

18th September, 1933

THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

*relative*  
*(OFFICIAL)*

Volume VII, 1933

(15th September to 21st September, 1933)

SIXTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,  
1933



NEW DELHI  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1934

# Legislative Assembly.

*President:*

THE HONOURABLE SIR SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, K.C.I.E.

*Deputy President:*

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A.

*Panel of Chairmen:*

MR. H. P. MODY, M.L.A.

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

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

SIR ABDULLA-AL-MAMUN SUHRAWARDY, Kt., M.L.A.

*Secretary:*

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

*Assistant of the Secretary:*

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

*Marshal:*

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

*Committee on Public Petitions:*

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

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

MR. B. SITARAMARAJU, M.L.A.

MR. GAYA PRASAD SINGH, M.L.A.

MUNWAR HAJEE ISMAIL ALI KHAN, O.B.E., M.L.A.

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME VII.—15th September to 21st September, 1933.

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1933—	
Member Sworn . . . . .	1589
Cancellation of the Evening Party in honour of the Members of the Central Legislature . . . . .	1589
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1589—1612
Message from the Council of State . . . . .	1612
Statement laid on the Table . . . . .	1612
Statement of Business . . . . .	1613
The Indian Tea Control Bill—Passed as amended . . . . .	1613—27
The Factories Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	1627—47
The Hedjaz Pilgrims ( <i>Muallims</i> ) Bill—Discussion on the motion to recommit to Select Committee not concluded . . . . .	1647—56
SATURDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1933—	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1657—76
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1676—90
Short Notice Questions and Answers . . . . .	1690—92
Election of Members to the Salt Industry Committee . . . . .	1692
Ruling as to whether a Member of the Executive Council of the Governor General who is not a Member of the Assembly has the right of raising a Point of Order on the floor of the House . . . . .	1692—93
Statement laid on the Table . . . . .	1693
The Hedjaz Pilgrims ( <i>Muallims</i> ) Bill—Recommended to Select Committee . . . . .	1693—1711
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	1712—14
The Indian Arbitration (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1714—15
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1715—17
The Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	1717—18
Motion <i>re</i> Future Administration of Aden—Discussion not concluded . . . . .	1718—38

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1933—	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1739—53
Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	1754
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1754—65
Messages from the Council of State . . . . .	1765
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	1765—71
The Indian Dock Labourers Bill—Introduced . . . . .	1771
The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Nomination of Members of the Legislative Assembly to the Joint Committee . . . . .	1771
The Imperial Bank of India (Amendment) Bill—Nomination of Members of the Legislative Assembly to the Joint Committee . . . . .	1771—72
Motion <i>re</i> Future Administration of Aden—Adopted as amended . . . . .	1772—1820
WEDNESDAY, 20TH SEPTEMBER, 1933—	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1821—42
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1842—60
Messages from the Council of State . . . . .	1860—61
Death of Mr. B. N. Misra . . . . .	1861—65
Motion <i>re</i> Dues in respect of Lighthouses and Buoy in British India—Adopted . . . . .	1865
The Indian Medical Council Bill—Passed as amended . . . . .	1865—85
Resolution <i>re</i> Draft Convention and Recommendation concerning the Age for Admission of Children to Non-Industrial Employment—Adopted . . . . .	1885—96
Resolution <i>re</i> Amendment of Rule relating to the Constitution of the Committee on Public Accounts—Adopted . . . . .	1896—97
Demand for Supplementary Grant . . . . .	1897—1908
Report of the Public Accounts Committee . . . . .	1908—15
THURSDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 1933—	
Message from the Council of State . . . . .	1917
Death of Mrs. Annie Besant . . . . .	1917—20
Report of the Public Accounts Committee . . . . .	1920—27

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Monday, 18th September, 1933.*

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) in the Chair.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE POLICE IN CALCUTTA AND BOMBAY.

997. \***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur** : (a) Are Government aware that both Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Maulana Ismail Ghuznavi accused the police of excesses, the former in connection with the *lathi* charge during the Congress session at Calcutta and the latter in connection with the *lathi* charge during the embarkation of Haj pilgrims at Bombay in the month of March, 1933 ?

