taken were education, health, adding to the income of the peasant, which I suppose means the promotion of agriculture and so on. Take first the activities of the Central Government with regard to these matters. The field of their responsibility in these matters is co-ordination and research, and I venture to submit that the record of the Central Government with regard to these two matters—research and co-ordination is not one of which Government need be ashamed. Take agriculture alone. The machinery set up by Government for agricultural research surely does not indicate any kind of indifference towards the welfare of those engaged in the primary occupation of the people of this country. The same may be said with regard to health and education. As I have said, these matters are transferred provincial subjects, but as it might be said that Provincial Governments are a part of the Constitution which is at present in force in the country—may I just take one province and draw the attention of Honourable Members to what has been done in that province.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got two minutes more.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I understood one Member on behalf of the Government could take half an hour.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Certainly, if this is the main speech.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Let me make this clear lest there should be any misunderstanding. I should not be understood for one moment as implying that all that is possible has been done, that we are living under the very best of conditions, and that we can now rest on our oars and need do nothing more. There is nobody on this side who would not agree that a very great deal remains to be done with regard to these matters, and that there must be efforts towards

continuous progress. It has been said that nothing has been done with regard to these matters. I am afraid that was a very sweeping and a very unjustified criticism of the activities of the Central and Provincial Governments.

**An Honourable Member:** Take it in the comparative sense.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I am taking it in the comparative sense. Take the province to which I belong, and which, among the major provinces of India, used to be considered, before the introduction of the present Constitution into the provinces, as the most backward province with regard to matters to which reference has been made, that is to say, matters relating to education, health, medical aid, communications, and the condition of the peasantry generally. Now, what are the conditions in that province today? With regard to education, it is certainly not much behind other provinces in the sphere of University and higher education, but in the much more important sphere of primary education, I think it can claim a pride of place among the Provinces. Surely, that cannot be the result of doing nothing at all even comparatively when you compare it with conditions as they were sixteen years ago. Take irrigation, which certainly affects the welfare and happiness of the bulk of the people of the province much more directly and which also has a direct relation to the earning capacity of the peasant. Even under my own observation—and I am not an old man—tremendous improvement has occurred in the condition of the peasantry in the Punjab. I recollect myself that peasants belonging to what we used to call the western districts, some portions of the Gujranwalla and Gujrat districts, the whole of the Shahpur, Jhang, and Lyallpur districts, portions of the Multan district, as a matter of fact, at least one-third of the whole province, presented a picture which nobody could have described as being far short of extreme privation and penury. They were generally not only ill-clad, but were seldom more than half clad. It was the rarest sight to see a peasant from these districts wearing a pair of ordinary country shoes. That was their economic condition. Today, even during and after a prolonged period of depression, that part of the countryside presents a picture of comparative prosperity. Their children, almost every one of them, have received and are receiving primary education; they are not only fully clad, but are comparatively well clad. In tracts where it was difficult to find in those days one wheeled carriage within 30 miles, 30 motor cars may be counted owned by proprietors and *abadkars*. One can go on multiplying instances. So that it cannot be said that these years have made no difference to anybody and that not a pie has added to the earning capacity of the peasant. I do not wish to imply that progress in all parts of the province is comparable to that made in the districts that I have named, but surely it cannot be said that no progress has been made. There is a great deal of room for improvement and a great deal more that can be and should be done, but I do protest against the criticism that nothing has been done.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga** (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): What is your answer to Mr. Darling's book about the prosperity and debt of the Punjab peasants?

**Sardar Mangal Singh** (East Punjab: Sikh): What about the amount of debt of the peasantry? Has it not been increased?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** No doubt, the indebtedness of the peasant has also increased. It has increased more rapidly during recent years owing to the depression, but even then nobody can say that on the whole, the Punjab peasant, especially in the districts that I have named, is not a hundred times better off than he was 20 years ago. The conditions under which he is living today are very much better than they were twenty years ago. Nothing can take away the education that he has received, the general advancement in matters of public health, medical aid and communications that has taken place. The extension of irrigation, the spread of education, the improvement of communications, the development of hydro-electric power which has brought electricity nearer to the homes of the peasants in that province will be there for ever and they have made a permanent improvement in the condition of the peasants.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** But 17 precious years have passed.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Yes, they have been very precious indeed, for, during this period, a great deal has been done. In fact, much more has been done during this period of seventeen years than during any other period of seventeen years that the country has witnessed.

Sir, that is the reply to the general criticism. I recognise that it may be said that it is not this particular Executive Council that is mainly responsible for the development to which I have made reference. My reply is as I have already indicated that the criticism was not confined to matters for which we are primarily responsible, and if the criticism goes beyond the sphere of our primary responsibility, surely it would be permissible in reply to draw attention to what has been done in the spheres which have been criticised.

Reference was made to one or two matters in the departments of which I am in charge. I shall, therefore, have a word or two to say with regard to them. The failure of Government to set up a factory for the manufacture of locomotives in this country was again referred to.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** It was referred to as indicating policy and not by itself.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Yes, I understand that. Now, this is a matter which has at least on three occasions been discussed on the floor of the House. This is one of those matters where there is a difference of opinion between Honourable Members opposite and Government. I am afraid all arguments on both sides have now been placed repeatedly before the House. So, I shall not take up any further time in trying to convince Honourable Members opposite that they are taking up an unreasonable attitude in the matter. The attempt would be useless.

Two other matters have been mentioned to which I might advert briefly. The first is the attitude adopted by Government in connection with the decision taken by this House concerning the Ottawa Agreement. Last year, towards the end of the Budget Session, this House passed a Resolution calling upon Government to terminate the Ottawa Agreement. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says that in the letter the Resolution has been carried into effect, but that it has been violated in the spirit. Government have given notice of termination and have set up a Committee of non-official advisers with regard to the personnel of which I understood that the House was entirely satisfied.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Why did you not appoint a Committee of the Assembly?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** For the reason that during the debates last year when it was urged before Honourable Members that they should appoint a Committee to advise Government over this matter, the reply was: "We are not commercial, industrial or agricultural experts. Why set up a Committee of this House? It will be entirely useless to set up a Committee of this House to give you advice on this matter".

