

10th 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	<b>THURSDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Statements laid on the Table . . .	912—16	Election of Members to certain Standing Committees . . .	1025
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	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—		Demand No. 6B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—		Construction of Locomotives in India— <i>concl'd.</i> . . .	1025—41
General Policy of Railway Administration . . .	921—4	Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	
Control of Expenditure . . .	941—5	Grievances of Third Class Railway Passengers . . .	1041—67
<b>WEDNESDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		Indianisation of Railway Services . . .	1067—80
Members Sworn . . .	961	<b>FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	961—64	Questions and Answers . . .	1081—92
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Unstarred Question and Answer . . .	1092
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>		Attempted Budget Leakage . . .	1092—93
Exclusion of Indians from the Wedgwood Committee . . .	965—1000		
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 Ser- vices . . . . .	1093—1113
Rail-Road Competition	1113—46
Demand No. 2—Audit . . . . .	1146
Demand No. 3—Miscel- laneous Expenditure . . . . .	1146
Demand No. 5—Pay- ments to Indian States and Companies . . . . .	1146
Demand No. 6-A.— Working Expenses— Maintenance of Structu- ral Works . . . . .	1146
Demand No. 6-B—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance and supply of Locomotive Power . . . . .	1147
Demand No. 6-C—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance of Carriage and Wagon Stock . . . . .	1148
Demand No. 6-D—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance of Ferry Stea- mers and Harbours . . . . .	1149
Demand No. 6-E—Work- ing Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Depart- ment . . . . .	1149
Demand No. 6-F— Working Expenses— Expenses of General Departments . . . . .	1150
Demand No. 6-G— Working Expenses— Miscellaneous Expens- es . . . . .	1150
Demand No. 6-H— Working Expenses— Electric Service De- partment . . . . .	1150

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 7— Working Expenses— Appropriation to Dep- reciation Fund . . . . .	1150
Demand No. 8—Inte- rest 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 Edu- cation, 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 In- dustries 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—Payments to other Government Departments, etc., on account of Services rendered . . .	1754
Demand No. 25—Audit . . .	1755
Demand No. 26—Administration of Justice . . .	1755
Demand No. 27—Police . . .	1755
Demand No. 28—Ports and Pilotage . . .	1755
Demand No. 29—Lighthouses and lightship . . .	1755
Demand No. 30—Survey of India . . .	1755
Demand No. 31—Meteorology . . .	1756
Demand No. 32—Geological Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 33—Botanical Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 34—Zoological Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 35—Archæology . . .	1756
Demand No. 36—Mines . . .	1756
Demand No. 37—Other Scientific Department . . .	1757
Demand No. 38—Education . . .	1757
Demand No. 39—Medical Services . . .	1757
Demand No. 40—Public Health . . .	1757
Demand No. 41—Agriculture . . .	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 Technology . . .	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—Broadcasting . . .	1759
Demand No. 50—Capital Outlay on Broadcasting . . .	1759
Demand No. 51—Indian Stores Department . . .	1759
Demand No. 52—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics . . .	1759
Demand No. 53—Census . . .	1759
Demand No. 54—Emigration—Internal . . .	1759
Demand No. 55—Emigration—External . . .	1760
Demand No. 56—Joint Stock Companies . . .	1760
Demand No. 57—Miscellaneous Departments . . .	1760
Demand No. 58—Currency . . .	1760
Demand No. 59—Mint . . .	1760
Demand No. 60—Civil Works . . .	1760
Demand No. 61—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions . . .	1761
Demand No. 62—Stationary and Printing . . .	1761
Demand No. 63—Miscellaneous . . .	1761
Demand No. 64—Grants-in-aid to Provincial Government . . .	1761
Demand No. 65—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments . . .	1761
Demand No. 66—Expenditure 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.

*Wednesday, 10th March, 1937.*

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

## MEMBERS SWORN.

Mr. Satyendra Nath Roy, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official); and

Mr. Noel James Roughton, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Central Provinces: Nominated Official).

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### EDUCATION EXPERT COMMITTEE.

607. \***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) Is it a fact that certain of the major provinces, such as Madras and Bombay, reported that they did not want any further investigation into the conditions of education in their Provinces, and that the recommendations already made by numerous committees have only to be given effect to?

(b) Is it a fact that the education expert committee did not go to more provinces than three and examine the conditions there? If so, why?

(c) Have any new recommendations of any major importance been made by this committee, which have not been thought of by any of the prior committees? If so, what are they and if not, what was the need for this committee?

(d) What is the total cost of this committee to the Government of India and what was the remuneration paid to each of the members of the committee?

(e) Were any of the Local Governments consulted before the committee was appointed, and did any Local Government suggest the appointment of a committee?

(f) What are the qualifications of the members of the committee for doing the work entrusted to them?

(g) Has any, and, if so, what, action been taken on the recommendations of this committee?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) and (e). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the answer given to parts (b) and (c) of Mr. S. Satyamurti's starred question No. 295 in this House on the 10th September, 1936. With the exception of the Government of Madras, all the Local Governments agreed to avail themselves of the expert advice in the reorganisation of the educational system.

(b) Yes, because of the shortness of the time at their disposal.

(c) and (g). The experts have not yet submitted their report.

(d) The total cost of the visit of the two experts is estimated at Rs. 39,000. One of them has been allowed an honorarium of £500 for the entire period of the visit and the other, pay at the rate of £1,500 per annum.

(f) One of the experts, Mr. A. Abbott, C.B.E., has recently retired from the post of Chief Inspector of Technical Schools under the Board of Education, England, while the other Mr. S. H. Wood, M.C., is the Director of Intelligence of the Board of Education and of Ministry of Health, England.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Did the move proceed from the Central Government or did the demand come from the provinces?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** It proceeded from the Central Advisory Board of Education. They made the recommendation first, and then the Local Governments were consulted by the Central Government, and, on the replies which I have already summarised, the Central Government proceeded to invite experts.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Was the original object to investigate the conditions of education in all the provinces or only in a few selected provinces?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** The intention was to study the conditions in all the provinces and to do it as quickly as possible. We could not get more than two experts, and, in the time available to them, it was not possible for them to visit all the provinces.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What is the meaning of "time available"?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** They could not stay here for more than six months.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** If they are not able to stay here for a sufficiently long time to finish the work for which they are brought, what is the idea in having them at all?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** The idea is to get their advice in regard to the provinces which they can visit.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Did the majority of the provinces consulted really want an expert committee?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** I do not know what my Honourable friend means by saying "really want". We did not force these experts upon them. When we asked the provinces, and when we explained the position to the provinces, they said they would welcome the visit of these experts.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will their advice be only as regards the provinces which they visit?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** I cannot say in advance of receiving their report, but we hope that the general principles which they may enunciate in their report will be of use even to provinces other than those which they have visited.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Do Government propose to bring in other experts to visit those provinces which these experts have not visited?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** The conditions have altered since last year. When we get their report, we will circularise individual Local Governments. If they want experts, we shall consider the matter.

**Mr. F. E. James:** I understand the Madras Government have declined the offer. Were any reasons given for their refusal?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** Yes, Sir. The reason given by the Madras Government was that they knew all about education, and they did not want any advice. (Laughter.)

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** May I know which of the provinces wanted this enquiry?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** With the exception of Madras, all the major provinces.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Were the provinces concerned asked to bear a proportionate cost of this enquiry?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** No, because the Government of India were advised by the Central Advisory Board of Education that the matter was of sufficient general importance for them to bear the cost themselves.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Are there any definite terms of reference?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** The terms of reference are set out in the Resolution of the Central Advisory Board of Education on the subject, of which I can supply a copy to the Honourable Member if he so desires.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** When does the Honourable Member expect the report of these experts?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** By the end of April.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Are they likely to interview any of the unemployed products of these Universities?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** They have visited some of the Provinces, and if they have interviewed any of the unemployed, they will mention that fact in their report.

**APPOINTMENT OF AN INDIAN TO WATCH THE INTERESTS OF INDIANS IN ZANZIBAR DURING DAWSON ENQUIRY.**

**608. \*Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) Do Government propose appointing an Indian to watch the interests of Indians in Zanzibar during the enquiry by Dawson?

(b) If so, when? If not, why not?

**Sir Gija Shankar Bajpai:** (a) and (b). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my replies on the 3rd March 1937 to supplementaries arising out of Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena's question No 476. For the reasons there given, the Government of India do not think it necessary to depute an officer to Zanzibar at present.

**EXPENDITURE ON MILITARY OPERATIONS ON THE FRONTIER AND CAUSES OF THE TROUBLE BY TRIBESMEN.**

**609. \*Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) What is the amount spent till now during the past six months on the military operations on the Frontier?

(b) What is the real cause of the trouble by the tribesmen, and are the raids due to want of employment and food?

(c) If so, have Government considered any schemes for providing the Frontier tribesmen with occupation and thus bringing them under control? If so, what, and if not, why not?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** (a) It is not possible to give exact figures for the last six months, but the expenditure during the Budget year has been approximately 12 lakhs.

(b) The present tribal unrest in Waziristan appears to be the result of religious excitement due to causes which have been explained in my reply to Mr. Satyamurti's question No. 563 and not to want of employment or food.

(c) Government have not only considered, but have implemented many scheme for providing occupation for the residents of tribal areas and also for improving their economic condition. It must, however, be realised that financial considerations impose some limit upon these undertakings and Government are also handicapped by the unwillingness of the tribesmen to place themselves under any form of Government administration.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** May I know in view of the recent vote of this House whether Government propose to have any change in their policy in regard to the Frontier?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** Government can hardly make a change in their policy within 24 hours.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Is it not a fact that religious excitement is entirely due to want of employment and food?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** No, I should say definitely not.



**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** May I know whether the advice of this House will be considered and whether there is a chance of the policy of Government being changed in this matter?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** Do you wish me to answer that, Sir? What is the information that my Honourable friend requires?

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** I want to know whether the vote of this House will be considered by the Executive Council and whether there is any chance of their policy being changed?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I am unable to prophesy.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** In view of the present economic condition of these tribesmen, why are they refusing the offer of help?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I have explained the reason why it is difficult to do as much as we should like to do for them, partly because financial considerations must be taken into account, and partly because the tribesmen themselves are extremely suspicious of any form of Government administration. It is surely clear that you cannot reorganise the whole economic situation of a tribal area without some kind of administration.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** May I know if the expenditure shown for this year is being spent every year on these tribal people?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I cannot possibly prophesy what the expenditure will be next year. I can only give facts for the past.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I am asking if it was spent in the last year?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** The Honourable Member has been told that for last year it was approximately 12 lakhs on military operations.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Has the Honourable Member convinced himself that religion is really not a cover for bad economics?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** That is a matter of opinion. Next question.

#### NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE TUNGABHADRA PROJECT.

**610. \*Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) At what stage are the negotiations regarding the Tungabhadra project in the Madras Presidency?

(b) Was a conference held in Delhi in November last as proposed by the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour?

(c) If so, what is the result of the conference?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to part (a) of the answer which I gave on the 9th February last to Professor N. G. Ranga's starred question No. 384.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** May I know at what stage the negotiations are at present? Have they not progressed since February last?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I referred the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Prof. Ranga's starred question which was asked as recently as the 9th February. I would suggest to my Honourable friend that he might look up that answer.

## MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

**Secretary of the Assembly:** Sir, the following Message has been received from the Council of State:

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State at its meeting held on the 9th March, 1937, agreed without any amendment to the following Bills which were passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 4th March, 1937, namely:

- (1) A Bill further to amend the Indian Tea Cess Act, 1903, for a certain purpose; and
- (2) A Bill further to amend the Indian Limitation Act, 1908, for a certain purpose."

## THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—continued.

### DEMAND NO. 21—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion of the Demands for Grants.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,40,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,40,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

### *Recognition of Trade Unions by Employers and Withdrawal of Recognition of Unions in Certain Cases.*

**Mr. V. V. Giri** (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhamadar Rural): Sir, I rise to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Department of Industries and Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The question of recognition of unions is a question of paramount importance to the workers' organisations in this country, because it affects the freedom of association of workers. So far as this question and other questions are concerned, they came up before the Royal Commission on Labour which was appointed about the 4th March, 1929 and which finished its deliberations about the 14th March, 1931. My feeling is that, so far as this country is concerned, Royal Commissions have been associated with Royal omissions and that Commissions are appointed merely to tide over the difficulties of the moment. At any rate, so far as the question of recognition and allied questions like the appointment of a joint standing machinery are concerned, the Government of India have not carried out either in spirit or in letter the recommendations, the very moderate recommendations, made by the Royal Commission on Labour. I submit that if this right of recognition of trade unions had been conceded and the employers had used that weapon for the best interests of the workers, many a trade dispute in this country would not have happened. I desire for the information of the House to quote the relevant recommendations as briefly as possible, with reference to the question of recognition, and they will be found at pages 504-505 of the Chapter containing the recommendations made by that Commission. Recommendation No. 145 says:

"A more generous policy in respect of recognition of trade unions is desirable."

Recommendation No. 146 says:

"A stage has been reached in the development of some unions where facilities might with advantage be conceded."

Regarding railways and railway unions, it was suggested in Recommendation No. 147 that a joint standing machinery should be established. It was also suggested that there should be a Joint Standing Central Board representing the Railwaymen's Federation and the Railway Conference Association as represented by the Agents, five of each to sit together from time to time to discuss matters relating to the grievances of the workers, and whenever disputes arose, that such disputes be brought forward before the Standing Central Board. If it was felt by the parties that the dispute could not be settled by the Central Board, the dispute could be referred to an appellate authority which was called the Tribunal, represented by five members of the Railwaymen's Federation, five of the Agents and five outsiders unconnected with the industry. Therefore, if many a dispute occurred between the year 1931 after the Commission left India and 1937, I am bound to say that it was because the spirit and letter of the recommendations have not been carried out, it was because the Joint Standing Machinery was not introduced. Many a dispute occurred in India, many workers have lost their wages through strikes and many workers have been discharged by way of victimisation consequent on strikes. To illustrate this point, I would like to place before the House the example of the Bengal Nagpur Railway dispute that occurred very recently. Very nearly 40,000 workers were involved and consequently their families. Among those workers every community, every race, every caste and every creed in India was represented. Not only that. That strike had a weary length of sixty days and a long march of 3,500 miles comprising five provinces of India. Speaking on that question, I am bound to say that the workers are thankful for the efforts made by both my Honourable friends, Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan and Sir Frank Noyce, the way in which they

[Mr. V. V. Giri.]

tried to approach this dispute and help us in its termination. But, Sir, I am bound to feel and feel very strongly, along with my esteemed Leader, that if the matter had been tackled earlier or even the provisions of the innocuous Trade Disputes Act had been put into effect earlier during the dispute, I am sure, the dispute would have ended earlier. At any rate, I can say without any fear of contradiction that if the Joint Standing Machinery proposed by the Whitley Commission on Labour had been established long ago, instead of mere discussions to disgust between the All-India Railwaymen's Federation and the Railway Board, I am almost certain from the little experience I have got of trade unionism in this country that this dispute and other disputes of a similar character would not have occurred, and, therefore, I feel some responsibility attaches to the Government in not having carried out the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour. I do not desire to get into the merits of the dispute or the causes that led to the dispute and I entirely agree with the Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan that we need not enter into this fact at the present moment or at any rate at present. I am a believer in burying the hatchet after the trade dispute has occurred. I am a believer in the spirit of "forgive and forget" after the trade dispute has been settled, and in fact, on the 10th February, in pursuance of the terms of settlement arrived at between the President of the Union and the Agent of the Railway by his communication, dated the 6th February, I called off the strike on behalf of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union at Kharagpur. I stated in my speech that the strike was not intended to humiliate either the administration, the employers or its personnel. The strike was intended merely to place before the employer certain grievances when all other attempts at compromise had failed. Therefore, I wanted the workers to resume in a most peaceful manner and show the spirit of discipline which they showed all along the strike. I may take the opportunity of referring to the conduct of the strike from the point of view of the wonderful discipline, the wonderful solidarity and the wonderful spirit of non-violence displayed during the weary period of sixty days. Sir, the Agent of the Railway took advantage of the fact that the Union had power to call off the strike. He took advantage of that power, came to an agreement with us and as soon as the strike was over, he would not allow the grass to grow under his feet but at the earliest possible opportunity declared that the recognition of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Union is withdrawn. I beg leave of you to read what he has stated when he withdrew the recognition of the Union. In Gazette No. 9, dated Saturday, the 27th February 1937, it has been stated as follows:

"In view of the action taken by responsible representatives of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union during the last eight months and the attitude adopted by the Union as a whole in its dealing with events which culminated in the General Strike, I have again considered my letter No. B-19892, dated 13th October, 1936, to the President of the Union and my conversation with him on the 19th October, 1936, regarding withdrawal of official recognition. From the facts before me, it is clear that this Administration can have no confidence in the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union as at present constituted and administered, and in these circumstances official recognition is hereby withdrawn."