(b) Is it a fact that Government have made their own enquiries with regard to the excesses and arrived at one and the same conclusion in each case ?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, viz., that the accusations were false, will Government be pleased to explain why no proceedings were taken against Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and why Maulana Ismail Ghuznavi is being prosecuted and a warrant has been issued for his arrest ?

(d) Are Government aware that the accusation in the one case relates to a political movement and in the other to a purely religious movement ?

(e) Are Government aware of the belief in the minds of Mussalmans generally that the policy of the Government is to discourage the Haj pilgrimage which is incumbent on those who can afford to undertake it ?

(f) Have representative Mussalmans addressed Government on this subject ? If so, with what result ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : (a) to (d). The attitude of Government in regard to the general allegations made by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya against the Calcutta Police has already been stated to the House in my reply to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's question No. 18, dated the 22nd August, 1933. Maulana Ismail Ghuznavi made a specific allegation against a certain Deputy Commissioner who applied for permission to prosecute him under section 500 of the Indian Penal Code. Permission has been granted by the Government of Bombay in accordance with Rule 24 of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules.

(e) No.

(f) An Honourable Member of this Assembly addressed Government on the subject and his letter was forwarded to the Government of Bombay. Several other Honourable Members have also mentioned the matter to me.

( 1739 )



**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Were the allegations made by Pandit Malaviya of a specific nature ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** They were general charges.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** May I know in this connection whether the Bombay Government consulted the Central Government about bringing this case ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Who will pay the cost of the prosecution in this case, the Local Government or the Deputy Commissioner himself ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I understand that the Local Government will bear the cost.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Might I know from the Honourable Member if the intention of the Government was to make a regular inquiry with regard to the allegations by Pandit Malaviya, and is it not a fact that Government said that some official inquiry would be made ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I am not quite sure that I have got the purport of the Honourable Member's question. I answered questions about Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya at very full length at an earlier stage of this Session.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Those were the answers that the Honourable Member gave, but the point is whether Government are going to rely upon the information which they have got or whether a regular inquiry is going to be made, in which the allegations made by Pandit Malaviya should be gone into.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I understand that the question relates not primarily to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, but to Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi and the action which the Bombay Government are taking with regard to him.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Was there any official inquiry made in this connection before allowing the Deputy Commissioner to bring this case ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** The Government of Bombay no doubt satisfied themselves that there were reasonable grounds for according sanction to this officer to prosecute Maulana Ismail Ghuznavi.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** I want to know whether any inquiry was made or not before this sanction was given. I did not ask whether the Government of Bombay were satisfied.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** At an earlier stage of this Session, we discussed the question of what was meant by an inquiry, and I think we came to the conclusion that there was some doubt and that the word has been used with different meanings.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know from the Honourable Member whether the question with regard to these allegations has come to rest where it is or whether any inquiry is going to be made or will be made ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No further action is contemplated by Government with regard to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Did Government consult the Standing Haj Committee on pilgrimage in connection with the subject-matter of this question?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** No, Sir.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** May I know why Government did not consult the Standing Haj Committee on this matter, when other allegations of Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi were discussed?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** That, Sir, is a personal matter, not a matter for consideration by the Haj Committee.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Will the Government of Bombay inquire from this Committee?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I do not think there is any necessity for the Government of Bombay to take any further action. A particular officer applied to them for permission to vindicate his character by prosecuting Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi. Sanction was given by the Government of Bombay and, so far as they are concerned, there ends the matter.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Are Government prepared to lay on the table the list of the allegations which have been made by Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi and which have been sent to the Government and the information which they have collected on those allegations?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir. The matter is before the Court and I do not think it would be proper to take such action.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** I am not talking about those allegations in regard to the *lathi* charge. A list of allegations has been submitted to Government, and my information is that a certain sort of inquiry was made. Some information has been collected. I want to know whether Government are prepared to lay on the table a list of those allegations or not.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I have already answered at some length a question about various allegations made by Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi, and I have nothing to add to what I said on that occasion.