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** No.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Most certainly. It was said that the House could give only a general decision, and it was left to me as Member in charge of the Department of Commerce to take such expert advice from people who are concerned in these matters directly as might be available, and, then, in the light of that advice, to try to bring about a new agreement. Therefore, Government have set up that Committee. I am not for one moment trying to shift the responsibility in the matter. Government are entirely responsible and accept full responsibility for whatever laches they might have been guilty of in the view of Honourable Members and for whatever decision they might eventually come to. But at any rate so far—I cannot here enter into details—Government have tried to act in accordance with the advice of that Committee, and I do not think Honourable Members are justified in complaining that a fresh agreement has not yet been arrived at. There are several factors in the situation which have to be taken cognizance of, and they are being taken cognizance of, but Government are at least trying to proceed in accordance with the advice given by the House to Government. Honourable Members opposite may have a different measure with regard to the speed with which these matters can be concluded. But no kind of motive can be ascribed to Government in this matter. Government said that they would be responsive to this House in this matter and they have in no way gone back upon that assurance.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** The question of motive is the question of speed.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** As I have said, I am not trying to shift responsibility, but it must be recognised that, under the conditions laid down by the House, the speed has to be regulated by three sides in this matter, not only by two.

[Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.]

The other matter was the strike on the B. N. Ry. I really was unable to follow what the grievance in that connection was with which Government were being charged. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, after mentioning this matter and the callousness of Government in respect of it, went on to develop some other theme. This is a matter that was settled sometime ago, and I would be the last person to wish to start a discussion of its details and to offer criticism of one side or the other.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** What was done at the end could have been done at the beginning. That is my point, if you want to know it.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I know the point now. If there is any meaning in public declarations, surely the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has read the public declarations of an Honourable Member belonging to his own Party who was directly concerned in this matter. He has paid full tribute to the sympathy and help which he says he received from my Honourable colleague, the Member for Industries and Labour, and myself in this connection.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** The Honourable Member has two minutes more.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Surely that is not a matter which could be brought up against Government. It is unnecessary to go into details, but Government were entitled to assume the position which was in the end accepted by the Union, that is to say, that the 27 men over whom trouble originally arose would go back to the positions to which they had been demoted. That being so, that is the best proof of the fact that Government had very early looked into the matter and were satisfied that there was no room for interference. As soon as a situation arose where it became necessary for Government to look into the matter, Government gave such sympathy and such assistance as was required by the situation. Surely that at least is one matter in connection with which it could reasonably be expected that Honourable Members would for once depart from their habit of assuming that Government's action and motives are ever open to question. Therefore, my submission is that though with regard to the doings of this Government, as with regard to those of all Governments, there must be a lot of room for criticism, and nobody could possibly take objection to reasonable criticism, it is the function of the Opposition, and if that function were not properly performed, the whole machinery of constitutional Government would fall to pieces, yet when criticism takes on a universal and sweeping aspect, that on no occasion have Government done anything that was worthy of recognition, I am afraid the position could not be accepted. I recognise the anomalous position of the Opposition. It is not in the position of an ordinary opposition, nor are the Government in the position of an ordinary Government.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** The Honourable Member must conclude now as he has exhausted his time limit.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Government, I recognise under present conditions, must pay a great deal more regard to the wishes of the Opposition than would be required under normal circumstances, because the Opposition cannot turn out the Government and take office, but the Opposition should also recognise that there are occasions where it is not possible to give effect to their wishes wholly or in part on account of the presence of factors which it is not possible for Government to ignore. (Loud Applause.)

**Mr. M. S. Aney** (Berar Representative): Sir, we have listened to a very eloquent but an unconvincing defence of the position of Government and a reply to the vigorous attack made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in his speech in support of the cut motion. I am unable to understand the point that the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways was trying to establish. I think he has practically admitted the charge that is made against him. He was trying to show that there is an inherent anomaly in the system and so on, and the only plea which I have heard him urge very eloquently and impress upon the minds of us all was that there should be a tendency on the part of the Opposition to give them some credit for such crumbs as from time to time fall from them. That is all I could gather from the statement which he made. The facts that it is an irremovable executive and irresponsible executive and that, therefore, it is inherent in the very Constitution itself that there is no possibility of any change of Government on account of their inability to accept the view of this House, are admitted by them. I think that it is a greater reason why the views propounded by this House and the views expressed, adopted and passed by this House have to be more seriously considered than we find the Government inclined to do at present. His complaint is that because they have not accepted the views, so this part of the House is not willing to give them the credit of having considered them properly and even question the *bona fides* of Government when they have not acted up to them. When we find that no satisfactory explanation is given by the Government for not accepting even when an admittedly reasonable position is taken by this House, what else can we do except to suppose that either they are unable owing to want of intelligence to understand the position of this part of the House or that there is some extraneous difficulty or influence which comes in their way of accepting the view. And in either of the two cases an implied motive is to be attributed and there is no other way of getting out of it.

Let us take the example of the various cuts moved in this House during the budget discussions for the past so many years, or those passed by this House on the Finance Bill. There might be some portion of the votes which the Government for their own reasons might be unable to accept. But can it be urged that no portion of the vote given by this House on the Finance Bill, for example even the last year's unanimous vote of the non-official Members of this House in favour of the reduction of rates on the postcard was of such a nature that Government, on account of their financial obligations to the country, were unable to carry it out? What was the explanation to that? They callosely come here and say that they are not prepared to accept anything which is put before them by this part of the House. They say, "We are not going to listen to whatever you consider to be a reasonable position". That is the attitude of the Government. It is this spirit

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

of callousness and it is this feeling of defiance which has been experienced by Honourable Members on this side of the House for so many years in the past and which impel them, which compel them ultimately to attribute a motive to the Members of the Treasury Benches. It is not a question of attributing personal motives to this particular Member or that particular Member. That is not the point. But the Government, constituted as they are, are working under inspiration of somebody who has absolutely no interest of the country at heart. That is the point. That motive will remain like that till a situation will be created under the constitution wherein a free exchange of responsibility between the Treasury Benches and the Opposition will be possible in accordance with the import of the vote recorded on the floor of this House. Till that situation is created by the constitution, the position will remain thus.

Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, when he moved his cut, tried to lay down certain tests by which the Government of the country are to be judged. In fact, he explained that this cut is intended to give an opportunity to this House to review the general administration of the Government of India for the whole year and for the years past; and judged by that test he has shown how it has failed to come up to certain expectations of the people in certain matters. I will touch on just only a few more points, because I know that a general review of the administration means a great deal of time, and I am not going to enter into that big subject and will, therefore, touch upon one or two points only. We are now practically coming to the end of the period which began with the year 1921. A new era, so far as the provinces are concerned, is going to be opened on the 1st April. I do not know what is going to come off, but it is hoped that sooner or later, may be very soon even this House and all these things will go away and something else is likely to come here. I think this is the proper period, therefore, to look at the general situation in the country as bequeathed to the new Government which is going to come, by those who have to part with authority in the new constitution. To begin with, let us go to the days when the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were first inaugurated. Looking to the financial position of that time and the financial position today, one great and striking factor will be noticed. The arrangement then made was of this nature that the Central Government were expected to receive contributions from the provinces when the Central Government were formed under that Act; and as to the provinces, they were considered by the Government of India as sufficiently able to pay certain contributions to the Central Government. Now, after 17 years what do we find? When the new reforms are to be inaugurated, we find that the provinces are unable to meet the financial obligations which they will have to incur when the new reforms will come. Not only that, but Government have to think out plans of subsidies and subventions and shares of the old central incomes, and so on, in order to finance the provinces. It means that the administration of the reforms during these 17 years has impoverished the provinces and also rendered the position of the Central Government themselves very insecure, as this year's budget has shown beyond doubt.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** That is because much more money is being spent in the provinces on beneficent activities now than used to be the case previously.