Mr. Jarrad, the Agent of the Railway, thought that after the strike had been called off he could easily take advantage of it and he therefore intimated the fact that the recognition had been withdrawn. I could have

understood this fact if it happened when the negotiations went on with the help of the two Honourable gentlemen opposite between myself and Mr. Jarrad and at the time he wrote the final letter he could have made them understand or made me understand by a communication sent to me that so far as he was concerned after the calling off of the strike, the withdrawal of the recognition would also take place. If he had said that, we would not have said, I at any rate would not have said, that it was hitting below the belt or it was nothing more and nothing less than a backdoor method on the part of the administration. Then, the Union would have decided to call off or continue the strike. I am, therefore, bound to question the *bona fides* of an Agent, a responsible officer of a big administration, in doing acts which might have a tendency to lead to further strife in the railway. After all, it is the tax-payers that are the owners of this railway as well as other railways and the tax-payers and therefore the Government of India are responsible to see to the good administration of the railway. All along the dispute was conducted on the basis that there were two parties. No doubt the Agent of the Railway tried to ignore the Union during the course of the dispute when he issued a communiqué, dated the 17th January. He issued that communiqué not after consulting the Union about the settlement which he wanted at that time but he issued the communication straight to the workers offering certain terms in which he characterised the leaders of the Union and others as unscrupulous agitators but the workers who had known the value of trade unionism would not touch those terms with a pair of tongs, firstly because those terms were most unsatisfactory, secondly because there was not the recognition of the trade union by the employers as a party in the dispute. Then, on the 22nd, it was very wise and good of him, he thought that I should meet him and he should meet me. On the 22nd January I met him in Calcutta regarding the terms of settlement. There also the terms were not satisfactory because while he conceded certain points he wanted somehow or other to crush the spirit of trade-unionism and to victimise certain leading workers on the railway by the implications that he stated in his communiqué, dated the 23rd January:

"The Agent reserves to himself the right to examine a limited number of cases regarding men whose re-employment is doubtful and this will be an understanding that the Agent is personally satisfied that their re-employment would be clearly undesirable in the interests of both the Administration and the peace of the community."

I do not know when the Honourable the Home Member delegated the powers of law and order to the Agent of the Bengal Nagpur Railway, unless it is understood that these powers would be delegated hereafter to the Statutory Railway Board when it comes into operation. Of course, these terms could not be gulped by any trade union of standing and therefore the Trade Union as well as the workers resisted these terms. Thanks to the intervention of the two Honourable Members opposite—and we are thankful for the help rendered—we were able to get over that difficulty and about the 6th February the matters were settled in an amicable way but the Agent was not satisfied. He felt that he should humiliate the workers and therefore in a communiqué, dated the 11th February after my communiqué, dated the 10th was published calling off the strike he stated:

"It will be seen that from the 17th January, 1937, at least, the 27 cooly mechanics and the 1,100 men who had been dismissed had already been given all that they could possibly expect and which has now been accepted by the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union. The Agent gave an interview to Mr. Giri on the 22nd January when he explained the reasons why it was impossible for him

[Mr. V. V. Giri.]

to reinstate all the 1,100 men immediately, Mr. Giri however proceeded to Delhi and kept the men away from work until the 11th February by giving them the impression that he would obtain better terms for them than those offered by the Agent."

I would like to ask the two Honourable Members opposite whether better terms were secured or worse terms or the same terms. Agents of the Administration started the evil propaganda amongst the workers that these "unscrupulous agitators" were going about the country creating a wrong impression. I feel that the facts would not justify the making of such allegations. On the other hand, negotiations about the dispute were being carried on on the 25th January. There were definite negotiations going on between me on the one hand and the Agent on the other, and on the 27th the Agent issues a communiqué, dated the 27th January, when he states as follows, and which statement is not borne out by the facts:

"Statements have appeared in the press during the last few days which will give the impression that negotiations are proceeding between the Administration of the Bengal Nagpur Railway and the President of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union in connection with the terms of settlement of the strike. The Agent desires to make it clear that no such negotiations have taken place since he granted an interview to Mr. Giri on the 22nd January."

I refer to all these matters only to show the intention behind the back of the Agent, which was and continues to be this, namely, that he desires the workers to understand that they gained nothing by the strike. He desires the workers to understand that to believe in the trade union movement is a dangerous and fruitless thing; that is at the back of the mind of the Agent of this Railway. Sir, I would very gladly agree to the Agent's idea of humiliation: provided sixty days' wages are paid to the workers, but I am not prepared really to agree to the sacrifice of the trade union movement of the country rather than accept crores and crores of rupees that may be presented to the workers by Mr. Jerrad, the Agent.

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

**Mr. V. V. Giri:** Sir, for want of time I will just read out the further information I have got as to how the Agent is going back upon the terms of settlement. These are the complaints that have been sent forward to me by the Union:

"The Union has come to understand definitely that the Railway Authorities are continuing to employ men who have been entertained as black legs during the strike and they are retained in the Company's service to the detriment of those who have gone on strike. Further, while the Administration has stated that fifty men were not taken in because there were no vacancies, the Administration's *mala fides* is proved by the fact that there are temporary men working (who were engaged during the strike), whose places could have been given to these fifty men.

The Union is further informed that some strikers who offered themselves for duty before 15th February, 1937, were not taken in.

"There are definite complaints that some of the strikers are being harassed in different ways by their superiors, thus creating opportunities for the Railway Administration to get rid of them.

The Administration is trying to frighten the workers by creating surpluses on the one hand and on the other retaining temporary staff engaged during strike permanently, vacancies for whom do not exist.

Further, the Union is informed that promotions of junior non-strikers were made to higher grades which will have the effect of debarring the strikers for some years from their legitimate promotions which in the normal course they would have got."

Further, transfers of strikers have been made immediately after the strike was called off, and some who were transferred just on the eve of the strike were not sent back to their original places and I strongly feel that the spirit contained in the Agent's assurance on the 22nd of January *viz.*, in regard to men on strike who resume work, there will be no direct or indirect action taken which would be to their disadvantage in respect of increments or promotions and they will be permitted to join the offices held by them before the strike, without let or hindrance, etc., has not been carried out. Not only did he begin to victimise the men, but the administration has recently served notice of discharge on Mr. Suryanarayana, Trustee and Treasurer of the Union and a leader thereof. I, therefore, want to bring it to the notice of Honourable Members how things have gone on, and I desire to say that the spirit of the settlement arrived at is not being carried out. (Applause.)

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

"That the demand under the head 'Department of Industries and Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, my reply to the Honourable Member who has just spoken will be very brief indeed. In the first place, I would call the attention of the House to the announcement that you, Sir, made in regard to the order in which the demands for grants relating to the general budget would be taken up in this House. You stated, Sir, that "Monday, the 8th of March and Tuesday, the 9th of March have been allotted to the Congress Party for moving their three cut motions relating to Indians Overseas, Frontier Policy, and Executive Council—General Administration. The Congress Nationalist Party will take the whole of Wednesday, the 10th March, for moving their motion regarding the repressive policy of the Government". You will observe that nothing whatever has been said in that announcement in regard to any cut motion with reference to the affairs of the Bengal Nagpur Railway.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to have taken his objection when the motion was moved.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: I might have done so, Sir, but I was going to explain that it was not until I entered this House that I knew that a cut motion on this subject was being moved at all and it was not until the Honourable Member got up that I knew that the cut related to my Department. I fully admit that I ought to have taken objection at the time, but I was not quick enough and, in any case, I thought it was possible that Mr. Giri would develop his subject in a manner that would show its special relationship to my Department. I do think, Sir, that he has hardly treated me in this matter with the courtesy I should have expected from him. His main theme has been the withdrawal by the Bengal Nagpur Railway authorities of recognition of the labour union. I have obviously had no time to ascertain the facts, and I am, therefore, not in a position to reply to him. He had sent me a letter on this subject which is engaging my careful attention. I can say no more than that all that he has said this morning will continue to receive my careful attention, that my Honourable colleague, the Railway Member, and I realise that the state of affairs

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

existing on that railway at the moment is not altogether satisfactory and that we are prepared to find out exactly what has happened and to take such action as may seem to us necessary. I am glad to be able to inform my Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, my Honourable colleague tells me that I can count on his co-operation. I trust that this assurance will satisfy him and that he will agree that no useful purpose would be served by continuing this discussion.

**Mr. V. V. Giri:** On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I may say that I only took the Bengal Nagpur Railway as an example. I wanted to refer to the general question of recognition of trade unions, and I thought that it was relevant for me to bring this fact to notice, as I did but

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would point out that to-day it was the Congress Nationalist Party that was to move their cuts, and, therefore, the Member of the Government could not be prepared to deal with any cut moved by the Congress Party, and, besides, the Honourable Member certainly had no notice of this motion that has been just moved.

**Mr. V. V. Giri:** In view of what has been stated, Sir, I ask your leave to withdraw my motion.

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

#### DEMAND No. 12.—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—*concl'd.*

##### *Policy of Repression.*

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta** (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I move:

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

My object, Sir, is to discuss the repressive policy of the Government, and to censure the Government for their policy of repression, ruthless repression, during the year 1936-37. That was a normal period. There was no Civil Disobedience Movement, and there was no terrorism. During those normal times, repression of all kinds was carried on in all the provinces against all kinds of activities—even the province of Captain Lal Chand was not excepted. Now, Sir, my complaint is that that policy of repression was directed against the freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of association and the freedom of all legitimate activities. My charge-sheet is a pretty long one. It contains more than three counts, which is the maximum number allowed in the trial of a criminal in a Court.

My first count is that the repressive and emergency laws and measures enacted for the purpose of combating the Civil Disobedience Movement and the terrorist movement have been made permanent and have not yet been repealed. My second count is that about 2,000 youngmen are being still detained in jail and elsewhere without any trial. My third count is that new externment and new internment is going on. In fact, in my province of Bengal, externment and internment are the order of the day even during the year 1936. Then, Sir, the ban on individuals, ban on groups, ban on associations and organisations still continues. Organisations, not previously under ban, are also being banned. Then, Sir, property seized during the Civil Disobedience Movement is not being returned. The next count



in my charge-sheet and a very serious count is that the press is being almost gagged. Then, Sir, people are being prosecuted for sedition on most flimsy grounds. There was interference during the recent elections, and one of my greatest complaints is that there was repression and interference with regard to the Independence Day Resolution and pledge. Then, Sir, there was arrest on a very extensive scale. Only the other day, 42 persons, including two unmarried girls, were arrested, because some Communist literature was found with them. These are the different counts, and it will not be possible for me to develop them during the short time at my disposal. I shall, however, try to amplify one or two points.

So far as the detenus are concerned, the policy of the Government as declared on the floor of this House by the Honourable the Home Member was that they would be released when there was an improvement in the general situation with regard to terrorism. My case is that according to the admission of the Honourable the Home Member and according to the admission of the Bengal Government, as contained in their administration reports, the position has improved with regard to the terrorism ever since 1932. The time at my disposal will not permit me to go into details, but I make the statement with the fullest responsibility that, according to the administration report of the Bengal Government, things have improved ever since the end of 1932. We are told that there was a decided improvement in the year 1932, and that a substantial decrease in the terrorist crime has taken place. This happened five years ago. In 1933, it was said that the general situation was decidedly improved and that there was a definite reason for believing that the terrorist groups had been in a large measure disorganised. Then, it is again repeated in 1934 that the situation has improved. In 1935, we have been told, there was not a single terrorist outrage. It is further added that the events of the year 1935 have shown that the main onrush of the terrorist attack, which began in 1930, has been broken. So far as 1936 is concerned, there is no trouble, no complaint. Therefore, it comes to this that during all these years there has been neither Civil Disobedience Movement nor terrorist movement and the country has been passing through normal times. This has been the position according to Government's own version.

Now, Sir, in view of the assurance given by the Government, that these detenus would be released when the situation improved, a question was asked in this Session of the Assembly on the 25th of January as to whether the Government, in view of the improved position, were thinking of releasing the political prisoners. The answer given was that, although the situation had improved, there was still just the possibility of the recrudescence of the movement if these prisoners were released. Now, Sir, that is a sort of argument which it is very difficult to meet. That is an argument which can be applied at all times and under all circumstances. The practical and necessary implication of that argument is that these people will undergo a sort of transportation for life, because there will never come a time when these arguments cannot be applied. The Government's formula is this that although the situation is all right at present, there is just the possibility of recrudescence in the future. In other words, the formula is this: once a detenu, always a detenu—a detenu till the doomsday. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, I feel justified in saying this that the former plea that these political prisoners would be released when the situation improved was not a *bona fide* plea, it was not an honest plea, it was a mere

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

camouflage. May I say that that was the false plea of a hopeless offender? Now, Sir, the beauty of the whole situation is this. It is admitted that there is no terrorist outrage, and still Government must have an Act for the suppression of the terrorist outrages.

Now, Sir, as regards the number of detenus, we have been told that their number in jails and detention camps was as follows:

July, 1934—1,377.

July, 1935—1,471.

July, 1936—1,281.

The figures are very remarkable, because, whereas, on the one hand we have been assured that the situation has steadily improved and there has been no outrage in 1935, still we find that a hundred more detenus came into existence in 1935.

Mr. Suryya Kumar Sen (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Do they include the home internees and village internees?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Is the Honourable Member referring to detenus in jails and camps?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: I have read the answer of the Honourable Sir Henry Craik, and it says this: the number of detenus in jails and detention camps, was as follows: the village and home internees are not here.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There must be some mistake. There has been a steady decline in the number of detenus in jails and camps since 1935.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: I am not now speaking of the number subsequent to 1935. The figure of 1935, as compared with the figure of 1934, shows an increase of about 100 in 1935.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Why not go on to later years?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: The point I am now making is this that whereas we had the assurance of the Honourable the Home Member that things had improved steadily and that there was no outrage in 1935, still, as a matter of fact, we find that there were 100 more new people taken as detenus in 1935.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The figure of 100 is certainly incorrect. There was no such increase according to my figures.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: I am sorry I cannot give way any more as my time is short. I am merely quoting the figures given by the Honourable the Home Member himself.

Now, Sir, at the present moment, including the home interneers, the number is still about 2,000. I am not certain about this figure, but it will be somewhere there. The result of this prolonged internment has ended in three suicides among these detenus in quick succession a few months ago. As regards the number, Sir, we find from a statement by Sir Robert Reid in the Bengal Legislative Council that the number under detention in Bengal is 2,350. In the Punjab, it is 25. We find from a statement made in the Bengal Council that during the last two years five detenus committed suicide.

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra** (Presidency Division; Non-Muhammadan Rural): Do you refer to the statement of the Home Member of the Bengal Council?

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** Yes, I rely on the statement of the Home Member of Bengal, who stated that five committed suicide and two went mad during the last two years. This is the result of prolonged detention of these people during these normal times.

Now, Sir, a request was made that all these detenus should be released on the eve of the Coronation and on the eve of the inauguration of the new Constitution, but we got an emphatic "No" from the Honourable the Home Member. Therefore, I am entitled to say that this year of 1936 is a year of depression. Why on earth are you perpetuating the emergency measures in spite of this improvement? Emergency legislation was intended to meet the Civil Disobedience Movement and the terrorist movement, and it is now about five years, according to your own admission, that the situation has improved, therefore, I ask why on earth do you want to keep these men in detention without trial indefinitely? Why are these so many beneficent organisations like the Congress Committees and others still under ban? Why have you not lifted the ban? There is one very outstanding act of repression during the year, and that relates to the Independence Day Resolution and pledge. It has been described by Government order that it is definitely a seditious document. What is this Independence Day Resolution after all? It is merely a *verbatim* reproduction of the Congress Resolution for Purna Swaraj. There is one point on which I should like to have an answer from the Honourable the Home Member. These Independent Day celebrations have been going on even during the Civil Disobedience Movement days, it was there even before the Civil Disobedience Movement days; that pledge was being read all through right up to 1936. Why on earth then should there be this new act of repression in 1937, particularly when, even according to your own admission, there is no Civil Disobedience Movement or terrorist movement in the country? One of my friends suggests elections. Possibly this policy of repression is due to elections as a challenge to the Congress.

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

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** This reminds me of a certain observation of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. He says in his book, "The Government of India", the following:

"Repression is the last chapter in the history of Bureaucracy. They pass away like an old monarch driven from his throne, hurling accusation of sedition against his approaching successor."

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

This is obviously the reason why the Bureaucracy had hurled accusations of sedition against the Congress people whom they look upon as their approaching successors.

Now, Sir, within the two minutes at my disposal, I shall try to develop one point. So far as this pledge is concerned, Congress offices and newspapers offices were searched and raided; search warrants were issued, I think, even for the search of the house of my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

**Mr. M. S. Aney** (Berar Representative): Was he searched personally?

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** There was no Congress Resolution in his pocket, but there was a suspicion that it was lying in his house. The *Hindustan Times* was taken away. The press of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* was searched; any number of arrests were made for reading the Resolution in public meetings. There were prosecutions launched under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Indian Penal Code against those who read the Congress Resolutions on the Independence Day. Sir, can anybody deny, in view of all these facts, that this year there was greater repression than even in the previous year? I want an answer to this from the Honourable the Home Member.

Then, Sir, about the freedom of the press, it is practically a myth and mockery now. In Bengal, the press officer sits like a nightmare on the breast of the whole press of Bengal daily interfering with the views and the news and even about mode of display of the news,—he has, in fact, become the editor-in-chief of the whole press. (An Honourable Member: "Editor-General of Bengal".) Yes, that would be more accurate. Now, Sir, the Bengal Security Act of 1932 was described as a "heavy roller" by one of the former Governors, and yet we are told that new powers had been given under this Act only in September last.

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

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** I shall finish in two minutes.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot allow any more time to the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** Very well, Sir. Therefore, my charge against the Government is that there was greater repression in 1936 than even in the preceding two or three years. 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."

**Mr. S. N. Roy** (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, the speech of the Honourable the Mover of the cut has covered a  
12 NOON. very wide field. My intervention in the debate is for the purpose merely of dealing with one aspect of the charge-sheet, as he called it, that he has produced against Government; and that aspect is the aspect

which deals with the question of detenus in Bengal. The Honourable Member said that the position in regard to the detenus had steadily improved in Bengal since 1932. That is not quite correct, because for many years the detenu position fluctuated, an improvement was followed by deterioration—and this was because there had been no real change in mentality.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** I quoted the very words of the Honourable Sir Henry Craik and of the Bengal Government.