**Shaikh Sadiq Hasan :** When serious allegations are made and there is excitement in the country, is it not due to the Government to make public inquiries?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I have answered that question last Session and informed my Honourable friend that the Government of Bombay believed that there was no foundation for those allegations. Since then the matter has advanced to a further stage in that the particular officer against whom specific allegations have been made has been given permission to prosecute Mr. Ismail Ghuznavi and the case is now, I understand, before the Court.

**Shaikh Sadiq Hasan :** May I know why Maulana Ismail Ghuznavi has been prosecuted after such a length of time?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I am not sure that the sanction was given after a very long time. I have not the date with me. There might have been some delay in bringing the matter before the Court.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Was the action taken only on the ground that he belongs to a community which is supposed to be loyal and did nothing against the Government ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I think it is a reasonable principle that when Government servants consider themselves maligned, they should have an opportunity of seeking redress before a Court.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** I believe that my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, would be in a better position to reply on this point. Is he prepared to lay on the table a list of those allegations ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** No, Sir ; I am not in a better position to answer these questions than the Honourable the Home Member.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** May I know if these allegations are also of a confidential nature ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I am not aware of any allegations apart from those which have been referred to by the Honourable the Home Member.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Was it not the legitimate duty of the Department to look after the accuracy of these allegations ? When some other person exposes them, another Department comes forward and asks to explain his action.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I do not admit the suggestion that any Department has treated Mr. Ghuznavi unfairly. If he goes out of his way to make suggestions which are unfounded, then he must take the consequence.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Is it not for the reason, that the Department, whose legitimate duty it was to take action, took no action and was silent about it ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Not at all, Sir.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Does my Honourable friend say that there was nothing confidential in the allegations made ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I have already said that my Department is not in possession of any allegations which are not already before the Court.

#### REGISTRATION OF THE CORDITE FACTORY LABOUR UNION, ARAVANKADU.

998. **\*Mr. K. P. Thampan :** (a) Are Government aware that the Cordite Factory Labour Union, Aravankadu, applied for registration in August, 1931, and submitted bye-laws as required by the Registrar of Trade Unions at Madras ?

(b) Is it a fact that the Army Department in their letter No. 4452/M.G. 1 (A.D.-3), dated 20th November, 1931, advised the Union not to press for registration ?

(c) Are Government aware that the Union at its last annual conference passed a resolution regretting that the Government of India had not by that time accorded sanction to the registration of the Union ?

(d) Are Government prepared to issue instructions for the early registration of the Union ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** (a), (b) and (c). Yes.

(d) No, because the Government of India have no power to issue instructions to Registrars in matters of this kind.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan :** May I know, Sir, why this Union has not been allowed to register itself. Are there any special reasons for it ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** It is not, Sir, that it has not been allowed to register itself. The fact is that, as I said in answer to part (b), the Government of India advised the Union not to get itself registered in 1931. That was in accordance with the policy of Government at the time regarding the recognition by Government of Government Servants Associations.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan :** Do Government persist in the same policy ? What harm is there in allowing this Union to be registered now ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** Personally, I see no harm whatever in allowing this Union to be registered. I will consult the other Departments of the Government of India concerned and see whether we cannot inform the Union that it can be registered.

PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF CHARGEMEN AT THE CORDITE FACTORY,  
ARAVANKADU.

999. **\*Mr. K. P. Thampan :** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that labourers of long service are not promoted to the rank of chargemen at the Cordite Factory, Aravankadu ?

(b) Are Government aware that one Ari Gowder who acted as a chargeman on three occasions was reverted to supervisor's post without being made permanent ? If so, why ?

(c) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolution No. 10, passed at the annual conference of the Cordite Factory Labour Union in 1933 on this subject ? If so, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** (a) There is no bar against the promotion of qualified labourers to chargemen.

(b) Certain supervisors, who had begun their service as labourers, were tried as chargemen, but much to the regret of the authorities, they did not prove a success and were therefore reverted to their previous posts.