**Mr. M. S. Aney:** Of course, it is true that more money is being spent, but whether for beneficent activities or not is another matter. Had it been spent beneficently on remunerative projects, the expenditure would have brought in a corresponding revenue and no situation of emergency would have arisen.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Education, health, medical aid, roads, dispensaries,—these cost a good deal but do not bring in any revenue.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Do not Education and Public Health yield revenue?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** Not as much as is spent on them.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** The position is this. Considering the situation after these 17 years of reforms, we find that the financial position of the provinces and the Central Government has become very precarious. Financially at least the Government of India cannot be acquitted of the charge of not having looked into the Indian finances in a proper way and kept them in a safe and secure position at the end of 17 years.

After that, let me take the case of railway finance itself. Those, who were in this House in the year 1924-25 when the new era of railway administration began, know the various conditions under which the House was persuaded to accept the separation of railway finance from the general finance; and one of the most important conditions introduced in that separation convention was that the House was practically assured that a certain amount will be guaranteed to general revenues by way of contribution every year. Now we find that for years past the railways are not able to pay that contribution. Not only that, but they have eaten up all the reserve funds that were gradually built up in order to make the position of the railways secure against difficulties and emergencies. And this year my Honourable friend had to come with an audacious proposal, before the House that 61 crores of rupees which have accumulated in the form of arrears of contribution and debts from the reserve fund, depreciation fund and so on, should be wiped out.

**An Honourable Member:** 62 crores.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** It may be 62 crores; a mistake of one or two crores is nothing. (Laughter.) Sir, the proposal is extremely audacious. Had it been the Government responsible to the Legislature, they would have thought thrice before coming up with a proposal of that character before the House. They would have known what it meant. But the Honourable Member said, to add insult to injury as it were, that we will be getting nothing now and we will be benefited if the old debts are wiped out and a new clean slate is started. That is the position to which the administration of railways has come and the financial position it has been reduced to. We have been reduced to a state of insolvency. Now, Sir, the custodians who have rendered us insolvent should be the last persons to come forward and say that in judging them there should be some kind of mercy, some kind of consideration, some tendency to recognise whatever little good they have done, and so on. All this comes with ill grace from the Treasury Benches who have so hopelessly mismanaged, in my opinion, the entire financial affairs of this country.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

Turning from that, let us go to the other factors. I was going to say something about the natural responsibility which the Government of India carry as a Government entrusted with the governance and superintendence of the entire Government of this country. The Honourable the Commerce Member referred to certain reforms in the provinces and said that Members will not give any credit for them to the Central Government but will say that this is all to the credit of the Provincial Governments. He has tried to take some little credit for whatever little reforms have been introduced in the Punjab. If I enter into that discussion now, it will take a long time. There are valiant Members from the Punjab who can say how far the claims which he makes can bear the testimony of close scrutiny and examination. But so far as the other provinces are concerned, I can say one thing. The criterion is this. If the indebtedness of the people and their capacity to pay your own revenue have considerably deteriorated and indebtedness has become hopeless, then all the reforms that you point out and plead will not be items to your credit, but in my opinion, they are so many things to your discredit. You have not done anything to increase the purchasing power of the people, their resisting power, and improve their ordinary sources of income. The main problem was that. What is the position of the Indian cultivator today? Where is he? We find you have had to pass so many laws to give him some relief to mitigate his indebtedness; and that was one of the reasons of my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, advanced in justification of the position he took up, as to why less money is coming into the Government treasury in the form of taxes and so on. But my point is this: the fact that you have had to pass laws to mitigate indebtedness is in itself the strongest proof to show that indebtedness has become so bad and chronic that it cannot be solved properly, and, therefore, you are dabbling with it in this fashion. That is not going to help the cultivator very much. Are you prepared to face this problem and are you going to make a proper inquiry into the whole affair, see the magnitude of the problem that has to be solved and prepared to float a loan in order to give a clean slate to the Indian cultivator so that he can live on unhampered and unfettered from tomorrow? Why should you consider it difficult? For the sake of financing the railways, you are floating loans every year, for the sake of many other things, you are floating loans. Why not float a loan for the sake of relieving the Indian cultivator from the position of indebtedness into which he has fallen? You are not prepared to consider a problem of this magnitude and to see what will be the equitable basis on which it could be solved so that some relief could be given to the poor cultivator. Have the Government the least idea of doing it? The very magnitude of the problem frightens them away: they do not want to shoulder the responsibility. They say, "This is a question in which the provincial members mainly are interested: the Central Government cannot do anything and so on and so forth". Therefore, in order to twit those who have come out successful in the recent elections in spite of all the efforts made by the Government, they say that this responsibility will be assumed by others, and they should not be criticised. That shows how they help in solving this question. After having created an insolvent state, when we are going into the Provincial Councils now, we are asked to take charge and see if anything could be done. We have to reap the fruit of all their sins.

all their faults and all their derelictions. I say that the failure of the future ministers will be the measure of the mismanagement of the present Government for so many years in the past. I say it will take half a century for us to clean the place. As the President of the Congress has very rightly said, the Congress broom has just begun to clean this Augean stable, the outside vested interests and so on. It will have a great deal of work to do: we must have a proper cleaning inside the Legislature and inside the Government. (Laughter.) Whether it will succeed in that cleaning I do not know: I do not know whom it will touch . . . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got two minutes more.