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** That may be; I am trying to give the Honourable Member the position as I know it.

As I said, the situation did not remain steady. It is perfectly true that the period 1930 to 1932 was the worst period in the history of the last phase of terrorism in Bengal, and that after 1932 the position began to improve somewhat. But there were set-backs. At the beginning of 1934, Honourable Members will remember, there was an outrage at Chittagong which had very wide ramifications. Later, in 1934, there was an attempt on the life of Sir John Anderson. In 1933, again, in September, there was the murder of Mr. Burge in Midnapore. It is, therefore, incorrect to say that since 1932 there was a steady improvement.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Their official information is incorrect.

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** I do not know to what official information the Honourable Member is referring.

**An Honourable Member:** Administration Report.

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** I do not want to take up the time of the House by dealing with that, because I do not know what actually he is referring to. Anyway, the situation is that since 1934 there has been a considerable and fairly steady improvement in the situation. And I can assure the House from my knowledge of what the Government of Bengal have been doing, because I was for a part of the time associated with those who had to deal with this problem, that since the end of 1934 the attention of the Government of Bengal has been steadily and continuously devoted to the possibility of releasing these detenus in as large numbers as can be done consistently with public safety. Now, in considering the question of release, a fact that has to be borne in mind is that the Government of Bengal have had very large experience of terrorist activity. Terrorism began in Bengal as long ago as 1908, and, during the 30 years that have elapsed since, more than once releases have been made on a widespread scale and the Government of Bengal have had more than one occasion of judging the results of such releases. The problem, therefore, in the light of the experience which they have had in the past, which the Bengal Government had to solve, was how to release these detenus consistently with public safety. One of the things, of course, which they had to look at was the public attitude towards terrorism. Until the beginning of 1934, as I said, that attitude had not improved sufficiently to enable Government to embark on a policy of releases with any confidence. But fortunately during 1934,—and I may say incidentally in this connection that the attack on Sir John Anderson had a great deal to do to bring about a revulsion of feeling towards these terrorists, which is an instance of how good comes out of evil,—from 1934 public attitude has definitely and

[Mr. S. N. Roy.]

consistently changed towards terrorism. The Government of Bengal had another difficulty. They felt, from the experience they had in past years, that if they released large numbers of these detenus before they were able to break up the organisations with which they were connected, it was quite likely that many of them without actually intending to go back to terrorism would be drawn back into it. Therefore, simultaneously with release they had to consider how to break up these organisations. And I may say that much of this criticism about repression that we hear of is due to the steps that Government were forced to take in order to break up the organisations to which these boys belong.

The third factor that the Government of Bengal had to take into consideration was how to provide opportunities for many of these boys whose education had been interrupted to earn a living after they came out of their detention camps.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** Which kind of detenus is the Honourable Member referring to?

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** I am talking of all kinds of detenus. Time will not permit me to explain how the whole system is run. But I am talking of every kind of detenu. Naturally there are shorter forms of detention, and when the scheme was finally adopted, people who were under the lesser forms of restriction were given an opportunity first. I shall come to that later. I was saying that the Government of Bengal felt it incumbent on them to consider how best to provide opportunities for these detenus whom they were going to release, to earn their living. They, therefore, decided that it was necessary to undertake some form of training in agriculture and in industries. And apart from the releases which were taking place during the year as a result of consultations with parents,—I may incidentally state that on my last leave in England, I saw, at the request of their parents, two detenus whom I had myself been instrumental in releasing,—the Government of Bengal started these industrial camps and agricultural camps. One large agricultural camp and three industrial centres were opened. The idea was that they were to have training there for a period under the supervision of the Department of Industries, and, thereafter, they were to be provided with means to set up on their own, and so gradually by passing a large number of detenus through this sieve conditions could be stabilised. Honourable Members will realise that the immediate and simultaneous release of large numbers of these detenus is fraught, and has been shown by experience to be fraught, with grave consequences. Therefore, it was desirable that as far as possible the pace of release should be so regulated that those released could be absorbed in the normal life of society; and I claim, Sir, that that policy has, since the beginning of 1935, been steadily pursued. I am not conversant with the latest figures, nor have I taken the opportunity of studying them, but my recollection is that about 140 of them are now under training, and about a similar number have passed through this training and have now been set up or are in the process of being set up on their own as industrialist or agriculturist. I claim that this is a policy which has met with the enthusiastic support of the public in Bengal, and that in the Bengal Legislative Council very little is heard of the kind of criticism that my Honourable friend, Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta, has voiced in this place . . .

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** You know the reason.

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** So far as legislation is concerned, my Honourable friend said that repressive legislation and legislation which was intended to deal with the Civil Disobedience Movement still remained on the Statute-book. May I point out that this legislation to which my Honourable friend refers was passed by the Bengal Legislative Council, with large majorities. (Interruptions.) It may be so: Honourable Members may have their own opinion, but the fact remains that the Legislature of the province passed them by large majorities. (Interruptions.)

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

**Mr. S. N. Roy:** I do suggest that certainly from the 1st of April next, it may be regarded as improper interference with the Provincial Autonomy for the Central Legislature to attempt to pass any censure on the Central Government for legislation of this character for which they are not responsible and which is the sole responsibility of the Provincial Legislature.

In conclusion, I would ask Honourable Members to remember that this question of detenus is a question to which a tremendous amount of attention and a good deal of anxious and careful thought has been devoted in Bengal. To characterise the Bengal Government's policy in this matter as repressive is, I think, a misuse of terms. The declared object of this movement was the subversion of Government by violence. That object Government were bound to prevent, as every Government is bound to prevent, as the future Government of my Honourable friends opposite will be bound to prevent. At the same time, I do want Honourable Members opposite to believe that Government are doing their very best with every desire to help those youths, to set them on their feet again as honourable members of the society.

**Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya** (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is really interesting for me to hear a Bengal official coming to advocate the cause of the repressive policy that the Government of Bengal have been carrying on since 1908. I wonder that there can be any honest gentleman, an Indian, who can advocate that policy of repression. Just as a man cannot say that dishonesty is the best policy in place of the saying that honesty is the best policy similarly no man with commonsense will have the courage to say and support that a Government using repressive policy is a Government worth the name. Throughout the world, oppressors and tyrants have tried their level best to repress the legitimate aspirations of nations. There was a time in Italy when any man loitering alone was a suspect; and really Mazzini was taken to task for his solitary cogitation; and what was the result? Austria could not keep Italy. England tried her best to keep down America by repression: England could not keep America; and today Ireland is free, Egypt is free; and so the policy of repression has failed all over the world. The history of Russia is there; one day the people said that there shall be no repression, and Czarism was finished. In the same way, this policy of repression is bound to fail and it has failed already. This policy of repression was carried on simply to keep down the Congress movement, and the reply has been given. My personal experience this year in Midnapore has proved to the hilt how this policy has absolutely failed. I

[Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya.]

wired to the Honourable the Home Member from Midnapore when I was carrying on a campaign on behalf of the Congress, and from Contai, from Tamluk and Midnapore I had the experience that magistrates, sub-divisional officers, chowkidars, presidents of union boards and *panchayats* and all were arrayed against the Congress candidate: durbars were being held where the speeches of the District Magistrate himself were made directly against the Congress candidates in elections; and when I wired for an assurance to the Honourable the Home Member that the attitude of the Government should be openly declared, I am given to understand that nothing was done. What do the results show? The results show that the gentleman who stood against the Congress forfeited his security deposit, and Kumar Devendra Lall Khan, who had almost left Midnapore and lived in Calcutta, had secured 75,000 votes, while his opponent got only 5,000—thanks to this policy of repression. You may ask, why do you want to get rid of this? Sir, we want to get rid of this, because it cannot be tolerated by men.

**An Honourable Member:** It has helped you.

**Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** It had helped Ireland, it had helped Egypt, and it will help India too no doubt. ("Hear, hear" from Congress Party Benches.) But, Sir, it is unmanly, it is cowardly, and, therefore, we do not want to remain in a Legislature, nor do we want to be a party in a Legislature, which passes these cowardly laws. Sir, the laws that have been maintained in the Statute-book since 1804 are a slur on the nation, and it is high time that the Government of India repealed those laws. It is stated that after the introduction of Provincial Autonomy all these powers would be transferred to Indians, and it would be impossible to keep these laws on the Statute-book then. Sir, law is the Command of God, law is sacred, law is blessed, and it represents the will of the people, it represents the voice of the people, it is the voice of God, expressed through nature and the voice of the people. In law, there is inherent sanctity, there is utility in law. Now, under what categories do these laws fall? What is the use of these laws? Where is the sanctity about them? Sir, how long will this Government keep these 350 millions of people down by force? That is the question which I place before this House.

Then, Sir, regarding the detenus, it is true that some have been released under certain conditions. I think even more than those who are released are again taken in, not exactly as detenus, but in other ways. In the name of Socialism, in the name of possessing seditious or proscribed literature, in the name of one's connection with some suspicious movements like Communism, many youngmen are trapped every day, and if you will obtain facts from the Bengal Government, you will be able to see how many youngmen have been thrown into prison on these counts.

As regards the detenus, Sir, some have been in jail for over 21 years, since 1915 (*An Honourable Member:* "Shame"), and still they are detenus. Is it contended that these people should remain suspects all their life? Can any sane Government think of keeping men for 21 years in jail without trial? Have not the Government the courage to bring them before the Courts? Don't they respect their own Courts? Don't they respect their own Criminal Procedure Code? Don't they trust their



own judges? They don't give these people a chance to vindicate their character or to prove their innocence; still Government say that they are justified in keeping these people in jail. Sir, one of these men died on the 6th of February last about whom I put a question,—I refer to Satkari Banerjee. He was in jail for 21 years. There are men whom I am familiar with who are kept in prison for long periods, and I can say they are fit to be administrators of countries, they are fit to be leaders of armies, they are fit to be leaders of nations, and yet only on mere suspicion this Government want to keep them down. And, Sir, it is a shame that the will of 350 millions of India cannot bring those people out of the jails. Sir, we are feeling helpless,—the more helpless we feel, the greater is our indignation. Sir, Mahatma Gandhi, who has introduced the non-violence movement, has really saved the British Government in this country and most of our youngmen from being clapped in jails as suspects. It is not the repressive laws that have saved the Government, it is not the repressive laws that have kept these youngmen under control and non-violent. They are still thinking and considering what they should do now. In spite of this, if Government continue their repressive policy, I am afraid they will not succeed in keeping these people down for long. Government perhaps think that they can kill the movement by confining young people in jails all their life. Sir, they are mistaken. No law can prevent a man from doing violence to others when he does not care for his own life. Is it contended that when people are kept in jails for 21 years without trial, their sons and other relatives will take all this treatment quietly? Will they all remain non-violent? Sir, the policy that the Government are pursuing is a mistaken policy. The British Government have always committed this mistake in their history, they have always adopted the policy of rabbles who insist on their rights and no wise man's advice is ever accepted by them at any time, and they will have to pay the penalty for it as they paid in the past. Sir, I can say without the least fear of contradiction that there are thousands of families today in Bengal who have been rendered homeless and destitute simply on account of the policy of Government in putting youngmen into jails without giving them a chance to vindicate their character. How many mothers are there who have been turned into beggars? How many children have gone without education simply because their guardians, father or elder brothers, have been put in jails . . .

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

**Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** Sir, this question makes my blood boil. (*Some Honourable Members:* "It makes everybody's blood boil") Really speaking, no gentleman can approve of this policy of repression, and it is a disgrace that those people who come forward to support the repressive policy of the Government are Bengal people. I see that they are paid for it. I know, Sir, that from the 1st of April the colour of the Government will change. I know they have kept all the safeguards, they have kept law and order in their own hands fundamentally, and those gentlemen who will take the portfolio of law and order will find themselves at sea. At present people who are paid may support this repressive policy, but when the Ministers go in as elected Members, their position will be quite different. They will have to accept the verdict of the people; there will be constant tussle, and they will have to go to the Governor very often, what would they do?

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

**Mr. Amarendra Nath Chhattopadhyaya**: As my time is up, I, therefore, ask everybody here, as I asked last year and the year before, to vote for this motion and censure the Government on their insistence on continuing the repressive policy.

**Mr. N. V. Gadgil** (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by the Deputy President and the Deputy Leader of the Nationalist Party. In doing so, I hope to point out to the House that the policy of repression which is alleged to have been abandoned has not been abandoned in reality and in substance. Taking first the organisations that were banned in the year 1930-31, many of them still continue to remain under the same ban. Congress Committees in the North-West Frontier Province are still under the ban. Similarly, educational institutions like the Prem Maha Vidyalaya in the United Provinces continue to be banned. Associations which were primarily meant for the uplift of women in the Bombay Presidency and particularly in Poona, such as Mahila Mandal and Sut Committee, where members interested themselves primarily in kitchen problems, still continue to be banned. There are several other institutions from different provinces which, in fairness, according to the conciliatory policy of Government, ought to be de-notified. It is no use merely saying that Government are not following a policy of repression when there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of press and no freedom of association. Confining myself to my own province, take the working of the press law. In Poona alone, security has been demanded from three papers in the course of the last year—namely, *Sakal*, *Trikal*, and *Loka Sakti*, the official organ of the Congress Party,—and only a month ago, the *Yugantar*, a socialist paper from Ahmednagar, has also been asked to deposit an advance security of Rs. 1,000. Then, coming to the freedom of association, meetings have been banned under one pretext or other. Particularly in Sholapur it is not possible to hold a single meeting within the city limits. Open spaces that are available and had been used so far have been banned under one pretext or another, and very recently, when the President of the Indian National Congress came to Sholapur, he had to address a meeting attended by 50,000 people at a place which was two miles away from the city proper. The same thing happened at Karmala. You will be surprised to hear that on the 26th January last, on the Independence Day, although according to the Government communiqué only the reading of the pledge was banned and no meeting as such was to be banned, a police sub-inspector with a party of constables attended the meeting, and as soon as the meeting started its work, arrested the President and the speaker, took charge of the table and chair, and, after two hours, quietly released both of them and returned the furniture. The same thing happened in half a dozen places in the Poona district where police constables went from house to house requesting people not to attend meetings that were to be held in the evening to celebrate the Independence Day. If you were to ask the authorities, they would say, "There is nothing. No notification has been issued and the repression complained of does not exist." But what is the psychology that is sought to be created by doing these little pinpricks under the name of law and order?

Then, Sir, so far as the elections were concerned, official interference was such that some of the Members of the Congress Party in this Assembly were not allowed to proceed to certain places in the North-West Frontier. Here, in this Assembly, they have often been complimented for their sweet reasonableness, but they were not allowed to make an exercise of the same in the Pathan territory near Peshawar. Yet, in spite of all that, the Congress has succeeded to a very remarkable extent in the North-West Frontier, and in six other provinces all calculations of the Government have gone wrong. In fact, if I were asked to generalise, I would say, history ought to have taught Government that repression was an anachronism. The law of the land has exacted its pound of flesh; the judiciary has run its course like the Car of Jagannath; the hangman has done his work; and yet, in spite of all these things, neither the shadowy reforms could be prevented nor the Congress crushed. Repression leads to revolution. That is the historic law. But like the Bourbons this bureaucracy will learn nothing. The Independence Day pledge, which was good enough in 1934 to be read, was quite innocent in 1935, and nothing was wrong about it in 1936, but on the 26th January, 1937, one fine morning, most of the Provincial Governments got up and say that this was most dangerous for them, and it was banned. This was the trap that was laid thinking that Congressmen would break it and spoil their chances in the elections. Whatever may have been their intention, somehow or other Government proposes and God disposes.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena** (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Congress disposes.

**Mr. N. V. Gadgil:** Congress and God together.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** Hand in hand.

**Mr. N. V. Gadgil:** I agree.

Therefore, it is no use merely saying that there is no repression. In my province, most of the released prisoners from the Meerut Conspiracy case have been interned under one pretext or another. Mr. Mirajkar at a far village at Shegaon, the Adhikari brothers at Bijapur—none of them is given any allowance. Mr. K. N. Joglekar, who stood for the elections, had been restrained from addressing his voters. Mr. Phadke, who is a practising advocate, was given restraint orders that he was not to participate in any political activities. For the last four years, he has been restrained, and he could not contest the elections. When you cannot speak freely, you cannot associate freely and there is no freedom of press, to say that there is no repression is something which cannot be believed on this side of the House. Therefore, I have great pleasure in supporting the cut motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.

**Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid** (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, the cut motion which the Honourable the Deputy President has moved seems to have become a hardy annual. This is the third year in succession that this motion with slight variations in phraseology has been before the House. When I listened to the speech of the Honourable the Deputy President, I expected that a strong case would be made out for commending the motion to the consideration and acceptance of the House.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** I hope you will do it now.

**Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid:** I will not mind any interruption—even from the veteran Leader of the Congress Nationalist Party. What struck me as extremely odd was that the Honourable the Mover of this motion should have chosen to move it again this year, unless the incentive to move this motion was furnished by a desire to perform an annual mechanical duty.

Sir, the charge against the Government of India is that this Government have been persistently trampling upon the liberties of the people and continue to implement a policy which is subversive of the normal public life of the country. In the light of recent events that took place during the last two or three months in particular, this accusation which the Honourable the Mover has laid against the Government of India and which he asks the House to endorse falls to the ground. What, Sir, are after all, the civil liberties of the people of the country? They are freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, freedom of thought and freedom of association. (Interruption from certain Honourable Members.)