**Mr. M. S. Aney**: I am prepared to stop at this stage, because this sort of indictment and condemnation can be carried on for hours (Laughter); such is the amount of sin committed here that even if every one of us speaks for half an hour, including the eloquent Leader of the Independent Party who is likely to come after me, even then this volume will not be diminished. So I am prepared to save those two minutes for others who follow me and I will merely say that for these reasons I have got no other option but to accord my whole-hearted support to the cut, and I am sure the whole House will carry it unanimously.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this year's budget speeches from the side of the Government have shown an inferiority complex. The mentality has been to admit defeats and defects at every possible step. My Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, has taken shelter under the Constitutional position. He says, "It is such that it is not our fault: it is the fault of those who made the Constitution, who thrust this Constitution at the head of India". If that is the argument, I also take the same position. We, on this side of the House, also have a right to criticise under the same constitution. Whether the criticism is good or bad, we claim that it is good criticism and that we are entitled to make it. The Honourable Member also referred to the speed of the committee which is sitting to deliberate over the British Trade Agreement. The speed is not really in the hands, we know, of the Government of India or even of the Opposition; but it is dictated, so far as we understand it, by the Downing Street, and that is what we regret here. Our position is this: the Ottawa Agreement is broken, and the House has passed a censure motion over it and notice has been given: and we thought it would be speeded up; but what is the result? Months have passed. I am sure it will take years and years perhaps before a decision is reached.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

Is it the position of the Government that the suggestions made every year from this side are all irrelevant and not to the point? I am sure the Government have always listened to what we have said and amended their budget and taken note of our suggestions. The Honourable Member also referred to conditions in the Punjab. Of course, my Punjab friends will reply to that. But so far as my own province is

[Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali.]

concerned, I am prepared to say that the conditions he has mentioned do not prevail in my province. If my friend were only to go to the villages and see the conditions of the tenantry there, he will find that they are absolutely poor, they have nothing to eat; and specially this year owing to hail storms and other calamities, the whole lot of tenantry will become very poor and will not have even enough to eat. Government take credit about their better management of Indian affairs. Now I put a question to my Honourable friends. Is this sterling loan of 385 crores which India owes to England a good sign and a sign of better management of the Indian house? I submit it cannot be. Government stand condemned on this one point alone, that India owes a debt of 385 crores of sterling loans to the Home Government. In addition, we find the Army is not Indianised: we find the Indian tenantry are not solvent: we find that industries in this country have not been worked up to a stage when we can make even a pin or a needle in this country. Under these conditions, I ask how can any Government expect from this side of the House to give them every credit for solvency, for good management and for good government? The cuts we move on this side of the House, the speeches we make here and the Resolutions we move with the demonstrations which are made outside the House, what are they signs of? Don't the Government know the real condition? Don't they know that the insolvency of the country has reached a sufficiently high pitch, that it has reached almost at the breaking point? The tenant and landlord both are insolvent. To say that a man, who was once really rich, is rich today is wrong, because all the gold and silver which he possessed at one time have been drained out of the country; taxes have been imposed, and life has been made exorbitantly costly. Can all this be called good management? My submission is, that the verdict of the House cannot but be that the management of the Indian house has not been what it ought to have been. Sir, India is not a poor country. India is very rich in her raw materials, minerals, climate and in everything, but still what do we find? We find that the Indian Government have not managed the country in the way they ought to have done. What is the condition of our education, what is the condition of our universities? Our universities are all furnished. If we take agriculture, we find that the tenants are dying in thousands. There is famine threatening the country every year. And yet Government will not take a lesson and adopt ameliorative measures. Sir, Government must have opened their eyes to the curious fact that every Minister in every province has been dislodged in the recent elections, and that should be an eye opener for the Government to see that they have not managed the affairs of this country in the way they should have done. Cottage industries are not encouraged, the condition of the peasantry is in a very hopeless plight, their children and women are starving, they have no education, their men folk have not even a loin cloth to cover their bodies with. This is the condition of our peasantry. Sir, as my time is up, I shall stop here for the present.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** (Leader of the House): Sir, the debate this afternoon has wandered over a very wide field and at times I have wondered whether I was listening to the general discussion on the budget or to the general discussion on the First Reading of the

Finance Bill. There has, however, been one common thread which has been running through the speeches of the speakers opposite, and that is the attempt to condemn us for all that we have done. Sir, a short time ago, I received a letter from an Indian friend for whom I have a great regard, requesting me to help him to secure a high post in one of the provinces for which, I think, he is very well fitted. In that letter he said: "I am a first class administrator." That is a very big claim and it is not one which I would make for myself, but I do claim to be a thoroughly indifferent politician. My administrative abilities, such as they are, are of a far higher standard than my political abilities. I could wish on an occasion like this that I had the arts of the politician,—I hasten to add that I am not denying the fact that in a democratic country he is as useful as the administrator. My Honourable colleague on my right disagrees with me. I did not wish to overstate the case; but, be that as it may, the politician has two gifts which I do not possess. One is that of making the worse appear the better cause. That gift has not been exercised in this House this afternoon, but the Opposition has exercised to the full the gift of making the better cause appear the worse. We on this side are in the unfortunate position of having no one to blow our trumpets for us (Laughter from the Congress Party Benches.) (*Some Honourable Members*: "You have already enough of them there."), as my friends opposite doubtless will have when they take their places on this side. Therefore, we have to do the best we can for ourselves, and I venture to think, Sir, that my Honourable colleague, the Commerce Member, has made out a good case for us. I think, Sir, if time had permitted, he could have enlarged upon it considerably. Time does not permit me to do so either. One of the questions which have been asked this afternoon has been: "What have this Government done for agriculture, for education, for health and for industries?" I maintain, Sir, and I endorse all that my Honourable colleague has said on the subject, that we have done as much as we have been permitted to do under the present constitution. It has not perhaps produced results as quickly as might be desired, but we have done all that financial conditions permitted.

As regards Education and Health, I would point to the Central Advisory Boards which have been constituted to assist the provinces in such ways as are open to them. As regards Industries, I can only repeat what I have said several times before on the floor of this House. I would point to the constitution of the Industrial Research Bureau, I would point to the effects of our protective and revenue duties and to our stores purchase policy. Above all, Sir, I think the Government of India have done a very great deal, as it was only fit that they should do, in what is after all a predominantly agricultural country, in regard to the welfare of the agricultural classes, by the constitution of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research which has spent lakhs, now running into crores, on agricultural development. I would point to the sugar industry, the prosperity of which has only been made possible by the Government of India, by the introduction of the improved varieties of cane discovered by the officers of the Central Department of Agriculture. I would point to the work that Department has done on improved varieties of wheat, cotton, tobacco and various grains, all of which have helped to improve the earning capacity of the people. It may be said, Sir, in the words of the

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

Scriptures! "These ought ye to have done and not left the others undone". That may be a perfectly true accusation, but I would ask that we should at least be given credit for what we have done.

Now, Sir, as the administrator that I profess myself to be, I would 4 P.M. turn to one or two points which have been raised in regard to the Department with which I am connected. It came to me as a great surprise that in a budget, one special feature of which has been a very substantial increase in the provision for the development of civil aviation, I should have been accused of making entirely insufficient provision for that purpose. I was expecting, Sir, that the accusation would be of a different order. I was expecting the accusation that we were doing too much. My friend, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, read out a list of the amounts spent in some of the dominions on civil aviation. The dominions are differently situated from India. They have greater resources than we have. I maintain, Sir, that India is spending as much as is justified on civil aviation at this juncture, and no more and no less than is justified by the existing conditions. Sir Henry Gidney referred to the fact that the total provision under civil aviation amounted to about Rs. 25 lakhs, and pointed out that about 13½ lakhs of this was for direction and only Rs. 7½ lakhs were paid as air subsidy. He drew the conclusion from that that the Department was over-staffed. That, Sir, is very far from being the case. For one thing, out of the Rs. 13½ lakhs, which he has calculated as being spent on staff and nothing else, no less than just under Rs. 6 lakhs go to the Posts and Telegraphs Department for wireless facilities. There is thus only a balance of Rs. 7.74 lakhs for direction, which includes pay of officers, pay of establishment, allowances and honoraria, contingencies, and a small amount for scholarships and other miscellaneous charges. Far from the Department being over-staffed, it is really undermanned. As is the case with all new and expanding departments, staff always lags behind the increase in work. We are really managing with very much less staff than the circumstances would justify. Fortunately, we have a number of enthusiastic officers in the Department who are willing to do a great deal more than they could legitimately be asked to do. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, told the House that the Aeronautical Training Centre of India was not receiving the support from Government that it should do. If I am right—I must confess I did not hear him well—he referred to that again and again as an internal service. That is not our conception of the meaning of an "internal service"; the centre may be an internal institution, but it is certainly not a service. All I can say about that Institute is that it is run by a private company which declared a dividend recently, and from that the natural assumption to be drawn is that it is a self-supporting and not altogether an unprofitable concern. I may mention that I have inspected it myself, and that officers of my Department have also done so. We all realise that it is doing important and useful work in training young men for civil aviation and some other activities, and we are prepared to help it to the extent that we legitimately can in a manner which is free from objection, such as by sending a number of pupils whom we want for special purposes and cannot get in any other manner, to be trained there. There are at present four pupils who are being trained in wireless telegraphy there at Government expense. The charge

that Government are doing nothing to train young men for civil aviation careers is entirely unfounded. If time had permitted, I would have proved this, but I may have an opportunity later on to give the House very full details of exactly what we have done in regard to the training of pilots, aerodrome officers, aircraft inspection staff, wireless operators, engineers and the like. I would only mention now that we have, as many Members of the House probably know, encouraged the development of flying clubs in India, and we are now assisting seven of them with an annual subsidy of about Rs. 1½ lakhs. More important is the assistance we render to individuals in obtaining advanced training. We have spent no less than Rs. 3½ lakhs up to date on schemes of individual assistance. In the early years of civil aviation, we had to send Government nominees to England for training, but as aviation has developed in India, this has become less and less necessary except with regard to higher engineering qualifications. This tendency to train men in this country, instead of sending them abroad, has already become apparent, markedly so in the case of aerodrome staff, and it naturally means that the training has become less costly.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** What about aircraft inspectors?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** My Honourable friend has asked me specially about aircraft inspectors. The position there is that in 1930 two Indians were sent for 3½ years' training in England and qualified as assistant aircraft inspectors at the end of that time. In 1935, two more were selected for similar training and are now in England. It is probable that further assistance of the same kind will be given in the course of the next year.

My time seems to have gone very quickly, and I can only touch upon one or two other points and hope to have a further opportunity of explanation and expansion in the course of another debate. What I would point out is that as regards the development of what are rightly called internal feeder services, that is, the Indian National Airways and Tatas, we are providing in the budget for an expenditure of something in the neighbourhood of Rs. 13½ lakhs, and I submit that that is a very ample provision.

There is one point arising out of my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das's speech to which I should like to refer before I sit down. If I recollect correctly, he told the House that the Postal Department cannot even manufacture the flimsy appliances required for the use of the Department, such as telegraph instruments. I would invite my Honourable friend to visit the Telegraph Workshops at Alipore where he will receive a very hearty welcome and in which he will be very interested, being himself an engineer. He will find that we not only *can*, but *do* manufacture all the telegraph appliances that we need in India with the exception of a few patent ones. The total value of the output of the Workshops is no less than Rs. 20½ lakhs a year. There was another misstatement, I am sure an inadvertent one, in his speech in which he enquired what Government were doing in regard to the manufacture of lethal military appliances. My Honourable friend, the Defence Secretary, has, I think, told him on more than one occasion that 80 to 90 per cent. of the lethal requirements of the army are made in India. If time had permitted, I would have wished to

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

deal with the question of unemployment raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, but I may have an opportunity of doing so later on. (Applause.)

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, you will recollect that last year, at the very end of the proceedings on the Finance Bill, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, raised a very important constitutional issue which has found an echo today in this Honourable House.

My friend, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, described this Constitution as illogical, a very correct description, but may I point out to him that, illogical as the Constitution happens to be, it was intended by the framers of the Constitution that Government should not make it as illogical as it is possible to make it, but to make it as logical as they could. Have they done so? That is the point I would like to ask Honourable Member opposite and to make a few remarks about.

Sir, I pointed out specially to my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, last year that, under the Constitution under which we work, and, according to the intentions of the framers, it was always intended that Government should try their best to meet the wishes of this side of the House, that it was not intended, as is the position in England, that Government should carry out their intentions to the letter regardless of the opposition who always must be in a minority. I pointed out to him that that was the spirit of the Act of 1919 under which we work. Well, I was taken severely to task for the expression of that opinion by our friend, the Leader of the House, who, we all regret, is not here present today, and, may I say, who, we all hope, will be soon in his place. He took me severely to task for that interpretation of the spirit of the Act and he read out to this House on that occasion one or two extracts from the Select Committee Report of 1919. I would like to remind the House of those extracts today.

"It is not, however, within the scheme of the Bill to introduce at the present stage any measure of responsible Government into the central administration, and a power must be reserved to the Governor General of treating as sanctioned any expenditure which the Assembly might have refused to vote if he considers the expenditure to be necessary for the fulfilment of his responsibility."

He also drew attention to the following line:

"It should be understood from the beginning that this power of the Governor General is real."

And then, he also drew attention to the following two lines:

"It is not, however, within the scheme of the Bill to introduce at the present stage any measure of responsible government into the central administration."

Now, Sir, no one, who had taken the slightest pains to understand what the Act is under which we work today, was unaware of these expressions of opinion of the Select Committee, but may I ask whether by giving a very strict interpretation to these words they mean that, in the opinion of my Honourable friends opposite, there has been no advance in the constitutional position of the Opposition during the last 30 years? If you place the very restricted interpretation upon these words, you are admitting that for the last 30 years there has been no constitutional advance. That was not the intention of the framers of the Act.