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask Honourable Members not to interrupt the speaker. If there is liberty of speech from one side, the same liberty should be allowed to the other side.

**Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid:** I am sorry to observe that this is a sample of the liberty which we will get when the opposite Party comes into power.

Let us dispassionately examine the situation whether these civil liberties, these valued and highly prized rights of the people have really been trampled upon so ruthlessly as has been alleged by the Honourable the Mover and the speakers who have followed him. During the period that has elapsed since this motion was moved 12 months ago, two events of outstanding political importance have taken place. One is the Congress Session at Faizpur and the other the provincial elections. At Faizpur, certain resolutions were passed some of which might conceivably have provoked repressive action on the part of the Government of India. But it must be said to the credit of the Government of India that no such action was taken. As regards the provincial elections, the results of six provinces clearly show that there was no interference from the Government side. In spite of this alleged interference which my friends on the opposite benches allege, Congress has been able to achieve a great victory in those provinces. That cuts at the root of the suggestion that there was interference. If there was interference, it helped you. If there was no interference, then also you have no cause for complaint. The result of these elections to my mind and the mind of every rational person bears unmistakable testimony to the fact that this charge of official interference is really a very flimsy charge.

**An Honourable Member:** Did you stand for election?

**Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid:** No, but I hope to do so next time. Sir, when you consider the vastness of the stage where these scenes were enacted, when you consider the magnitude of the electorate and the intensity of the election propaganda, I think you cannot help marvelling at the smoothness, the impartiality and the toleration with which this gigantic task was performed by the Government of India. (Interruptions.) I think you must concede me the right of expressing my opinion however different it may be from yours. It is a sort of liberty that you desire the Government of India to extend to you. The result of the elections might have been different, if not to a very large extent, at least to a certain extent, if the freedom of speech, freedom of thought and freedom of association had been curtailed in the way in which you suggest it was. The Honourable Member who moved this cut motion read out a long list of the counts on which he has indicted the Government of India. I expected that he would prove by chapter and verse, at any rate the majority of those charges. I am afraid that with the exception of two or three he made no reference to the others. The Honourable Member from Bengal who followed made up for the paucity of his arguments by an incursion into emotional rhetoric. Sometimes it used to be alleged that the Government of India resorted to special laws and Ordinances in dealing with political offences. They have of late been dealing with these offences under the ordinary Penal Code, the ordinary law of the country, and yet the same complaint is made that there is repression. Inconsistency—thy name is politics! Sir, I feel sure that reasonable opinion, both on this side and on that side, will agree with me that this motion is not worthy of acceptance and that the Government of India, instead of being condemned or censured, deserve a pat on the back for the manner in which they have discharged their duty in the face of great complications and difficulties.

One word more, and I have done. Criticism from opposite benches has been prolific in the past. I have no doubt that that criticism has been of great value to the Government of India in focussing attention on certain important aspects of the problem with which they were faced. Now, their role, at any rate in the provinces, is likely to be changed. The choice lies with the gentlemen on the opposite benches themselves and their friends outside. We hope that they will accept the responsibility which their success in the elections constitutionally implies. The country will watch their efforts with sympathy and a hope that their achievements will be commensurate with their ideals and their protestations.

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** Sir, we have been hearing a lot about the violent activities of the Bengali youths . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better speak up.

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** Sir, we have been hearing a lot and for a long time about the violent activities of the youths of Bengal, and at the present moment we are led to accept that as a "fact". Under the circumstances, it would be well for me, coming from Bengal, to give this House an idea, rather a genesis of the cult of the bomb and the revolver as it is called in official language. Now, Sir, how has this mentality arisen in Bengali youths? All of you have heard about that unpleasant measure,

[Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.]

the Partition of Bengal, against which the Bengalis as a nation rose and organised themselves, and a great movement was started to upset the Partition of Bengal, and ultimately they succeeded, and the Bengal Partition was annulled. But when the Bengal Partition had been announced, there was a very strong movement set on foot among the politicians and the mass of the people at that time. When the Government found that the movement was gaining in strength from day to day, the first act of the Government was to take recourse to that almost forgotten Regulation III, and nine persons were deported. Among these nine men, Sir, were the most leading men of Bengal, who were and some of them still are, emblems of the non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi. Of these nine men, one was the late Babu Aswini Kumar Datta of Barisal and one Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra, who was subsequently,—and who died only very recently,—one of the greatest supporters of this repressive Government, and all these men were at once taken away from society simply because of their activities against the Partition of Bengal. Sir, the Government felt secure that by moving away from society the leaders of the movement, they had succeeded in nipping the movement in the bud, but, lo, another danger arose. After doing that, they engineered—and I say this with full responsibility—that notorious riot at Jamalpore in the Mymensingh district, where the mass of the people were set against the intelligentsia, the middle classes, in fact against all people who were carrying on the Partition agitation. Sir, their houses were burnt, their properties were looted for several days. I was at Jamalpore for seven days then, and I can say that there was no Government existing in Jamalpore during those days; the town was given up to the mob, who simply went on looting and destroying houses and committing arson and doing all sorts of things for seven days without any interference on the part of the Government or the police.

Then, Sir, the Bengali youths thought that their lives and property, their womenfolk, their sisters, their mothers, their wives were all in danger. So they hit upon the plan of learning *lathi* play, dagger-play and taking all sorts of physical exercises. *Akras* were set up in every town and village, where Bengali youths began to take to these exercises, and they were in a year or two thoroughly organised, and life and activity reigned in Bengal for a year or two. That was in 1908 and 1910. Then, Sir, the Government began to stop these *Akras*, and by executive orders all these *Akras*, all these simple athletic associations, were stopped! Now, Sir, when these sporting associations and physical culture associations were stopped by the Government, some energetic and imaginative youths of Bengal thought that they could not give up their legitimate attempts to protect and defend their hearth and home on account of the frowns of the Government, and then they began, Sir, to organise secret societies in which they began to learn revolver practice, *lathi* plays, dagger plays and all these things. These secret societies were started, simply because innocent physical-exercise clubs and sporting clubs were banned; thus the movement was driven underground. This is, the genesis of the cult of the bomb and the revolver in Bengal.

Now, Sir, who is to blame for these violent movements in Bengal? I say it is the bureaucracy, it is the Government that is alone responsible. Sir, placed under such circumstances, any nation, which believed in its future and had the will to live, would have taken to this course anywhere

and everywhere. We have seen a sample of some of the activities of the bureaucracy during these elections,—how they wanted to terrorise the tenants, how they wanted to terrorise the voters to vote against the Congress. Sir, if they carry on this sort of activity, so that the mind of the mass of the people is sorely exercised, I am bound to point out that they will only thereby drive the mass movement underground, and that will be a dangerous day for the bureaucracy. Sir, I give them a warning; and if they do not take this warning, I can only say, “you better see the writing in the wall”. If you have sense enough to read the signs of the time, then beware. So, Sir, this being the genesis of the cult of the bomb and the revolver in Bengal, I leave it to the House to consider who are responsible for this, for which I may say everyone of us is sorry now. It is the bureaucracy which is responsible for this cult in Bengal and that is how such societies were rampant in Bengal, and the better class people in Bengal are suffering today from their after-effects for which, however, the bureaucracy alone was responsible.

Now, with this genesis, I would like to show how by repressive policy the Government have been trying to suppress the very movements which they themselves brought into existence. Now, we find that since 1912 one after another repressive laws and Ordinances were issued by which the better class people in Bengal, including most innocent people occupying high positions in Bengal, are in daily danger of being arrested and pronounced upon and taken away at any moment on the secret information of the spies who are collected from the scum of society and who supply all sorts of false and concocted information to the authorities. If these repressive measures were carried out in the spirit and for the purpose for which they were enacted, there would have been much less grievance on the part of the people. As a matter of fact, these laws were passed with one object, and, at the time of passing these laws in the Local Councils, the sponsors of these Acts distinctly said that they would be used very carefully and with scrutiny by responsible officers, and innocent people will never be touched. That was the assurance given when these laws were passed. But, subsequently, after they had been enacted, the matter was left in the hands of the police and spies. The higher officials also took advantage of these Acts in order to do away with people, however good and of high position they might be, to remove them from the field because of their political activities which were against the Government. I can say, Sir, that in 50 per cent. cases they get rid of prominent men in Bengal by the application of these laws, under which they can arrest a man without any reason and send him to jail. They are not to give any reason for the arrest of the man; they are not to give reasons why they are keeping the man interned for so long a period as 15 years. So, the bureaucracy took advantage of this law in order to remove prominent but undesirable men from the field.

Sir, I know of a case of a next-door neighbour of mine, Mr. Ganendra Chandra Mazumdar. He was a student of the fourth year class in the Presidency College, Calcutta, in the year 1914 or 1915, and he was the only son of a retired Deputy Magistrate. Now, on the report of a spy, he was interned and he has been in internment up to this time in Deoli. He was released only for a period of one or two years during this time. We know him very well, because he was our neighbour. He was one of the best men of Mymensingh.

[Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.]

Not only that, he has got a wife and a son and a daughter. Subsequently, the wife and the son were also interned at Mymensingh. The son passed his B.A. examination when he was interned in Mymensingh and none of them is given any allowance.

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

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** Sir, this Ganendra Chandra Mazumdar had some landed property and he used to do money-lending business in the mufassil. Who is to manage all these things? He has been taken away and interned, and his wife has been compelled to live in her house where she has been interned; his adult boy is also compelled to live in the house with the result that there is nobody to look after his property which is going to rack and ruin. I asked some questions in this House about this gentleman last year. I said that he was losing in weight, he was getting slow fever, and I entreated the Home Member to release him or to intern him with his wife and children. That request was not complied with, and the Home Member said that he was not prepared to release him at present and his health was not so seriously bad as to endanger his life.

Now, Sir, I would like to refer to one question more. I am referring to a class of men who are called externees. These men are asked to leave their districts and to live with their family outside the districts.

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

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** May I have one minute more, Sir?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot allow any more time.

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** It is no use dilating upon these facts any more. The House has carried Resolutions like this in the last Assembly and I hope all Honourable Members, even those who sit on the other side, will vote in support of this motion.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Asim** (Chittagong Division: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, as one who comes from Eastern Bengal, I think I will be fulfilling the mandate of my constituency if I should take part in this debate. I have often spoken on measures like this, and I will try to take a detached view of the whole picture.

**An Honourable Member:** Louder please.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Asim:** Not being gifted with a very loud voice, I am certain, my colleagues in the House will excuse me if my feeble voice does not reach them all. In any case, I should like to say this with the utmost humility that a human being is capable of, that on the eve of this great experiment, if I may so call it, we should like to see goodwill and tolerance playing their proper part in modulating our



thoughts and ideals for the good of all. I am the last person, Mr. President, to have the audacity to hold any brief on behalf of the Government of Bengal as they themselves are sufficiently powerful to look after themselves. I know that one Honourable Member, who had earned good reputation in the Bengal Secretariat and who was also a distinguished Collector in certain parts of Bengal, has already spoken with regard to the position of the Bengal Government in this particular matter. I hope my friends will excuse me if they disagree with my ideas but they must have noticed since the new orientation was coming into the picture, that every day there has been some gesture on behalf of the Government of Bengal to come to terms with the aggressive party. Of course, I do not blame anybody for holding his views, and everybody is welcome to have his ideas, but I should like to address the Honourable Members in this sense. Suppose you put somebody of your own as Home Member in Bengal, may I ask you most humbly whether he would not require some measure of laws by which his administration will be safe from factors which are likely to disturb the normal life of the citizen? This is a very important matter to which all sides of the House should kindly pay attention. It is a very good sign, indeed, that it seems that in certain provinces, I think in a majority of them, our friends of the Congress Party are trying to have the experiment of autonomy. May I ask them whether they, in their turn, will not require certain of these laws which are to be seen now on the Statute-book and about which Mr. Dutta was complaining? If there is a difference of opinion with regard to the application of these laws, one can understand it, but to say in a general way that we do not require any protective laws for the administration of the country is not correct. I do not blame the Congress Party or the Nationalist Party for having come here in this Assembly to make the Government of India realise their position, for the Government of India are responsible for superintendence and control. As a matter of fact, if the Congress is in power today, of course that is the result of the constitution that has been granted by the Government of England to this country, and for this they should show some gratitude. It has been over-stressed here on the floor of this Assembly whether or not it is necessary at times for the good governance of this country to have measures which are likely to be conducive to public peace and tranquillity. If these laws which have been enumerated by my Honourable friend, the Deputy President, have been so harshly used and utilised by the provinces in this country, I am certain that when he and his co-workers come to power, I am certain that they will be able to take off the edge of the sharp corners and they will be able to utilise them to the good of everybody. If it is contended that there could be no laws from the Centre, that there could be no *Dora*, there could not be laws to protect the peaceful citizen and protect the growth of harmony and good feelings between man and man, I could not visualise such a situation. I am certain that even my Honourable friend who initiated this debate will not say that the laws to which he has taken exception will not be necessary even if he were in charge of law and order in his own province. The conditions in Bengal are taking good turns, and if the Congress follow the policy of conciliation and coalition, many of the sharp features will be things of the past.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** In normal times, that was my point.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Aziz:** My Honourable friend from Mymensingh, Mr. Suryya Kumar Som, has given the genesis of this cult of bomb and other things here in this country. I am certain, he knows best how these things came about. But I should like to say this much that if really these things are in existence, he will not grudge the small power which still exists on the Statute-book, if it is utilised for public safety and public tranquillity at times. He has also taken exception to so many people being detained without trial and not presented for any judicial trial in Bengal. My answer to him will be that he will be soon having the full dose of autonomy in Bengal, the High Court of Bengal and other controlling judiciary in Bengal will be under his control under the autonomy in that province, and I am certain that he will certainly now have his own people to judge these cases, for the judiciary and the High Courts will be under the executive there.

Another speaker, I think it was Sir Abdul Hamid, speaking a few minutes ago, pleaded with the party opposite for tolerance and goodwill. As a matter of fact, that is also my appeal to my Honourable friends to my right. If they want to have ordered progress in this country, then the Congress and the Congress Nationalists must have this ideal before them. They must be tolerant to others, and unless and until they are in a position to listen to others when they represent their case, I am afraid really the conditions in this country will not be better. The Congress pleads equality for all, and they should be consistent. So, with these few words, it seems to me, Mr. President, that really this censure is unwarranted at this time.

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. Ghansham Singh Gupta** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion on the repressive policy of Government, particularly during the election days. The policy of repression is not confined to any particular province. It has been followed in all the provinces and even in the most peaceful province of the Central Provinces and Berar. This policy of repression has been rampant, and it was most in evidence soon before election time. During the election, Sir, various sorts of repression were resorted to. We have been told just now by some gentlemen that during the elections, the Government policy was one of most rigid impartiality. Every one of us who had anything to do with the recent elections knows that that is not the case. On the contrary, somewhere openly, somewhere secretly, and somewhere under some disguise, the interference of Government officials with the elections was known to almost every worker who had something to do with the elections. And the crowning incident which is reported from Bilaspur shows anything but impartiality in the elections on the part of Government. But apart from that, there have been open acts of repression, and in Berar the Honourable Mr. Biyani, a Member of the Council of State, has been prosecuted under section 124-A, for one of his speeches during the election. Similarly, Mrs. Durgatai Joshi has been prosecuted and Mr. Akarthe has also been prosecuted under section 124-A. All these relate to their activities in connection with the election campaign on behalf

of some candidate or other. Proceedings under section 108 have been started against Mr. Anand Rao Joshi and some others. In Bilaspur, we were told that proceedings were started against Seth Govind Das (a Member of this House) and some volunteers for rioting with deadly weapons. Sir, I know Seth Govind Das personally. He does not carry even a stick, but even against him a prosecution was started for rioting with deadly weapons. Securities were demanded from several newspapers; Rs. 2,000 from the *Independent* of Nagpur, Rs. 3,000 from the *Maharashtra* of Nagpur, and Rs. 2,000 from the *Matribhumi* of Berar. On the 22nd January, a notification was issued by the Central Provinces Government confiscating to His Majesty's Government the Independence Resolution or pledge of the Indian National Congress and all documents containing copies, reprints or translations or extracts from the said document. But the most funny part of the story that I wish to bring to the notice of this House is that in the Extraordinary Edition of the C. P. Gazette published on the 22nd January, 1937, the whole of that Resolution has been reproduced almost *verbatim*. The notification says:

"In exercise of the powers conferred by section 19 of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, the Governor in Council hereby declares to be forfeited to His Majesty all copies wherever found of the document in English containing the so-called independence resolution or pledge of the Indian National Congress, and all other documents containing copies, reprints or translations of or extracts from the said document in as much as it contains matter of the nature described in section 4(1) of the said Act as amended by section 16 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1932. This resolution or pledge runs in the following or similar terms."

The whole of that resolution has then been reproduced not in one place but in two places in this Extraordinary Edition of the C. P. Gazette. I could not understand the propriety of confiscating a document which has been published in the Gazette *in extenso* almost *verbatim* and has reached everybody who is a subscriber of the Gazette or gets a copy of it. This was on the 22nd January last, just when the elections were on. Fortunately we escaped all this. There were preparations in many places to arrest people, particularly the candidates who, they thought, were going to read this resolution. But the candidates escaped, and they did stand in the election and most of them were successful. What I mean to say is that this policy of repression is not confined to one particular province. It is the order of the day, even in a province like the Central Provinces and Berar, which to all accounts is the most peaceful province in the whole of India. No wonder, therefore, that in Bengal and in the North-West Frontier Province the tale is more miserable and more rigorous. Sir, I support the motion.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi** (Dacca cum Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Deputy President, I was not in the House when you made your speech today in moving your cut. It is always a pleasure to hear you as you always speak to the point. Unfortunately, I was not here then, and I have not had the advantage of hearing your speech. But from the speakers, who followed you, I understand that the cut is with regard to one point, and that is, censuring Government for the repression practised and repressive laws enforced throughout India, and I believe particular stress was laid on my province of Bengal. This is a very old question, and year in and year out we have a cut of this description and condemn Government. The House has not been furnished with any specific items of repression in Bengal to which exception has been taken. Of course, Sir, I

[Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi.]

did not hear you, and so I do not know if you made any such point. But from what I could hear of the other speakers who supported the motion, not one could state a particular act or instance of repression which was condemned. One speaker, my Honourable friend, Mr. Chattopadhyaya, referred to a detenu who was still detained for 21 years . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** There are other detenus.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** I stand corrected, and I accept that there is more than one such detenu.

Now, as regards the detenus in Bengal, it is a well-known fact that the cases are very carefully examined. I am not aware of what the Honourable the Home Member is going to say about the case that my Honourable friend has just mentioned about detention for 21 years: but of the officers who were dealing with these detenus' cases for a long time, I find one in this House, Mr. S. N. Roy (*An Honourable Member*: "He has spoken already"), whose speech I had not the advantage of hearing. Many cases had been brought to my notice which, in my turn I brought to the notice of Mr. Roy and Mr. Blair, and in every case I can say that the parents or guardians concerned were satisfied that the law had been justly invoked and in every possible case the hardship, if any, was removed and sometimes in proper cases the suspect was made a home detenu.

**An Honourable Member:** Will you cite those cases?

**Another Honourable Member:** Question.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** What do you mean by question?

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** That cases were never brought to your notice, nor were they satisfied.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** My Honourable friend's colossal ignorance makes him say that.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** I know they have no faith in you.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** I know that people in Bengal have no faith in you.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** I have got correspondence with me which I can show you, and I challenge you to let me go to Bengal.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** And you got a very good reception, which you well deserve!

Now, what is the position about the detenus? The position is this: that except in cases where it is dangerous to release them or to allow them to stay in their houses, most of the detenus have been released. Not only that. Look at the position today. Every detenu has been given an opportunity of earning his living. Government have done all that . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** For every detenu?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** For every detenu who could be relied upon.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member should address the Chair.

**An Honourable Member:** What do you mean by who can be relied upon?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Unless he is a very dangerous lot.

**An Honourable Member:** Who is to determine that?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** The Authorities entrusted by law as in every country. Government have found the money for all this, and there are hundreds of detenus now who are practically free men and earning their own living. What is the repressive measure? Detaining a terrorist who wants to shoot down irrespective of white or black? That is the repressive measure. What you do in this country I wish you could do in other countries. You would have been shot instead of being detained. (*Honourable Members:* "Oh! Oh!") Just see what is being done in Russia. You would not have been allowed to talk as you do in this country. What are the Government going to do? (*An Honourable Member:* "Knight you!") Are they going to do anything? What is the present situation? Look at this red book—Communism: the terrorists have now changed to Communism, and what is the cult of this Communism? This is not Government literature . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Where have you got it from?

**Another Honourable Member:** Supplied by Government!

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** You can buy a copy if you subscribe Rs. 6 a year: you become a member of this league, and find out the details of Communism in India. . . .

**An Honourable Member:** You are a member?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Yes, I am . . . .

**Sir Srinivasa Sarma** (Nominated Non-Official) Do not interrupt him.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** That is the freedom of speech one can expect when my friends come into power. This is a sample. When they speak, we listen with rapt attention; and when we get up to speak, that freedom of speech disappears. (Showing a typed list) Look at this huge list . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** What about the book?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Shall I use very strong language?

**An Honourable Member:** Do.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Let the Honourable Member proceed uninterrupted.

**An Honourable Member:** He loves interruption.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Not always. I was horrified when I got this list of the Communist movement in Bengal. Look at the formidable list of names in Bengal . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Who gave it to you?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** It is given here group by group, here is a list of the Communist Party in India . . . .

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar** (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North-Arcot; Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I know who supplied the Honourable Member with that list?

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Who gave that list to you?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** You better apply and get a list from the Government. Ask for the names and get yourself satisfied whether they are Communists or not.

**Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** Do you want us to apply for a list to the Government?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Yes, they will give you.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I should like to know the source of that list.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** I place this list here and challenge you to say that the names contained there are not Communists.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): But how is it an offence to be a Communist?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** You ask me how it is an offence. This is an offence. May I tell you how it is an offence . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member over there wants to know what that document is and from where the Honourable Member got it.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** Sir, this is the Red Bulletin. The annual subscription of this paper is Rs. 6 only, and it is issued by the All-India Progressive League, it is printed at Poona by Mr. S. N. Joshi.

**An Honourable Member:** Is that a half brother of Mr. Joshi here?

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

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** I am glad I have got only two minutes more, because I shall be free now from being interrupted. Sir, this is the present menace which the Bengal Government have to face . . .

**Some Honourable Members:** From whom?

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi:** That menace is destruction of property, destruction of life and destruction of everything. That is the menace which the Bengal Government are faced with at the present moment, and no measure taken can be called a repressive measure, no measure can be called a strong measure to put it down with a strong hand. Sir, I oppose this cut.

**Mr. Kuladhar Chaliha** (Assam Valley: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I consider myself as one of the most reasonable men on this side of the House except possibly my friend, Mr. Sri Prakasa. The fact is that repressive measures have been used, not merely in Bengal, but in my province also. We were asked by our friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, that we should be quite reasonable. Sir, we are very reasonable people in Assam, perhaps we are more reasonable than people like my friend, Mr. Ghanshyam Singh Gupta, in the Central Provinces; yet repressive measures are so infectious that in Assam no time was lost in enacting those measures by the passing of the Assam Criminal Law Amendment Act for little or no reason. They were very anxious to adopt repressive measures on some pretext or other, and they were at their wit's end to find out a reason, because nothing had happened there which could justify the Government to enact them. Yet they gave out the reason that in a certain post office in the Assam Valley the post master in charge had certain seditious books in his possession, and that was the reason the Government advanced for introducing the Assam Criminal Law Amendment Act. Then as regards the district of Sylhet, the only reason given was that six dacoities had been committed, though in the trial latterly it was found that these dacoities were committed, not with any political motives, but for criminal purposes, and, therefore, this Act was passed by the Assam Legislative Council, a subservient body, the Members of which have now gone out of the picture altogether; except perhaps two or three, the rest of the Members have disappeared from the Council. That shows the will of the people, that shows the voice of the people. After the passing of that Act, we found that six people were interned, and, probably, by the end of April, 1936, there were only three remaining. Mr. Hiranya Kumar Bose of Dhubri who went to Tangail in Bengal was taken away just on the eve of his marriage and interned. We tried to obtain information from this House about his whereabouts, but unfortunately the question was disallowed.

Then, Sir, this British Government, which administer and pretend to carry the torch of civilization to the Naga country, had the stupidity to arrest and try a girl of 21. Her name is Miss Guidallo, known as the Naga Rani. She was tried in the Manipur State and transported for life. I attempted to get some information from the Honourable Member; again the question was disallowed on the ground that she belonged to an unadministered area in the Naga Hills, and the question could not be discussed here. Sir, as I said she was a young girl of 21. Her only offence was, she loved her country very intensely, she wanted that the British interlopers should not be there. That was the offence, and for that she was transported for life, and no information is vouchsafed to us about her whereabouts.

Now, Sir, coming to the sister province of Bengal, what do we find? I think the case of Miss Renuka Sen is fresh in the minds of every Honourable Member of this House. She was a distinguished graduate of the

[**Mr. Kuladhar Chaliha.**]

Calcutta University, and she was interned in her own village at Vikrampur without giving her any allowance. When she was due to be released, she notified to the police that she was going to break the conditions. So she was tried for breach of the conditions and convicted but when the case came before the Sessions Judge, on appeal, she adversely criticised the action of the Government for keeping her as an internee without paying her any allowance. The matter went up to the High Court, and even there the Honourable the Judges who heard this case severely criticised the Government. But a communique which was issued by the Government stated that allowances were offered to Miss Renuka Sen, but her own grandfather refused to accept them. The High Court wanted to know whether it was a fact. The Honourable Judges wanted to know the date when the allowance was remitted but they could not supply the information. That is the state of the communique. That is how the Executive Government want to hoodwink the public, and the House.

Then, Sir, we know the case of Miss Brahma, who was interned,—and we were sorry to hear the other day that she died of an abdominal abscess. Sir, she was only 20. She was interned in 1931 after the murder of Mr. Stevens. If young girls of 13 and boys of 14 or girls of 20 have to be interned or transported for life in this manner, surely this Government are doing something fundamentally wrong.

Sir, I shall not say anything about the remarks made by my friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi. Nobody knows from where he got the list from which he read out something. He never said how Communism was a bad thing. Sir, in his younger days, he was one of our leaders, who misled us. I was one of those youngmen who had the honour of following the Congress principles under the leadership of my friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi,—I am referring to the years 1904, 1905 and 1906. He misled us then by giving us wrong advice. He has now turned for his own convenience, to the greatest shame of Bengal. Sir, that such a man should now turn and speak against the very movement, of which he was at one time one of the leaders, is a standing disgrace . . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** He is a turn coat.

**Mr. Kuladhar Chaliha:** Sir, he misled us. I had the honour to meet him very often. Perhaps he has forgotten those days. He has brought misery to men like Mr. Chattopadhyaya, men like myself, Mr. Brahma Bandhab Upadhyaya, Mr. Upendra Ghosal and several others, and now he is basking in the sunshine of the executive Government. Sir, with these words, I support the cut motion, and I hope the House will accept it unanimously and condemn the action of the Government.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** Sir, I rise to say a few words in support of the cut motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Datta. A policy

3 P.M. of repression has been pursued in India for a long time with the utmost rigour and this policy has taken various forms. At the present moment I shall discuss the question of detention without trial. As is known to every Honourable Member of this House, such detention without trial is opposed to the rule of law, is opposed to all canons of morality, and is opposed to the principles and practices of all civilised nations. It is true that in some countries in an emergency like a great war the rule of law is suspended and detention without trial is practised for a short while.



But in India detention without trial has now become a part and parcel of the administrative system. And what is the manner in which this policy is practised? It has resulted in untold sufferings to large numbers of individuals and their families. It has resulted in the suicide of not a few persons, it has shattered the health of a large number of detenus and it has been responsible for the death during incarceration of a considerable number of persons.

Sir, many cases of the victims of this policy are known to this House, but I will refer to one particular case, and that is the case of Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose. I came to know this gentleman about 16 or 17 years ago. In 1924 Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose was appointed the Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation and elected a Member of the Bengal Legislative Council. At that time, he was a bright young man full of energy, full of vitality, full of hope, full of promise. But it was not long after this that he was spirited away to Burma and kept in detention till his health completely failed and he was almost at death's door. It was only then that he was released. But before he had had time to recover his former health, he was again put in prison and his health again became so bad that he was obliged to go to Europe, carried on a stretcher. When after undergoing a serious operation he came back to India, how did the Government treat him? He was again kept in detention and he has been steadily losing weight. His health is now so shattered that it is difficult to say whether he will ever recover his former health or not. Sir, a few months ago, I was obliged for the treatment of my eyes to proceed to Vienna. While I was there, Professor Demel, a famous surgeon of that place, who had treated Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose, came to see me. He made very anxious enquiries about the health and whereabouts of Mr. Bose. I was surprised at the deep concern that Prof. Demel felt for him. Now, look upon that picture and look upon this. On one side we see a foreigner, who had never known Mr. Subash Chandra Bose before, taking a keen interest in him,—a man of the greatest sympathy, a man of a very wide outlook,—and on the other, we see here seated on the Treasury Benches men who pose as guardians of the people of India, devoid of sympathy, devoid even of pity, and bent upon doing the greatest harm to Mr. Bose. Sir, this is only one instance which I cite, but there are many other instances which can be cited by other persons.

What has been the result of this policy? Has this policy succeeded? My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Chattopadhyaya, have shown that the elections have proved that the Government policy had not found favour with the people of the country. Why have the people of India voted for Congress candidates? Because the Congress in their opinion is against the Government. In fact, every vote cast in favour of a Congress candidate has been a vote against the Government.

Sir, what is the reason for which these persons have been detained? Government say they are involved in terrorist activities. I do not deny that there are some persons who are involved in terrorist activities. But we cannot accept the assertion of Government to the effect that everybody whom they suspect as an anarchist is really an anarchist. We can never accept that position. And what is the value of the information which the Government has in its possession? We have seen time and again that such information is often inaccurate. Now, I am not one of those who is in sympathy with violence. I was in intimate contact with young men for

[Dr. P. N. Banerjee.]

over 30 years and during my career as an educationist I made it my duty to urge upon the students the policy of non-violence. But what is the reason which impels young men to take to paths of violence? The real reason is that they have no faith in constitutional methods; they believe that constitutional methods have failed and are bound to fail in future. And who is responsible for creating this frame of mind in them? It is the Government. And who has taught them violence? It is from Government and their officers that these terrorists have learnt their lessons in violence.

Sir, this is only one form in which a repressive policy has been pursued in India; but there are many other forms. The time at my disposal will not allow me to discuss all those other forms. But I will say this that the laws which have recently been passed by the Central Legislature and the provincial Legislatures have had the general effect of interfering very seriously with the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech and the freedom of association. Sir, I have spoken about the consequences of the policy of repression. Repression has failed. And why has it failed? Because Government have dealt with only the symptoms and have not tried to probe into the root cause. What is the root cause of terrorism? Terrorism is really an offshoot of the present discontent in the country, and what is the cause of the present discontent? The main cause is the desire of the people for freedom. If the Government had met this desire in the proper way, I am sure that discontent would have disappeared from the country. Desire for freedom undoubtedly there is, and the people are determined to win freedom. What particular form this freedom will take will depend upon various circumstances, particularly the attitude of the Government towards this question. Whether it will take the form of dominion status or complete independence is a matter of detail which can be decided without much difficulty. Besides this main cause, there are several contributory causes. So many wrongs and injustices have been heaped upon the people that their grievances know no limits. Then, again, there is poverty and unemployment all over the land. Have the Government thought it necessary to tackle these problems of poverty and unemployment? No.

I am, Sir, by habit and temperament a man of a peaceful disposition, and I always desire that there should be peace in this country. But how can there be peace in this country so long as the Government continue their present policy? I am not in the habit of uttering threats, nor am I in the habit of using strong language; but I cannot help expressing my firm conviction that there will be no peace in the country unless and until the Government in all sincerity accept freedom as the goal for India, do away with the wrongs and injustices from which the people suffer, and replace the policy of repression by a policy of conciliation.

**Sardar Mangal Singh** (East Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I had no intention to intervene in this debate but for the fact that one Honourable Member from my province has spoken on this motion and he has chosen to speak against it. I wish to say a few words, so that the position may not be misunderstood that all is quiet on the western front. Next to Bengal, my province is perhaps the most repressed province in the whole of the country. Sir Abdul Hamid Khan has made a complaint that this motion has become a sort of hardy annual. I wish to remind him and through him the Government of India that so long as you continue to repress the people, so long as you continue to suppress the liberties of the people of this country and

so long as you keep on the Statute-book the repressive laws, not only every year but if we have the opportunity every month, we will come here and censure the Government for that. May I ask the Government of India if they have done anything during the last year? This Honourable House passed a censure motion against the Government on this very point. May I ask the Home Member whether they have done anything, whether they have repealed any repressive law, whether they have released any political prisoner—whether they have in any way tried to do anything to remove the impression that this Government of India are trying to rule this country by repressive measures.

This Honourable House some time back passed a Resolution urging upon the Government to remove the ban on the Red Shirts in the Frontier, and this House also expressed a desire constitutionally that the ban on Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan should be removed. May I ask the Government of India whether they have done anything in that connection? I know Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is a very God-fearing and peace loving and truth loving Muslim. It is very inhuman to deprive the inhabitants of his province of his valuable advice and lead at a critical juncture like the present. I know it is the presence of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and his brother Dr. Khan Sahib that is conducive to the law and order and peace in the Frontier. I may remind this House and the Government that at the time of the Shahidgunj agitation when every one including His Excellency the Governor of the Punjab thought that the Punjab and the Frontier would be ablaze during that week, it was the efforts of leaders like Dr. Khan Sahib that kept peace in their province. I personally know that some people tried to rouse feelings. Dr. Khan Sahib went there and gave them the right advice, and it was not the Government, I can say without the least fear of contradiction, it was Dr. Khan Sahib and his Red Shirts that protected the lives and properties of Hindus and Sikhs there in those days. To continue the ban on an organisation like the Red Shirts or a person like Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is not in any way justified. I, therefore, wish to remind the Government that it is not only the Frontier Province but it is my province also which has been deprived of the advice and wise leadership of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. He can come up to Delhi but the moment he would cross the boundary of my province, he would probably be dealt with according to law.