**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I did not say so.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** You yourself did not say so. The intention of the framers of the Act was that where it was possible to carry out the wishes of the Opposition, it should be done, provided Government felt that the credit and safety of the country was not jeopardised. These safeguards were given to the Government to protect the financial stability of India and to preserve peace and law and order in India. They were not given to enable the Government to deny the Opposition at every point, and deny every suggestion that the Opposition might make. Now, Sir, by this, I do not mean to contend that the Government have consistently and regularly, throughout the period of this Act, defied the Opposition or done nothing to meet the wishes of the Opposition. What I then did contend, I desire to contend today, that in last year's budget Government could have accepted and should have accepted some of the suggestions made by the Opposition, that those suggestions did not jeopardise the financial safety of this country, and in no way came in the way of law and order.

I contend that the building of Quetta from revenues was wrong in principle. The Honourable the Finance Member has every right to disagree with me. The Honourable the Finance Member believes that such expenditure should be incurred from revenue. It was merely a question of seven crores, merely a question of 50 and 60 lakhs every year in the budget for the next number of years. We contended, and we were firmly of opinion, that a loan should be raised to meet a disaster of this character. That suggestion was turned down on the grounds that the financial stability of India could not be maintained if a loan was raised for that purpose. Now, Sir, I call that not acting in the spirit of the Constitution. You may disagree with us as much as you like. You have a right to disagree with us, but this illogical Constitution expects you to follow the opinion and desires of this House whenever it is possible for you to do. I contend that in not carrying out the opinion definitely expressed by this House you are defying not the Constitution, but the spirit of the Constitution.

Then, again, year in and year out, this side of the House has definitely expressed the opinion that the postcard rate should be lowered. That could have been done when we have a man of the ability of Sir James Grigg as Finance Member. He could very easily have done it, I am certain, if he really wished to do it. He may not agree with it. He may feel honestly and sincerely that this is not the time to reduce rate of the postcard, but this illogical Constitution demands that he should take notice of the wishes of the side of the House on a matter of this character. This illogical Constitution demands, if it is to be worked in the spirit in which it was framed, that he shall make provision for this unreasonable demand, if he likes to call it so, of this side of the House and I may say of the whole country. Has he done it? No. Has he done it this year? No. Is he carrying out the Constitution in its spirit? No. It is an illogical Constitution. You cannot compare it with the Constitution that my Honourable friend has been accustomed to work under.

Then, he gave us certain figures last year and said that with the English Budget of seven to eight hundred million pounds, the Chancellor of the Exchequer generally keeps up his sleeve about half a million to play about with, in order to make concessions to the Opposition. He said that, with

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

our figures, half a million was equivalent to about five lakhs, or a lakh at a time on five different occasions; but he forgot that we were working under an illogical Constitution and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had half a million to please the people to whom he owed nothing. He keeps that half a million to please perhaps a few of his supporters, or some of the Opposition who are always in a minority and on whom he does not rely for his vote. The Constitution is totally different here. The Constitution here is that the Government are given reserve powers, are given safeguards, naturally to meet an irresponsible Opposition. They are given those safeguards in order to meet and to restore in the budget illogical and unreasonable cuts. That is why the safeguards are given, but they are not intended to be used in any one instance, I contend, where, however unreasonable in the opinion of the Government it may be, it is possible to put them into practice. That, I think, has been the misunderstanding in the working of this Constitution which has resulted in a considerable amount of discontent, in a considerable amount of irritation and which has led the agitation from strength to strength in a demand for the reform of the Constitution. I have always maintained that if dyarchy had been worked in the spirit in which the framers intended that it should be worked, there would never have been this insistent demand for the reform of the Constitution. It was because dyarchy was not worked in the spirit in which it should have been worked that it has given rise to discontent throughout the country. Again, I maintain that it is because on many occasions—not on every occasion; I am not going to put it in that extreme form—the Constitution was not worked in the spirit in which the framers intended it to be worked that there is this amount of discontent throughout the country.

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

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: Even if a reasonable, what we consider a really reasonable demand, which can be met by Government, is turned down, it is no wonder that you have a considerable amount of criticism, and, may I say, justified criticism, from this part of the House. Sir, I do not propose to go on further just now pursuing this point. I was only tempted to raise it, because it was prominently brought to our attention last year and was, may I say, very reasonably pursued by the Honourable Member who spoke today on behalf of Government.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): (Loud Applause.) Sir, I am thankful to the Honourable the Commerce Member who was the principal spokesman on the Treasury Benches this afternoon for his candid speech. He has unreservedly pleaded guilty to the charge: he accepts the charge that the Government have defied the wishes of this House, that the Government have disregarded the Resolutions, the proposals and the motions solemnly adopted by this House. We want to censure the Government for their refusal and failure to carry out the wishes constitutionally expressed by this House. That is enough so far as this motion is concerned, and no better argument could be advanced, no more argument is needed; but I am thankful to him also for another reason. He has brought home to

us the irony of the present wicked order of things. He says, "Well, we are not responsible to you, we are responsible to people thousands of miles away, they are our masters, we have to carry out their wishes, why do you blame us for it? If you are really in earnest, then you must upset the present order of things; we are units of a machine which is grinding you and all of us together, break it, destroy it and replace it by something better, and then alone those who will be here will listen to you". Sir, I accept the diagnosis, I accept the remedy, I accept the prescription, and I ask Honourable Members sitting on this side to take that to heart and to work for it. The Commerce Member frankly told us, "well, what can we do, we are here only to carry out the directions of our masters abroad". After all, the position is not exactly as he has put it before us. It is not, I contend, a position of absolute and futile impotence so far as the Indian Members of the Government are concerned. Really, are they satisfied with everything that the Government have done, and is no remedy open to them? Are they satisfied, at a time like this when unemployment is leading to suicides and disasters all over the country, when our young men are committing suicide after suicide because they are not able to get the wherewithal even to keep their body and soul together, along with it the system of examination for the Indian Civil Service has been replaced by that of nomination, so that, if deserving non-Indians are not available, undeserving non-Indians may be imported to keep out the deserving Indians in this country?—I ask, is no remedy open to them? Should they submit to all these outrages because they are only answerable to their masters abroad? Do they not notice what is happening all over this country? I ask the Honourable the Railway Member—is he prepared to deviate even from the policy unequivocally accepted by his predecessor that there should be at least one Indian on the Railway Board, and is he prepared to submit to the replacement of that single Indian by a foreigner? I ask the Railway Member, is it proper for him to acquiesce in the decision refusing to acquire the Bengal Nagpur and the Oudh and Rohilkund Railways which are admittedly profitable concerns paying a dividend of 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. today, when his own railways are a source of loss to the State? Is it proper for him to continue the subsidies and patronage to the P. & O. and other shipping companies when they refuse to take an Indian even as a cadet? Are not there one hundred and one other things which are adding to the unemployment in this country, adding to its poverty and to its distress? Is he prepared to be a party to the arrangement which, on the one hand, encourages the export of gold from this country and, on the other hand, hampers the import of silver by the addition of an import duty to the existing duty on silver? Does he think that India's hoards have been the one cause of its ruin, because it was these hoards which tempted foreigners from distant lands, and does he believe that it is for the good of the country that it should be reduced to absolute penury and that no part of any precious metal should remain here? Sir, it is wrong to state that there is no remedy open to them. Is it not open to the Indian Members of the Government to assert, "we will be no party to this wicked game of Whitehall; we will clear out". What is there to prevent them from doing so, and if no Indians are available to occupy the positions which my respected friends are occupying today, do they think it will have no moral effect? Even immoral systems have to be sustained by plausible appearances, and unless there is some sort of co-operation by Indians, the wicked system cannot last. So, if they really realise and

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

appreciate the wickedness of the present order, they must join us in putting an end to it.