**An Honourable Member:** Lawless law.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Now, Sir, coming to my province, there is the same story of Bengal repeated perhaps on a smaller scale. There are detentions without trial. There are internments and externments. Several people have been detained without trial and interned in their villages. Several are being kept in jails. Some of the gentlemen who have been recently interned are not known to the public because they happen to come from foreign countries and they are arrested and kept some in the Lahore Fort and some are interned in some village or in a corner of the jail. I would like to remind the Honourable the Home Member of the cases of Sardar Teja Singh Sutantar who is now being detained in the Campbellpur Jail. Sardar Achhar Singh Chhina, who has recently come to this country after a long time, was arrested and kept in the Lahore Fort and now he is being detained in some village. There are several other names but I would particularly like to mention the name of Sardar Harjab Singh who is being detained in his village. He has now been elected on the Congress ticket

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

to the Punjab Legislative Assembly but all our efforts have so far failed to remove the restrictions imposed on him. I would also like to remind the Government of the case of Mr. Ram Kissen. He is being detained in jail for the last several years. He is suffering from a dangerous disease, but his relations, who are in a very bad condition, are not being given any allowance by the Government. I shall stand corrected if the Government can say that they are giving any allowance to his wife and his mother, but, so far as I know, no allowance has so far been sanctioned for his family, nor is he being allowed to be treated by his own doctors. I tried to see him. As soon as I applied to the jail superintendent he was transferred from Lahore to some hill station and then I got the reply that as he had been transferred from Lahore to some far-off jail, I probably would not like to see him. There is another gentleman with whom I had myself been living in jail. He is Mr. Ahsan Ellahie of Lahore. He is in jail for the last seven or eight years. The Government would not put him on trial; several representations have been made to the Government by his brother, but the Government would not reconsider his case, nor give any allowance to his dependants. The last though not the least case is that of Sardar Gurmukh Singh who has recently been arrested and has been transported to the Andamans. We have all been protesting against the deportation of this gentleman to the Andamans.

**An Honourable Member:** When was that?

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Recently, two weeks or a month ago.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** He is an escaped convict.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** That does not matter. (Laughter.) He has been transported to the Andamans.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Well, he escaped from the Andamans and is serving the balance of his sentence.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** He has been transported from the Lahore jail to the Andamans against the protests of all of us. Coming again to the frontier, the Frontier Government has already decided to launch prosecutions against several Congress workers in the Punjab. Shrimati Amrit Kaur, who went there to help the Congress candidates, has been arrested under section 124-A, and she is being tried there. We read the other day that the President of the Lahore City Congress Committee, Pandit Sant Ram, has been arrested and has been taken away to the frontier. My friend Mr. Chabildass and his wife went there to help the Congress candidates but they were served with an order prohibiting them from entering the Frontier Province. My Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Hamid Khan, was saying that Government were not interfering in the elections. May I ask him do not the cases like these prove that the Government was actively interfering in the elections? Some of the Congress friends from my Province tried to help the Congress of the Frontier Province but they were not allowed to enter that Province and those who did so have been prosecuted. May I put it to the Government of India whether this was the proper time to launch this campaign of repression in my Province? Sir, we are told that a new era is coming into this country. We are being told that His

Majesty's Government have granted a sort of *swaraj* to this country (Laughter); we are told that within a few weeks the administration of several Provinces would be in the hands of the representatives of this country . . . .

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

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** But I put it to the Government whether at a time like this, would it not be advisable, would it not be right and proper to release all the political prisoners, to repeal all the repressive laws so that we might start on a clean slate, so that the impression might be given to the Indian people that along with the change of constitution there is a change in the heart of the Government of India, so that the impression might be given that the Government is also anxious to work the constitution, so that the people might understand that the British Government and the Government of India are sincere in their professions? Sir, I think this opportunity should not be lost. Before I sit down, I want to refer to another case and that is of the Maharajah of Nabha. He was arrested in 1928 and he is still being detained there. I do not know whether his case is being examined every year, and if so, I would request the Home Member to say something about him in his reply, *viz.*, what the Government want to do in his case and what the allegations against him are . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** I hope that the whole House would vote for this motion and would demonstrate the intensity and the volume of the feeling against the repressive policy of the Government. Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. K. Santhanam** (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support this motion. In certain respects I feel that this motion is the most important which has been moved this Session, because, Sir, with regard to other motions, the Honourable Members on the Government Benches pleaded the constitutional excuse, but for this motion, at any rate, they cannot plead any constitutional excuse. They cannot say that the present Government of India Act has forced them to enact unconstitutional laws; they cannot say that it has forced them to keep several young men under detention without any trial; they cannot say that it has forced them to enforce repressive laws throughout the country. Sir, Honourable Members who spoke before me have cited many instances of overt acts of repression, but there is an aspect which is more important than this, it is what we may call the atmosphere of repression which arises from the power which the executive possesses to repress the normal activities of the people. Owing to this atmosphere of repression, Sir, the soul of our people is cramped; the minds of our people get warped, and the fountain-springs of our national life are being daily and steadily poisoned. I may give one instance of the fatal results of this atmosphere of repression. During the Salt Satyagraha movement in the Tamil country we had a salt Satyagraha march from Trichinopoly to Vedaranyam and one hundred young men under the leadership of Mr. Rajagopalachariar started from Trichinopoly and decided to walk together to the salt Swamp at Vedaranyam. We came to the borders of the Tanjore district. The

[Mr. K. Santhanam.]

Collector of Tanjore, who was till recently a member of this Assembly and is a distinguished member of the I. C. S., got a brain wave. He said he would not arrest these people who go to defy the law. On the other hand, he issued an order that anyone who supplied food to these Salt Satyagrahis would be committing a crime of abetment and would be duly punished. I wish I could describe to this House adequately the effect of that order. We got food in shoals but the whole population was panic-stricken and when we issued a rule that we shall not accept any food unless it was given openly, then many of the villagers, women and children, were in tears. In one town they came to us in large numbers and said: "We want to feed you at any cost". Then we said: "You must take courage in both hands and feed us in the open." Then they sat all night and discussed among themselves and resolved that they would give us food openly and take all the consequences. And when they did so, they were so exalted that we were afraid they might commit some acts of outrage on Government servants. Sir, it is like this that the atmosphere of repression works.

An Honourable Member who spoke before me mentioned many cases in which the nationalist press of India has been penalised. Even in the case of the press it is not so much the actual repression that counts as the fear of repression. The Damocles sword is always hanging over us and I may inform the House that often we get a message from the Associated Press giving us the text of a speech from a Member of this House with the footnote "consult the Editor as to the propriety of publishing this speech". My sub-editor used to ring me up in the middle of the night and ask me whether he should publish it or not. I do not claim to be an exceptional representative of the Indian press. I gladly acknowledge that many journalists of India are of a better calibre and are more courageous and patriotic than myself and if I have given personal instances about the way in which this repression works, it is simply because they are representative and not exceptional. I shall give two instances in which the Damocles sword actually fell and two instances in which it was expected to fall but did not fall. In one case, a case for conspiracy against some youngmen in Madras was conducted. A few youngmen had some rash conversations among themselves and it was magnified into a conspiracy and a great trial was staged in Madras. After the trial was over, in one of my articles I made only this comment that at a time when the vested interests in Great Britain were exaggerating the risks of transferring the law and order, the Madras Government ventured to magnify some minor activities of immature youngmen into a major conspiracy. I wrote this article so carefully with almost the Indian Penal Code in my hands that I never thought that it would come under the law. None of my friends expected that it would come under the law. We did not expect it but the Damocles sword fell. But when we appealed to the High Court, it was found that there was nothing objectionable in it. But at the time we felt that our paper would stop.

Then, Sir, one day my correspondent at Jubbulpore flashed a message saying that a party of soldiers had raided a village and done terrible havoc. No other news agency gave that message and when our readers saw it in the paper, they were alarmed. They did not know what to think of it. They were phoning to me all the day whether we had verified the truth of the statement. When we assured them that we had verified the truth of the

statement, then they began to ask why the other news agencies had not published this news. For the whole week no news was allowed to come. In fact, all the news had been suppressed and after a week's time the truth slowly began to filter and this Assembly knows how true the facts were.

Then, again, one fine morning a friend of mine handed to me a copy of the circular which is known as the Hallet circular. It was given with so many particulars that there was no doubt at all about its authenticity, but it was a great question to us whether we should publish it or not. When we did publish it, it was thought that the Damocles sword would fall. Luckily, Sir, that time it did not fall but it fell again at another time when it was least expected. The Tamil paper, which is being published by us, reproduced an article from a Bombay paper about the Quetta earthquake. No action was taken against the Bombay paper but the Madras Government took action against our Tamil paper and demanded a security of Rs. 4,000 from that paper. I am not citing these instances to show whether the action was just or right in any particular case, but what I want to convey is that it is in this atmosphere that we have to work and you can imagine what a nerve-racking business this is. I may say that this repressive policy is producing an effect like the alternating current; it takes us at one moment to despair and at another moment to irrepressible anger and, if we have not so far burst out into violence, it is because there is a copper wire of our religious traditions and, above all, the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi which has kept us on the path of peace. (Hear, hear.) But for that copper wire, this thread would have broken long ago and there would have been a great conflagration throughout this country. I tell the authorities that they should beware; they should try to understand human psychology. They cannot go on repressing people hoping that by this repression the spirit will be crushed. As they know from the recent elections, Indian spirit is not going to be crushed. They may enact any number of laws, they may have punitive police, they may increase the number of detenus to 5 millions, but we are not going to submit to this repression. When the time comes, we will not care for this repression. We are going to revolt against the whole repressive system. This Government is a perpetual Act of violence and it is this act of violence we are up against. It is the law of non-violence that we want and we hope to establish that law before long both for the Government and the people of this country. (Applause.)

**Dr. R. D. Dalal** (Nominated Non-Official): Mr. Deputy President, one point from the speeches of my Honourable friends opposite that strikes me is this—that the powers employed by Government for the maintenance of peace and law and order are not necessary. So, Sir, my submission is that a case has to be established on the propositions—that these powers are unnecessary, that they have been greatly abused, and that the law provides no remedy against abuse. In this connection, I would point out that these powers have long been on the Statute-book, that they have been proved to be not only extremely valuable but necessary, and that they cannot be abused without the author of these orders being called to account before the highest Court of jurisdiction in every province.

Sir, I presume that the Honourable the Mover of the motion aims at the discontinuance of the policy of repression and the adoption of a conciliatory policy. That, Sir, is a proposition which every civilized Government shall at once accept and affirm. Now, Sir, let us examine the whole policy of Government. The policy of Government has been to use these powers

[Dr. R. D. Dalal.]

solely and entirely for the purpose of maintaining the tranquillity of the country and protecting the general public in pursuing their lawful avocations. Sir, the consistent policy of Government has been the freedom of expression for every variety of political thought on constitutional lines, and the promotion of political progress in India by constitutional means. I am convinced that no charge can be levelled against Government, that Government have ever tried to strangle national aspirations. On the contrary, the ever-persistent desire of Government has been to see India's political aspirations expeditiously fulfilled. Sir, nothing is perfect in this world; no Government is perfect; Government themselves will admit that sometimes mistakes have been made. But, this is quite true that Government have never tried to obstruct India's constitutional advance, and I can assure this Honourable House that in this respect Government have let their garments be always white. Sir, the consistent policy of Government has been to secure co-operation of the Congress. But it has been impossible for Government to co-operate with a body whose whole policy is to terrorise its officials, to hamstring its finances, to increase the difficulties of the administration, to paralyse all machinery of Government, and to proceed steadily with preparations to oust the established Government by revolutionary methods. Sir, the maintenance of law and order is the first condition precedent to any constitutional progress in India. The Congress leaders aspire themselves to be the rulers of India in the future. I, for one, have nothing but admiration for these aspirations, which are the natural outcome of human instinct to manage one's own affairs. But would it not be to their interest that the transfer of command shall be a transfer of power and not of weakness? Government cannot be expected to hand over authority to an India convulsed by disorder. Sir, to me it is a matter for deep regret that the Honourable the Mover of the motion has selected this particular time to discuss what he calls the repressive policy of Government. The civil disobedience movement is not withdrawn; it is suspended; it may be revived at any time. The Hindu-Muslim dispute has not been settled. The terrorist movement has not been crushed. Provincial Autonomy is shortly to be inaugurated. I respectfully ask—Is this then the time to seek to undermine the authority of those officers who are responsible for the maintenance of peace and law and order, and to lower the high morale, and to break down the strong sense of public duty and the strict sense of discipline, which at present animate the services which are responsible for the maintenance of peace and law and order and good administration throughout the length and breadth of the country. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, in conclusion, let me impress upon this Honourable House that at the present juncture, India wants peace, and a start on the reforms in a calm, cool, good atmosphere. I am certain that we all are influenced by a desire that conditions should be established in which all the energies of the whole nation may engage in the great task of working the new constitution in a spirit of co-operation, harmony, and comradeship. (Applause.)

**Maulana Shaukat Ali** (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, my views on the repressive laws of this country are well known. Here in this House in Delhi and in Simla, I have always put in a word that the time has come when we should do without these laws.



You are transferring power to our people, and the time has come when you ought to trust them and ask them to suggest something that will stop this terrorism. Personally speaking, how is it that I, a loyal Government servant, a pensioner now of this Government, living the life of a vagabond and an outlaw—I am talking of my previous days—and fighting my own friends in the services, how is it that I have become a rebel and an outlaw? I know it was not sheer cussedness, it is not a pleasure to me to go and oppose officials. I do not want to quarrel with anybody. I wanted to live an honest life of a God fearing Muslim and a self-respecting Indian. Circumstances happened. Our advice was not taken, our feelings were not considered, and they think they can go on very well as long as they have got the power. They can try oppression and repression, and they can temporarily carry on this Government. But I want to tell them that that is impossible to continue for a long time. I think the whole country is saturated with that mentality that if things do not improve, the whole country will become revolutionary. How long are you going to lock up people? You cannot do it indefinitely. I hope and pray that now that you are transferring power and now that we will be in this place to run the administration, cannot you trust us and listen to us and ask us: "What is your suggestion?" I have got a suggestion to make. Here I have my brother and friend, Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, and I listened to his speech. I know he has suffered much. When I just met him, I thought I had suffered a great deal more than he. But when I met him and heard his tales of suffering, his life as an internee, well, I bow my head to him. I must give the first place to him in the matter of suffering. I have known him and discussed things with him. When he and the friends from Bengal want to advocate that this repressive law should be withdrawn, ask them what is their suggestion. I would personally think, if I were in the place of the Honourable the Home Member—however there is no chance of my being in his place, I do not want to be there, I have lived my life as a humble Muslim, I am perfectly happy in that life, and I will not change my life for his—I would say this much that these terrorists have been created, because you would not listen to the people's advice.

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

You do not want to change your mentality. You do not understand the world movements. You do not understand what is happening in Europe. You do not understand the hard truth that Universities there are educating the young men and inculcating ideas from the West, you do not understand that the newspapers are there to spread knowledge among the people, you do not understand that the radio is there, you want that the people in India should not be affected in any way by these world forces. I think it is sheer folly to think so. I am afraid, it will lead you nowhere.

Now, if my Honourable friends like Mr. Suryya Kumar Som, Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya and Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant want that these laws should go, if they want that these young men whom you have arrested and interned without trial should be released, if they want you to relieve these young men of their misery and unhappiness, you ask them what is their suggestion. If you are really anxious that these young men should be really useful members of society, you have got to ask these

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

Honourable friends as to what is their suggestion. I would personally think, if I were in power, to release every young man for whom a Member of this House stands guarantee. If an Honourable Member of this House comes forward and says, "I stand guarantee for these five young men", you must release the young men. If they misbehave, you can ask the surety for an explanation. I am perfectly certain that an Honourable Member offering himself as surety is a very good surety for the maintenance of peace and order in this country and for the good behaviour of these young men. When you go to them with suggestions and remind them of their own promises, they lose their temper and bully you. Bullying does not pay, and I also can play that game. I am really anxious that this kind of quarrel should cease. I don't give my vote to the other side, because they do not listen to me, and so I vote with my friends here who, I know, cannot do without me and between whom and me, that is, between Hindus and Muslims and all other people, there must be an honourable pact. But Government's idea of co-operation is one of abject surrender, and we are not prepared to go as far as that. An insult offered to me will rankle in the hearts of my children and grandchildren, and future peace will be impossible. Therefore, although I am not a *persona grata* with the Home Member, I suggest to him that he should get the leaders of the Opposition together and consult them and take their advice. If things go right, every one will be happy, and we can devote our attention to constructive programmes. But as long as there is this hollow talk of co-operation without intending to co-operate, every one will be unhappy, and the policy will fail. It will bring unhappiness to both India and England. We have got a book containing the laws laid down by our Prophet, and every Muslim must obey that. You have got to deal with a hundred thousand Mussalmans, and you must have their goodwill. The old methods have failed, and the time has come when you must try some new methods. This is my humble request, and I have done my duty.

**Sir Srinivasa Sarma:** Sir, during the last eight years that I have had the honour of being a Member of this House, it was my privilege to have listened to speeches on cuts of this nature during the budget debate. I have also participated in some, but I must confess that the debate on this particular cut today has proceeded on, not only lines of sweet reasonableness, but also in an atmosphere of very great good humour, and I shall not spoil that atmosphere by making any aggressive or provocative remarks on this subject. Sir, the Honourable the Deputy President, in moving this cut sought to make two points, first, that this policy of repression ought not to be pursued, because it had the most demoralising effect of curbing the liberty of speech and action of the nation.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** That is what I did not say.

**Sir Srinivasa Sarma:** Another point he made was that during the last five or six years there has been a steady improvement in the situation, and as such there was no necessity for the continuance of these repressive measures. I think the most appropriate reply to that speech was given by another speaker from the same province, my Honourable friend, Mr. Chattopadhyaya. I think that was the best speech on behalf of Government that I ever heard on the floor of this House on this subject. He

answered the first point by saying that in whichever country in the world, Italy, Russia, Austria and other countries which he quoted, where repression was pursued for stifling the legitimate aspirations of the people, it had failed. And then he said what a great leader of Bengal once said that the blood of the martyr was the seed of the Church. Therefore, if anybody should be very much worried about the repressive policy being pursued with a view not to give self-government to this country, it was the Government and not the Opposition that are to be worried about it, because, on the admission of Mr. Chattopadhyaya, it quickened the day of self-government and Swaraj for this country!

Regarding the second point, my Honourable friend, Mr. Roy, also sought to make out that whenever there was a relaxation of these methods there was a recrudescence. It was more effectively put by Mr. Chattopadhyaya who, I may tell the House, knows more about this terrorist movement in Bengal than any Member of this House, and who has been a friend of mine for the last 21 years. He said that even now young men in Bengal had been considering whether or not to start this movement. That was the important admission he made. They were only kept in abeyance by the non-violent creed of Mahatma Gandhi, but they were considering whether to start this movement.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Government are driving them to it.

**Sir Srinivasa Sarma:** Whatever it may be, he said there are still people who are thinking like that. That shows that some youths have not yet realised that the movement of terrorism takes them nowhere; on the other hand that it was doing the greatest injustice to the legitimate aspirations of this country. So long as there are youngmen who still believe in terrorism, all these preventive measures are certainly necessary from the point of view of Government. And as Honourable Members have talked of repression with special reference to Bengal from which province I come . . . . . (Ironical Laughter.) When I say I come from that province, I mean that I am more or less domiciled there, and I can speak with a certain amount of knowledge and authority regarding that province. (*An Honourable Member:* "What about Madras?") I do not know much about Madras. What I want to ask is this; Can my Honourable friends point out one specific act of repression during the last 12 months on the part of the Government of Bengal, either with regard to the press or public speakers or with reference to detenus? The Government of Sir John Anderson has taken no action during the last 12 months. Not one man has been detained afresh, apart from those who have been already detained and sent to a detention camp, during the last 22 months. On the other hand, the policy of gradual release of detenus consistent with safety has been going on. Sir, I may say that I have had many opportunities of discussions, with His Excellency Sir John Anderson on this matter, and I may say this that to no one, including the Leader of the Opposition or any Congressmen on those benches, is it more hateful than to His Excellency to keep youngmen in continued loss of freedom. But faced with the problem of these terrorist outrages, a fear of a recrudescence, no Governor, consistently with his responsibility, can for a moment release all the detenus indiscriminately.

[Sir Srinivasa Sarma.]

My Honourable friend, Mr. Chattopadhyaya, mentioned Italy, Russia and other countries. But my friend knows perfectly well that, if instead of living in this country, Mr. Chattopadhyaya had been living either in Rome or in Moscow today, or if the repressive measures or the form of Government pursued in Russia or Italy were prevalent in this country and adopted by the Government of India, we certainly would not have had the pleasure and the privilege of having Mr. Chattopadhyaya in our midst today or the opportunity of listening to his eloquence. He was referring to those countries. But I know . . . . .

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** What would be your position in those countries?

**Sir Srinivasa Sarma:** My position would have been that I would have done what suited me at that time (Laughter) in this way, that if I did not have free expression of opinion under the Government of Mussolini or Stalin, I would have honestly faced the music or left the country: I would not have stayed and condemned without taking responsibility. But today all these Congress people might be condemning the present Government and the Government of Sir John Anderson for the policy of continued detention of some of those who in his opinion are still not safe to be let out to full liberty. But when these very people find that these young men, as a result of this policy which is being pursued in their own interests, are taken away from the paths of violence to more responsible avocations of life and become useful citizens of society, my friends, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant in the United Provinces, Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar in Madras and Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose in Bengal, will be able to sit in their arm chairs free from the fear of the bomb and the revolver to do the work of the nation-building departments—these very gentlemen will be thankful to those who have been carrying on so far, who have been honestly endeavouring, not only to make India fit for self-government, but safe for the enjoyment of those great privileges which the Government of India Act have conferred upon the people of this country.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai** (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, is anybody going to speak from the Government side? We have been waiting for some one to speak for the Government of India: and if the Honourable the Home Member does not wish to speak, I am quite willing to wind up the debate.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I shall wait to wind up the debate.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** But I can follow him after he speaks: if he does not wish to . . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Yes, I do wish to: but there is another hour. The Honourable the Mover will have a right to reply, I understand.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no right of reply.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** I am not suggesting that. All I was suggesting was that it would be fair to the House if Sir Henry Craik stated his case on behalf of the Government, so that we or some of us may have an opportunity to answer it.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I think the usual course in these debates is that the Government or the Member in charge of the subject on behalf of the Government has the last word. That has always been the convention.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Mr. President, if the Government feel that on a grave issue of this character, the mere fact that they speak last is going to do their case any good, I have no objection. I always thought that a justification was obviously called for when civil liberties in any country are restricted in any form whatever. It is not denied that many civil liberties may be restricted in the interests of the State; but it is for those who place the smallest restriction upon them to justify it. Without that justification, they stand self-condemned. It is usual with all Governments, however uncivilised or irresponsible they may be, that whenever they restrict the liberties of individuals or groups they come forward with a justification on the ground that it is only for the interests of the state to which those very citizens owe allegiance. But here it seems that the law does not apply. As one of the sponsors of the Civil Liberties Union which has, as you are well aware, branches in most parts of the civilised world, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing our view of the manner in which the administration of the Home Department in so far as the encroachment on civil liberties is concerned, is being carried on.

To start with, it is not denied that in every department of activities for which liberty is claimed, there is undoubtedly restriction by the present Government either by means of legislative Acts where they have the discretion to apply them or not, or by means of executive action. To take stock of the situation, as it now stands, you cannot help beginning with the province of Bengal; and the very policy as it is called which is now being pursued, as to which some gentlemen who regard themselves as very useful citizens by sitting on the other side of the House and voting with the Government seem to imagine that they are preparing the future heaven for this Government of India by the policy which they have hitherto been pursuing—but let them remember that after years of pursuing a wrong policy it requires very little arguments to tear off the disguise of the way in which they now wish to go back upon it as quickly and as decently as they could: for whatever credit may be given to the present Governor of Bengal—and I am not here to distribute praise or blame to the administrators in any part of the country—one thing is quite clear, that whenever the State and particularly a Government like this have got to reverse their policy, as usual they find an excuse: the excuse now is "We are training these young men to some useful avocations so that they will turn away from their wrong mentality and become useful citizens". But why did it take so many years for that wisdom to dawn on those all-powerful trustees of British Indian interests in this country?

If that was the method by which the terrorist was to be dealt with, why have had all the oppression and the suffering, all the privation which has had to go through? And I have yet to hear, notwithstanding a few verbal speeches made on the other side, as to what it is that made a change

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

in the mentality of those who, it was supposed, were murderous anarchists. If they were right so far, there is no question of going back upon that policy. But it is obvious from all their methods—and the communiques which I have been reading from Bengal during the last few months—that they are now finding some excuse for correcting an error without at least having the decency to admit it. The fact remains that batches of men are sent out—who they say will be released from ordinary restrictions of detenus and will have some other restrictions, the description of which is not clear, and the extent of which is not described—what they call some village restrictions of a nature which it is very difficult for a layman like me to understand, not having belonged to the great administrative hierarchy. But if the situation now is that the new policy as they call it of reconcoiling these young men instead of driving them into the methods of violence is true, what does it signify? It signifies one thing at all events, that they were terrorists for want of occupation, if their own remedy, which they propose to apply, is correct. For after all, what is the remedy which is suggested by them? “We are now trying to educate these young men”—for you may remember and the House may remember they have passed some of the most severe tests in University examinations even during the period of their incarceration. Their natural abilities were never disputed or denied. But they now say that they are turning those abilities to a useful purpose in order,—to use the hackneyed phrase of the gentleman who spoke last,—to turn them into useful citizens. But how will you turn them into useful citizens unless you know the diagnosis of the terrorist movement as to why they became, what they are alleged to be. They have become what they are either for want of employment or your methods of treating that part of India with a severity, for which you yourself will pay the penalty in due course of time, were wrong. If it was the severity which drove those youngmen to adopt such methods, you ought not to have adopted them. If it was a question of training them to a useful purpose, there was no reason why you should have waited for all these long years in order to train them to that useful purpose, so that instead of being unemployed anarchists they would have been employed as useful citizens. If, therefore, the present system, the present process, has any meaning at all, it is the clearest condemnation of the policy which has hitherto been pursued with so much piling up of misery and suffering and loss of human life and liberty. And are we really so deaf to the understanding of the human mind that today we do not know what the Government are doing? Not having suffered themselves, but having inflicted unwarranted suffering on large masses of youngmen, they have now got tired of inflicting suffering and thereby making them tired,—for you cannot kill the flame of patriotism by that method,—we know what the Government are doing.

I will relate, Sir, what happened to me in the Nasik Central prison. Believing that I was put in the “A” class, they thought that the proper warder for me was the worst habitual criminal in the jail. So they put up a man called Ramu, who had an accumulated sentence of 50 years not actually to be suffered, because some of the sentences were to run concurrently for dacoity, murder and all the rest of it. When I began to ask why such a man was let loose for the purpose of being made a warder of a respectable citizen, he brought me what is called the history ticket—I was very anxious to bring with me my own history ticket, but they would not allow me to take it out,—and I found that in Ramu’s ticket it was clearly

stated that he had been sentenced to flogging three times, and, at the end of the third flogging, he told the Superintendent, notwithstanding the burning and the bleeding wounds, if he had any other punishment he could think of. The result was that a report was made that the only way to reform this man of courage and fortitude was to make him an officer in the jail. If, therefore, you realise that it is not by oppression that you are going to reform men, but it is by turning their abilities into useful channels, you have only learnt it a little too late, and even today I hope my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Craik, will tender an apology to this House for having allowed a policy of ruthless suppression and oppression in that province teeming with intelligence and patriotism. (Applause from the Congress Party Benches.) For indeed I had the courage on the last occasion, a courage which I specially stress for the reason that for expression of a similar opinion my friend, Pandit Krishna Kant Malaviya, was almost howled down by a portion of this House,—I had the courage to point out, as I point out again today,—that good qualities may be turned to bad purposes; they may be coupled with questionable and reprehensible methods, and, therefore, in my country, as in their own, let them always remember that a man who suffers for a cause being prepared to pay the penalty for it does not deserve the kind of condemnation which that I have been accustomed to hear for two years in this House. To call them by names almost unmentionable in society is not the right method of treating patriotic men who, when India comes to her own, will be regarded as men who suffered for a just cause. (Applause from the Congress Party Benches.) But what is more, they have realised that on the eve of the new reforms which are coming and in which perhaps the Indian representatives might have something to say, and in which perhaps the policy might be reversed as a matter of propriety and decency they should prepare for climbing down at all events gently. I am very glad the Government are climbing down gently, it does not lessen the unpardonable crime of suppressing without any trial. When instances have been given of men being detained without trial for 21 years, that out of such desperation of a futile existence youngmen after youngmen resorted to ultimately put an end to their life, it requires a less hardened heart at all events than ours to keep on looking on. Nero may have his dinners and fiddles while Rome was burning, but fortunately we belong to Rome, and we are not the Neros of another race, and it is for that reason that we on this side of the House, and every man who has respect and patriotism, who has a regard for self-sacrificing suffering, will cast our vote in the way it should be cast so far as the vote on a question of this character is concerned.

Sir, it is unnecessary to trace the history of this debatable issue as to what was the origin of the terrorist movement, but whatever was the origin, whether it began with the oppressive methods of the Government, whether it was the unemployment, whether it touched the sentimental minds of those who suffered for no other cause than they believed that patriotism was a virtue, which indeed is a virtue, or some other cause, what did they do in their own country? What happened during the great War? Murdering the Germans was treated as an act of valiance, for which people were awarded the Victoria Cross. I suppose it was merely not murder, because it was on a gigantic scale, but it was regarded as an act of patriotism, it was regarded as an act of sacrifice. And yet, because it happens to be an individual, though it happens to be in a similar causes, a misguided individual undoubtedly, according to the view for which I have always stood, you cannot allow him to be condemned, to be treated as a

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

dog, the manner and expression of which I remember having been used in this House with reference to many of these youngmen who have been detained without trial. We have here respectable youngmen who under better circumstances and under a freer Government would be the best material for the defence of this country. It is only because you dare not condemn mere patriotism that you give it the false name of anarchism. They want a Government, but not yours which they think is anarchy, but ours, which is good Government. (Applause from Congress Party Benches.) And why should they want it, I like to know. Sir, so far as the treatment of youngmen in Bengal is concerned, whatever may be the fate of the Governments in this country or the present Empire, it will be one of the darkest pages which will have to be read at a time when memorials have been raised under similar circumstances, when Empires have changed to the hands of those who have suffered for them in earlier days, and I hope and trust that the present Government before it hands over charge, as my friend, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, was yesterday singing, as I always thought, his last swan song, let us hear at all events the song of decency, a song in which there is a recognition that after all is said and done, they had committed a wrong, and they were prepared to acknowledge it, they were prepared to right the wrong. But if it is merely to be done in that grudging spirit in which it is being done in Bengal, under a pretence of mercy, of patronage, of arrogance, that they had a right to repress and suppress occasionally, I should like to tell them, that they may as well keep these men confined in a manner which according to this Government they desire befits them for the cause they have suffered. I am not here pleading their cause on the ground of pity or sympathy. I shall be the last to do so, standing as we are for the principles for which we do. But I say that these men ought not to have been treated in the way in which they have been. It is contrary to the first principles of natural justice. The only ground that is given is that the evidence is of such character that it cannot be decided in a Court of law, that people who are likely to put forward evidence will be murdered. If that is the ground on which a person is not to be brought to trial, I think there are many cases I can think of during the last thirty years of my practice at the bar, which might have served as a good excuse for the abolition of most of the tribunals. A man merely suspected of a possible crime, or a possible crime which they may attempt if they were free, a crime which defies definition in the eye of law and common sense,—the crime is this, that if they were free they might possibly commit some possible offence. (Laughter.) That is the crime under which men have been kept for a period of 20 years and more without trial. Waste of human energy and creation of a feeling of bitterness, which is certainly not a preparation for handing over a good Government to a successive Government, despite the opinion of those who might see darkness in light and light in darkness. For one fact remains that if you hand over the Government after having done the wrongs that you have done, the first righteous act of that Government would be to show to what extent you have done wrong to this country. I hope and trust that the first great act of the Government which will come would be to see that all men and all women in the country detained without trial shall be free men and women. (Cheers.) So much, Sir, so far as Bengal is concerned. So far as the rest of the country is concerned, the situation is none better. May be that they were obliged under the



stress of the suspension of civil resistance to lift the ban from certain groups of associations. They still retain and maintain a bitterness, a pettiness, of which I will only give one example. There are four ashrams in the Bardoli taluk, one in the town of Bardoli itself,—all these no different from other ashrams. If anything, they have greater traditions of sacrifice and useful work than perhaps any other ashrams if a degree of comparison is allowed.

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

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** I shall finish in two minutes. And yet this mighty Government have not raised the ban on the Bardoli Ashram. It would be an acknowledgment of defeat because that is where they began the struggle, and if you raise the ban it will assist in the emancipation as they thought of a great deal of suppression which was being carried on. I am very glad indeed that they have not raised the ban on those ashrams though promises had been held out before during the last budget Session that that would be done. I have thought and thought to find out whether there could be any reason for singling out these four ashrams out of hundreds of such ashrams in Guzerat, and the only one that I find is this. My Honourable friends do not admit it; they repeat to me many stories. But the fear with which they governed us has already begun to seize their own minds, and it is one of the most hopeful signs of the advent of the future self-government of this country. One word more, and that is the banning of the pledge of Independence which was used to be read on the celebration of the Independent day since 1929. I will only add one sentence. I have read the pledge which was banned and I have read the earlier ones which had been read. And the Government in taking the action that they did could only have been inspired by one of two motives, either that many of us would read it and our attention would be diverted from the struggle in which we were then engaged of elections so that those of their henchmen might have some chance, or they were so afraid that by reason of the intensive propaganda the shaking foundations of the Government were likely to be shattered.

Sir, I have done, but let Government now have the decency and the generosity to acknowledge that in pursuing the policy of repression they have done a wrong which they will put right as soon as they ever can. (Applause.)

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** This is the third occasion on which I have had to meet a cut of this character dealing with alleged acts of repression on the part of the Government of India. I am glad that on this occasion the debate, though it has ranged over a very wide range of subjects, has for the most part been conducted in good humour. I rather regret the somewhat bitter tone which the last speaker imported into the debate, and quite frankly, I neither recognise myself in the character of Nero any more than I recognise the Bengali terrorists in the character of noble patriots striving to be free.

Well, Sir, there is a certain similarity about these debates which occur regularly year after year. In fact, I think today we have had almost the same speakers and almost exactly the same arguments used as were used this time last year, with the single exception that on this

[Sir Henry Craik.]

occasion it was Mr. Chattopadhyaya's blood that boiled over instead of Mr. Maitra's. I hope that that uncomfortable physical process has now terminated and that he will approach the decision on this debate in a calmer mood. The division on this debate has always been one of the leading sporting events of the budget Session. It has always been a peculiarly close division, and last year the verdict that was given—I am sorry to say, for the cut and not against it—was by one vote. If my Honourable friend opposite would like to have a little bit on this year's sporting event, may I know what odds he would like to lay? (Laughter.)