Then, Sir, it is no use defying the wishes of the Members sitting on this side as if we were individuals alone. As an individual, I would bow my head before any individual on the other side, but I am not here as an individual, I am here representing thousands and millions of people in this country. (Hear, hear.) The views that I place before this House are the views of the nation and the latest election that has taken place has demonstrated that the views that are expressed by the Congress are the views of the country. The opinions voiced by us are the expressions of the soul of India. So, to deal with us as though we are negligible individuals is to ignore the signs of the times. The Government must take note of it. It is not only one particular class that we represent here. Do not any longer dwell on the bogey of communalism in this country. Whoever was your friend, be he sitting on one side of this House or the other, be he outside or in the lobby or in the Visitors' Gallery, he had no support anywhere. Among the Mussalmans also, only the persons possessing a wider outlook had the support of the electorate and today the country has to a man demonstrated its lack of faith, its distrust, of the present Government, and it is determined to end it as soon as it can. The Government should take note of these portents and it should take them seriously. The censure is written in every vote that has been cast for the Congress, and we are doing no more than repeating it on the floor of this House.

Then, Sir, the Honourable the Railway Member told us that they are not here to look after our education, our health and our sanitation. These things do not worry them at all. The Government of India are not here to look after our welfare, it is here to look after something else. I accept it that the Government of India are not here for these purposes. The Government of India are here only to carry out political machinations. The Government of India are here to tighten the firm grip and the firm hold of foreigners abroad. That is the sole purpose, and that is the sole object for which the Government of India are here. But that is exactly the reason why the Government of India have to be smashed. That is exactly the reason why the Government of India have to be so treated that they may either cease to exist or they may be re-born, and that is the object with which this censure motion has been brought on the floor of this House.

Then, we were reminded by the Honourable Member for Railways that much progress has been made in the Punjab during the last 17 years. Well, who was in charge of the Punjab before these 17 years? Did the present system of Government come into existence only 17 years ago? I can tell him that what he has stated is not correct, and I will state merely a simple reason. Does he mean to tell me that in spite of the collapse of the prices of agricultural produce, which have fallen down by about 50 per cent. during the last four years, any agricultural province can be today better off than what it was 17 years ago? It is impossible. So, his statement has an inherent defect just as the system which he represents has an inherent defect. Has he not read the book of Mr. Darling about the Punjab peasant and poverty? Is he not an independent judge? In any case, he has no sympathies with us here. What has he found? Has he said that the average of the students attending schools in the Punjab

is 20 or 25 per cent. of the population as is the case in other countries? It is not even three per cent. So, a considerable leeway is yet to be made. Let him not be under a delusion. Then, does he not know what has happened during these 17 years in other countries? Does he not know what wonders have been achieved by Japan in the matter of mechanisation during these 17 years? Does he not know what has happened in the United Kingdom during the last 17 years? The Honourable the Finance Member will confirm the remark that I am making that the income of England from investments abroad has increased by about three hundred million pounds during the last 17 years, with the result that it is getting today from shipping and other investments in other countries more than the total income of our country. Does he not know that many of the States were born only 17 years ago? Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and several other States did not exist before? Does he not know what has happened in the Soviet Russia during the last 17 years? Let not the Honourable the Finance Member turn red: the State of Soviet Russia has really worked wonders. Its national wealth has grown by about 300 per cent. All admit that it has changed its state of economic affairs considerably. Then, he told us that they have no control over the provinces. Have you known really who are responsible for the internment of hundreds of our young men? Who is responsible for the suicides that the detenus are committing from day to day? Who was responsible for the banning and the prosecutions on the Independent Day pledge? Were you not responsible for the issue of the ban on the eve of the day, so that nobody might receive it in time, so that those who were considered to be undesirable might be clapped in the jail? And, then, who was responsible for these trials for sedition? On the one hand, to talk of responsible Government and on the other hand to clap people for attacking Government is to blow hot and cold in the same breath. Then, we were told, while you are having an opportunity now, go to the provinces and demonstrate your genius. Well, you have done enough not to let anybody do anything there. You have taken pretty good care to ensure a verdict in your own favour, but I challenge you to do other things.

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

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Let there be impartial people from any part of the world and let them judge what you have done in this country. Let them take account of what has happened since the British rule came in and let them work as impartial judges without any jury at all to examine the deeds, I will not say the misdeeds, because they were very much worse than that, and if any sentence short of capital is passed, I will plead guilty. What can these provinces do? In fact, the fundamental and the central fact of the position is this. Unless and until you replace the army of occupation by Indian army in this country, and unless and until you replace the present superior services manned by foreigners by properly paid, economically paid, Indians working in the spirit of missionaries for the good of the people of this country, no Government, whatever you may call it, can do anything. To fetter us in every way, to tie us hand and foot and then ask us to run is a very honest way of making a gesture indeed. Again, so far as the provinces are concerned, with the

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

Domocles sword of discretionary powers and individual judgment and of special powers vested in the Governors, and with deficit budgets at the outset facing them, it is unfair to expect anything from them. You have done your best to throttle everybody in this country, you have throttled the provinces at the very start. So far as I am concerned, I know that the remedy lies in throttling the whole system, in striking the entire machine, and until this is done, the censure will be there for you although this censure has to be borne also by us every minute of our life for tolerating this system. (Applause.)

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Sir, my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, indulged in the pastime of raking up his old speeches. As a general rule, reading old speeches is an unprofitable business particularly when they happen to be one's own.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** I was reading from the speech of the Leader of the House, not mine.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** But I have been not only reading one of my own old speeches, but I propose to ask the House to bear with me while I read an extract from it. This is a speech delivered two years ago, and, of course, in order to keep continuity, I do not propose to read the interjections which interrupted that speech at the end of almost every sentence. The occasion was a debate very much like this. I said:

"But may I conclude on a rather different note? It is quite true that both the Opposition and the Government are inextricably bound in the trammels of the present constitution and there is, for the present, no escaping from it. It is no good talking about irresponsible Government. If the Finance Member under any other democratic constitution, brings forward financial proposals, he does so with a very fair assurance that by the use of the ordinary rules of party discipline he will be able to carry them through Parliament. But here he has no such assurance. We have no party of our own. We have no means of assuring ourselves of the support of the silent Members who tramp through the Lobbies, not even by nominating them."

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** *Et tu Brutel*

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:**

"And, Sir, if the Opposition are deprived of their full share of an ordinary Opposition in shaping the policy of a country, so are the Government deprived of a certain amount of the machinery which they normally have to carry their policy into effect. We can, therefore all agree that the present constitution is most unsatisfactory, and if the Opposition find—I am afraid what I am about to say will fall on deaf ears—if you find the present constitution so unsatisfactory, are you quite certain that you are doing a wise thing in rejecting the new one which is offered to you? Whatever shortcomings it may have, however much it may disappoint you, it is one which will ultimately relieve you of the necessity and pleasure of coming down here and making speeches as you have been able to make today. The new constitution will place a very large measure of responsibility on Ministers who are answerable to the Legislatures, and that is after all the burden of complaint of the Opposition. In present circumstances, you can neither make us do what you want nor can you turn us out. Well, under the new constitution you will at least be able to do the second and I suggest that the real moral of this discussion is that the Opposition instead of blindly rejecting a very definite advance on the present position should think again not once, but twice or three times, before they adhere to their present attitude."

The relevance of this today is obvious. The Party which seek to censure us for our manifold sins of commission and omission are about to face a momentous choice, a choice momentous for them, and I think momentous for India too. In six or seven provinces of India, the Party opposite is in a position to resolve the deadlock of the irresponsible Opposition and irremovable executive, I beg pardon, unresponsive Government. If they decide to accept office, what is before them? They will take up the burden of that task which man has up to now found the most difficult of all tasks to carry out, namely, the task of governing himself and his fellow men wisely and well.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh! Oh!

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Yes, I do not feel in the least penitent about that word, to govern himself is the most difficult of all.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Govern yourself particularly.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** This is a heavy burden, but it is also what one of our modern historians called an endless adventure.

Well, Sir, if the Opposition decide to take office, they can expect no easy or glib solutions, for if they were available they would somehow or other at some time or other have been discovered. They cannot expect to be praised or rewarded, they must expect to face abuse and ingratitude and to be faced continuously with new and almost insoluble problems and to be conscious at the end of it all that achievement is a very small dividend upon aspirations. But they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they have tried to serve their fellow countrymen and they may even have the satisfaction of realising some part of their aspirations. But supposing they condemn themselves to further long years of barren and fruitless and unconstructive Opposition, and if I may say so without fear of being misunderstood—a fairly large assumption, I admit in this Assembly—I should say also irresponsible Opposition, and I say “irresponsible”, not only in the technical sense, but in the other sense, in the simple every day sense of the word, because I have no doubt whatever that Members of the Opposition know perfectly well that if only a quarter of their demands were carried into operation, a state of inextricable chaos would result. Supposing as I said the Opposition condemn themselves to a further period of barren opposition, what then? They will in effect have made the great refusal, the refusal to take up a task which they so often censure others for doing badly and even for doing dishonestly, and if they do make that refusal, they will have no right to censure others for doing badly what they are unwilling to do themselves. It is no good for my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, who spoke last protecting himself in advance by the argument “Oh! you made such an unholly mess of it that there is no chance for decent people like ourselves to extricate ourselves from the mess”.

Sir, I have very little more to say. The hour of the choice is at hand.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Yes, it is.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** A good many of my fellow countrymen who have served in India have been accused of selfishness and dishonesty. It is an everyday occurrence in this House, and apparently it is quite possible within the terms of parliamentary decorum, but I hope that the House will believe me when I say,—and I say it knowing perfectly well that it is quite easy for the people opposite to ridicule what I am going to say,—I hope the House will believe me when I say that I for my part, and I suppose all the British people here on their part, hope that the Party opposite will in the next few weeks make the right choice. If they make the choice that they ought to make, I hope that in time they will regard with a little more sympathy the efforts and mistakes of their predecessors. And they will, I am sure, at the end of it all, if they make the choice that I think they ought to make or that I think they will, share the feeling of many of us of another race who have worked in India, namely, a feeling of disappointment and disillusionment at not having been able to do more.

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—68.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.  
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.  
 Aney, Mr. M. S.  
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.  
 Asaf, Ali, Mr. M.  
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.  
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.  
 Chaliha, Mr. Kuladhar.  
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendr.  
 Nath.  
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.  
 Chetty, Mr. Sani Vencatachelam.  
 Chunder, Mr. N. C.  
 Das, Mr. B.  
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.  
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.  
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.  
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.  
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.  
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.  
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.  
 Ganga Singh, Mr.  
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.  
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
 Giri, Mr. V. V.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.  
 Hans Raj, Raizada.  
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.  
 Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury  
 Muhammad.  
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.  
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.  
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.

Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.  
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.  
 Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.  
 Khan Sahib, Dr.  
 Khare, Dr. N. B.  
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
 Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.  
 Laljee, Mr. Husenbhai Abdullahai.  
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.  
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
 Mody, Sir H. P.  
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.  
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi  
 Syed.  
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.  
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.  
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.  
 Sant, Singh, Sardar.  
 Santhanam, Mr. K.  
 Sham Lal, Mr.  
 Shaukat Ali, Maulana.  
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.  
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.  
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.  
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.  
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.  
 Varma, Mr. B. B.  
 Viesanji, Mr. Mathuradas.



## NOES—48.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.  
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.  
 Aikman, Mr. A.  
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.  
 Bansidhar, Rai Sahib.  
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
 Bhide, Mr. V. S.  
 Buss, Mr. L. C.  
 Chanda, Mr. A. K.  
 Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.  
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
 Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.  
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.  
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
 Hands, Mr. A. S.  
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
 James, Mr. F. E.  
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.  
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.  
 Lalit Chand, Thakur.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.

Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.  
 Mehta, Mr. S. L.  
 Menon, Mr. K. R.  
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.  
 Morgan, Mr. G.  
 Mudie, Mr. R. F.  
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.  
 Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.  
 Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.  
 Naydu, Diwan Bahadur B. V. Sri Hari Rao.  
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
 Rau, Sir Raghavendra.  
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
 Sale, Mr. J. F.  
 Sarma, Sir Srinivasa.  
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar Sir.  
 Spence, Mr. G. H.  
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.  
 Verma, Rai Sahib Hira Lal.  
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.  
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.  
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.  
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 10th March, 1937.