As I have said, the debate has ranged over a very wide range of subjects, many of them not even remotely connected with the authority and powers of the Governor General in Council and of which I have and can have in the nature of things very little knowledge. For example, one speaker on the Benches opposite, I think Mr. Gadgil, referred to certain incidents in Poona, such as restrictions placed on certain newspapers, or restrictions placed on certain lawyers in that city of which I have never before heard and in the nature of things I could have never heard. Many of the matters discussed are subjects for which the Governor General in Council has and can exercise no responsibility whatsoever. It is true that the Governor General in Council does exercise for the next three weeks and for the next three weeks only, powers of superintendence, direction and control over the Local Governments in India. Those powers disappear completely on the 1st April. One fortunate result of that so far as I am concerned is that there can never be a cut motion of this character hereafter, or if one is moved at all, it must be confined solely to the centrally administered areas of Delhi, Ajmer and the Andamans. (Laughter.) But after the 1st April, and that is a very short way off now, we shall have no power of superintendence, direction and control over Local Governments in regard to matters of law and order. That is a pretty obvious consequence of the Act of Parliament passed last year, and yet it seems to have been one that has escaped the minds of most of those who have spoken today. But although during the year that has passed we did have those powers of superintendence, direction and control, surely every Honourable Member can appreciate the fact that we cannot in the day to day detail of carrying on the administration exercise those powers over every single matter that comes up for decision by Local Governments. Of course we cannot, and of course we do not attempt to do so, and in fact in regard to a great many of the incidents which have been mentioned in the debate today not only am I perfectly justified in disclaiming all responsibility, but as I have said, of a great majority of them I had never even heard till they were mentioned by speakers in the course of this debate. So, Sir, I must of sheer physical necessity confine myself to one or two only of the very numerous topics that have been mentioned and I will devote the greater part of the time that remains to me to two subjects, one the Bengal detenus and terrorism in Bengal generally and secondly to a subject which has been mentioned by more than one speaker, the recent proscription of the Independence Declaration. But first I would like to say one word, and a very brief word only, in regard to the various allegations that have been made about elections and the interference of Government servants in the elections. I have had a good deal of experience of elections in one way or another, both in this

country and in my own country, and I never remember one which was not followed by a good deal of mutual recrimination and accusations by prominent political parties of unfair conduct on the part of their opponents. Now, I should have thought that in India at this last election that that would have been absent because as the Honourable Members opposite are so fond of impressing upon us, there was really only one party which mattered at all. However they wanted somebody whom they could abuse and they chose the existing Government, which was not a party at all. The surprising thing is that Government servants should have been accused of interfering with elections but from almost every province I have seen claims—and I have no reason to doubt their accuracy—that the majority of those Government servants who possess votes voted for the Congress. You cannot both interfere and work against the Congress and vote for it.

**An Honourable Member:** In spite of you?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I have not got a vote, and there was no election in Delhi. If it is true that a great many Government servants voted for the Congress, it is not likely that they would have worked against the Congress. It is hardly possible to do both. In regard to that subject a great many instances have been mentioned today and, as I have said, it is not possible in the nature of things that I should be able to reply to every one of those points. For example, I can hardly be expected to have heard of the two taxi-drivers in Midnapore whose licenses were alleged to have been cancelled by the District Magistrate, and another Honourable Member made an allegation of a charge of assault somewhere else. Those things do not come to my knowledge but whenever a specific allegation has been brought to my knowledge and I have made inquiries, I have been told that either the case was completely without foundation or that at any rate it was grossly exaggerated. That is all I want to say about the elections, except that I should mention that if charges have been made of unfair conduct and undue influence and so on, let the House believe me that it is all by no means on one side. Such charges have also been made and have been published in a number of newspapers that have come to my notice against the Congress Party.

Now, I shall leave that subject and come to the banning of the Resolution regarding Independence. I have been asked why this Resolution which has been in existence since 1930—I think it was actually passed in January 1930 soon after the session of the Congress at Lahore—was only banned the other day when it was announced that it was to be repeated at all meetings to celebrate Independence Day—that was, I think, on January, 26th last. Now, Sir, the position is this. It is perfectly true that the Resolution was passed originally by the Congress in January 1930 and it was not interfered with in 1930 or 1931 but after 1931, Honourable Members will remember—I think it was in the beginning of 1932—the Congress itself was proclaimed an unlawful association and from that time onwards such few attempts as have been made to repeat that pledge in a complete form have been done quietly and *sub rosa* and have so far as I am aware been objected to, that is to say, prosecutions have followed. In 1932 the Congress was banned, I think, and that ban—here again I speak from recollection—was removed in the summer of 1934. In 1935

[Sir Henry Craik.]

the pledge was repeated at the celebration of the Congress Jubilee but in a specially modified form which did not contain the words to which objection has been taken. That was in 1935. In regard to the Independence Day in 1936, we did receive information that it was intended to repeat the pledge in its full form but ultimately for some reason or other, possibly because wiser counsels prevailed but anyhow it is not for me to suggest the reason, that was not eventually done and the pledge so far as it was repeated at all in January 1936 was certainly repeated without the objectionable words. That brings me to January 1937. Here we received information that the whole of the pledge in its original form, the 1930 form, was to be repeated in full.

**An Honourable Member:** No, the last paragraph had been dropped out.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Yes, there was a slight verbal change to bring it up to date but there was no change of substance and no change of the words to which objection was taken. There were special instructions issued by the Congress High Command that the pledge was to be repeated at every meeting to celebrate "Independence Day" and that the reading of this pledge in full was to be a special feature of the programme of each Independence Day meeting. Now, Sir, that pledge, the full pledge—I do not say the mere declaration that independence is the ultimate object of a particular political party—but the language which accompanied that declaration was, according to the best legal advice procurable, of a highly seditious nature, and it would have been quite impossible for Government to allow that pledge to be read in public in the many places where it was intended to celebrate this Independence Day. That is the reason why Local Governments proscribed this document and issued a warning that people who repeated it would be liable to prosecution. As a matter of fact, to the best of my knowledge, it was repeated in the objectionable form only in one or two places, and I think I only heard of two prosecutions having been undertaken. . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Which Province?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I do not remember—one I think in Bihar, but anyhow it is immaterial. That, Sir, is the explanation of the attitude taken by Government in regard to this matter. I submit, Sir, that it is not an attitude that requires any elaborate justification. We were advised on the highest legal advice procurable that the document was seditious, and no one reading it could have the slightest doubt that it is gravely seditious; the advocacy of independence, whatever that may mean, as a policy is not of course seditious, but when it is accompanied by arguments such as this pledge is, calculated to cause disaffection and hatred towards the existing form of Government, then it is plainly an offence against the law and any Government which permitted that to pass without protesting, without taking legal steps to uphold the law, would be failing grossly in its duty. There was no inconsistency because, as I have said, the pledge was never repeated, at any rate in any widespread or broadcast way, during any of the three previous years.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Was it not repeated in 1930?

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

**An Honourable Member:** Where were your legal advisers then?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Where was I then? (Laughter.)

**An Honourable Member:** You were in the Punjab.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Now, I pass from that to the subject which has loomed the largest in this debate and that is the subject of Bengal. That Province is one which has had on three occasions had to bear all the misery and suffering caused by a movement of militant terrorism and anarchy. Various speakers have stressed the point that the terrorist movement is dead. Now, I admit that there has been a very great improvement in that respect, that there has been no murderous outrage at all in the course of the last two years. I admit, too, that there has been a very great improvement in the general attitude of public opinion towards the terrorist. There has, I think, even been a real improvement in the outlook of the terrorists themselves, I mean in the outlook of those who conscientiously believed that the assassination of individuals is a legitimate political method. I admit all that. I admit there has been an improvement, and I am sure the Government of Bengal have said so publicly themselves, but at the same time I think it would be very unjustifiably optimistic to take the view that the movement is completely stamped out. Disquieting incidents still occur; the discovery of arms and ammunition is still a matter of almost weekly occurrence in certain parts of Bengal. From the last report received only yesterday, it appeared that in the Chittagong district a detenu was assaulted by persons believed to be terrorists because they suspected that he had given information that led to the arrest of absconders, and on the same day a young man was arrested in the northern part of Calcutta in possession of a revolver and a number of cartridges. Now, those are disquieting incidents and we have reason to believe that recruitment to the ranks of the terrorists is still going on. It would be taking a quite unjustifiable risk in those circumstances for any Government to say, "we will relax all our restrictions, we will let out all the detenus, we will repeal all our special laws; the situation has so far improved as to justify that". If any Government took that view, I think it would be taking a quite unjustifiable risk,—and I very gravely doubt whether even the responsible Government that I hope will be soon formed in Bengal will take that line, but that remains to be seen. But at the same time, that the situation has improved is freely admitted; and I think, Sir, I can fairly claim that the improvement has been reflected in the steady policy of relaxation of restrictions now being pursued by the Government of Bengal. I shall give some figures in a moment in support of that statement, but I should like to add here one word from my personal knowledge in regard to the present Governor of Bengal. I have discussed this problem with him on several occasions and at considerable length and the House can take it from me that my Honourable friend on my right was perfectly correct in saying that no one

[Sir Henry Craik.]

has given more careful and anxious thought to this problem than His Excellency Sir John Anderson (Hear, hear), and that no one has done more to find a constructive solution of the problem—not merely the punishment of the guilty or the prevention of offences but getting down to the root causes of the problem—no one has made a more constructive contribution to the solution of that problem than Sir John Anderson, and I believe that fact is very generally recognised in Bengal itself. (Hear, hear.)

I would like to give the House a few figures showing how restrictions have been relaxed, especially because the figures given by my Honourable friend who moved this cut seemed to me—I am quite certain that was quite unintentional—to be inclined to be misleading; they rather implied that more people were in jails, and more arrests had been made recently than before. Now, actually at the end of 1935 the total number of persons in jails was 1,498, or in round figures 1,500; it is now below 1,100, that is to say, there has been a drop in just about a year of about 28 per cent. The number released unconditionally was 255, and also 108 who have been released after undergoing training in the new industrial and agricultural camps . . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** What about home internees?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** The figures there are just about the same as before—no serious increase. No, the village domicile figures are just about the same. Under home internee, there has been a small increase. Since these figures were compiled, I have received a further telegram from the Government of Bengal, which came in only today, that in view of the improved situation, the cases of all detenus interned in home internment or with relatives have been reviewed and not less than 230 are to be released immediately. This number includes 6 women. These persons will be released subject to certain conditions which I understand usually mean that they only have to report their place of residence or their change of residence to the police.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** That is in addition to 108.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** It is in addition to 108 who have been given a training in industry or agriculture and also in addition to 255 who have been released unconditionally, and also in addition to 133 who were at present in the industrial camp.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** What is the total number now under detention?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** If we count also those who are in home internment and with relations, it will be something like 1,800.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** This is the total number, all told.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Yes. The number in Deoli, which is the only place for which the Government of India have any direct responsibility, has decreased from 500 to about 400, as far as I remember, within the last 18 months.

Now, Sir, I think these figures which are the most up-to-date figures available are sufficient to show that the policy of the Bengal Government during the last year, so far from being one of repression, has been one of steady relaxation of the restrictions. There have been very large number of releases and we can fairly hope that if the improvement continues, the releases will go on at even a quicker rate than before.

There is one point to which I must refer and that is the disquieting symptoms to which reference was made by one other speaker. There is a tendency on the part of the terrorists in Bengal to swing over from the the methods of individual assassination to the methods of the communists, that is to say to advocate rather a mass revolution than individual assassination. Now, that is a very real danger and so long as that danger exists—and it exists in more than one province in India—it is a danger against which not only this Government but any Government must retain special powers. No Government, however composed, could sit by and watch, without power to prevent it, the insidious growth of communist propaganda in this country. Its objective is armed revolution, preceded by general strikes, and the paralysis of all kinds of trade by tearing to pieces the whole fabric of the existing social system. So long as there is a party in existence advocating those methods—and I can assure the House that within the last two years or so some 40 or 50 Indian students trained in these methods in Russia and financed by the Communist International have penetrated into this country under forged or altered passports—Government must be armed with proper powers to deal with it. I submit that any Government—I do not speak of the present Government which is a thing of only a few weeks now—that aims at peaceful progress would find it necessary to retain powers to deal with such a movement as that.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has spoken for 30 minutes.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik**: I have only one word to add. We are now on the very threshold of most momentous changes. I feel sure that all sections of the House will recognise that, whatever our methods, we can, at any rate, claim so far one result on which, I think, we are entitled to congratulate ourselves, and that is that these momentous changes, perhaps the profoundest single change in the constitution of any country that history has known, barring the violent revolutions which have accompanied recent changes in certain European countries, have been carried through at any rate to their penultimate stage without any serious disorder. That, at any rate, is something. Under less favourable conditions, if respect for law and order had been diminished or had been allowed to relax, it is not difficult to see into what chaos and confusion the country might have been plunged. Let us hope that the remaining stages will be carried out in the same peaceful way. I will only say this as to the future that I am quite certain that, whatever shape the Government takes, if its policy is to be one of progress, one of improvement of economic conditions and social conditions, it will never attain those objects unless it is strong enough to ensure a respect for order and the enforcement of the law. All civic liberty, all freedom if you prefer that word depends in the long run on respect for the law. (Loud Applause.)

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

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

The Assembly divided:

AYES—61.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.  
Aney, Mr. M. S.  
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.  
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.  
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.  
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.  
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.  
Giri, Mr. V. V.  
Govind Das, Seth.  
Gupta, Mr. Ghanisham Singh.  
Hansraj, Raizada.  
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.  
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.  
Jogendra Singh, Sardar.  
Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.  
Khan Sahib, Dr.  
Khare, Dr. N. B.  
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.  
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.  
Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.  
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.  
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
Parma Nand, Bhai.  
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.  
Sheodass Daga, Seth.  
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.  
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.  
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.  
Som, Mr. Surya Kumar.  
Sri Prakasa, Mr.  
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.  
Varma, Mr. B. B.  
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

NOES—55.

Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.  
Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.  
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.  
Ahsan, Maulvi Muhammad.  
Aikman, Mr. A.  
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.  
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.  
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.  
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.  
Menon, Mr. K. E.  
Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.  
Mody, Sir H. P.  
Morgan, Mr. G.  
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.  
Murid Hussain Qureshi, Khan Bahadur Nawab Makhdum.  
Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.  
Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.  
Naydu, Diwan Bahadur B. V. Sri Hari Rao.  
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.  
Rau, Sir Raghavendra.  
Roughton, Mr. N. J.  
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
Roy, Mr. S. N.  
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.  
Witherington, Mr. C. H.  
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.  
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.  
Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.



## DEMAND No. 1—CUSTOMS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 80,92,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 2—CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,48,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Central Excise Duties'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 3—TAXES ON INCOME INCLUDING CORPORATION TAX.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,82,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 4.—SALT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 63,41,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 5—OPIUM.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,90,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Opium'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 6—PROVINCIAL EXCISE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,25,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Provincial Excise'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 7—STAMPS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,06,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 8—FOREST.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,72,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Forest'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 9—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,29,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 10—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,30,51,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 11—INTEREST ON DEBT AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

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

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 1,18,699, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 13—COUNCIL OF STATE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,31,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Council of State'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 14—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,68,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 15—HOME DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,96,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 16—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,78,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 17—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS

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

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 5,84,900, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 18—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,03,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 19—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,03,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 20—DEFENCE DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 4,16,900, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Defence Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 21—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,40,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 22—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,17,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 23—INDIA OFFICE AND HIGH COMMISSIONER'S ESTABLISHMENT CHARGES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,42,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment Charges'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 24—PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS, DEPARTMENTS, ETC., ON ACCOUNT OF SERVICES RENDERED.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Payments to other Governments, Departments, etc., on account of services rendered'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 25—AUDIT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 91,23,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 26—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 53,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 27—POLICE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,93,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 28—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,93,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 29—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,45,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 30—SURVEY OF INDIA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,04,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 31—METEOROLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,05,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 32—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,18,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 33—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 34—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,41,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 35—ARCHÆOLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 36—MINES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,36,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 37—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,80,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 38—EDUCATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,31,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 39—MEDICAL SERVICES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,31,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 40—PUBLIC HEALTH.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,04,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 41—AGRICULTURE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 31,47,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 42—IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,62,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 43—SCHEME FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING IN INDIA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,65,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 44—IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF SUGAR TECHNOLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of Imperial Institute of Sugar Technology."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 45—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,64,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 46—INDUSTRIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,77,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 47—AVIATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 24,81,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted.

# DEMAND NO. 48—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL AVIATION CHARGED TO REVENUE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation charged to Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.



DEMAND No. 49—BROADCASTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,35,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Broadcasting'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON BROADCASTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Broadcasting'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 51—INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,97,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 52—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,34,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53—CENSUS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 54—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 55—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,96,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 56—JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,30,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Joint Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 57—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,09,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 58—CURRENCY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,58,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Currency'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 59—MINT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,95,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 60—CIVIL WORKS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,25,96,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 61—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,07,23,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 62—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 41,39,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 63—MISCELLANEOUS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,65,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 64—GRANTS-IN-AID TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,27,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Grants-in-aid to Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 65—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 66—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO REVENUE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 67—DELHI.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 53,01,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 68—AJMER-MERWARA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,37,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 69—PANTH PIPLODA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Panth Piploa'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 70—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 29,25,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Andamans and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 71—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SECURITY PRINTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Security Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 72—IRRIGATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,68,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Irrigation'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 78—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 63,08,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 74—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SCHEMES OF AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND RESEARCH.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,37,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 75—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,87,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 76—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 77—CURRENCY CAPITAL OUTLAY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Currency Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 78—DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 29,55,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Delhi Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 70—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,07,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Commuted Value of Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 80—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO CAPITAL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 81—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,63,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Interest-free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 82—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 98,49,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1938, in respect of 'Loans and Advances bearing Interest'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 12th March, 1937.