(c) The answer to the first question is in the affirmative. Government are always prepared to consider the claims of qualified persons but they are not prepared to reserve posts for individuals who are not qualified to fill them.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan :** Is it not a fact that this particular individual, Ari Gowder, acted as a chargeman on three previous occasions and was given rewards for good work ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** I am afraid, I am unable to give any particular information about this individual, Ari Gowder, but I am told that he was among a number of men who were tried in a superior post and ultimately the authorities decided that they were not suitable for it.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan :** Will you take it from me that he was doing his work efficiently and that he was given rewards for the good work that he did during the war time ? Besides, he belongs to the depressed class community.

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham :** I am prepared to take that from the Honourable Member.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan :** Will the Honourable Member inquire whether it would be possible to re-instate him as a chargeman ?

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham :** I will make further inquiries about this individual if the Honourable Member so desires.

#### DUTIES OF THE DIVISIONAL PERSONNEL OFFICERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1000. **\*Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what duties are entrusted to the Divisional Personnel Officer in the Divisional Offices of the North Western Railway ?

(b) Are the Divisional Officers, *viz.*, the Divisional Transportation Officer, the Divisional Commercial Officer and such others subordinate to the Divisional Personnel Officer ?

(c) Is it a fact that in practice everything is in the hands of the Divisional Personnel Officer in the Karachi Division Office who exercises control over the work of the Divisional Officers and disposes of it ?

(d) Has the Divisional Personnel Officer any power to give a final decision on any matter and can he order transfers or promotions or appoint new entrants ?

(e) Is it a fact that the clerks of the Divisional Officer, North Western Railway, Karachi, submitted a memorial on the 23rd January, 1933, complaining against the doings of the Divisional Personnel Officer of that office ?

(f) What orders, if any, were passed on it by the Divisional Superintendent, Karachi ?

(g) Is it a fact that the Divisional Superintendent in his *interim* reply to the clerks memorial said that the representation should have been first made to the Divisional Personnel Officer ? If so, under what rule was such an order justifiable ?

(h) What relief do Government propose to give to this generally discontented staff of the North Western Railway Divisional office at Karachi ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** (a) The Divisional Personnel Officer deals with all personnel work in the Division, *viz.*, cases referring to pay, salaries, mileage allowance, promotion, leave, passes, transfers, postings, appointments, termination of service, appeals, Provident Fund and gratuities, compensation to staff under the Workmen's Compensation Act, etc., directly or in consultation with other Divisional Officers to the extent to which he is authorised by the Divisional Superintendent.

(b) No.

(c) Government are not aware that this is the case, but are bringing this question to the notice of the Agent, North Western Railway.



(d) The Personnel Officer exercises such powers as the Divisional Superintendent may entrust to him.

(e) An unsigned printed copy of a letter purporting to be addressed by the clerks of the Divisional Superintendent's Office to the Divisional Superintendent has been received in the Railway Board.

(f) to (h). Government have no information, but I have sent a copy of the question to the Agent, North Western Railway, who is competent to deal with these matters, for any action that he may consider necessary.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** As the reply to part (b) is in the negative, therefore he is supposed to be an officer not above the Divisional Commercial Officer and others. What I am told is that he is doing all the business. In fact, they cannot do any business without consulting him.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** I will bring this matter to the notice of the Agent, North Western Railway.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** I might assure the Honourable Member that the original of the copy that I sent to his office was signed by the clerks and that they are very much discontented. Therefore, it will be reasonable that the Agent should inquire into this matter thoroughly and come to some conclusion whether this Personnel Officer's conduct is not such as to have made all the clerks discontented ?

**Mr. B. R. Puri :** I will be glad to send a copy of these supplementary questions and answers from my Honourable friend to the Agent.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** May I know the name of the Personnel Officer ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** I do not know his name, Sir.

#### IMPORT OF " EDIBLE OIL " INTO INDIA FROM JAPAN.

1001. **\*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Are Government aware that " edible oil " is being imported into India from Japan in large quantities ?

(b) Are Government aware that the said material is being used here as an adulterant for *ghee* ?

(c) Do Government propose to take steps to put a stop to such practice ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Adulteration of foodstuffs is a provincial transferred subject, and as such it is for Local Governments, who have their own Food Adulteration Acts, to take steps to prevent the use of edible oil as an adulterant of *ghee*. The Government of India enquired from all Local Governments in April last whether any steps in this matter had been taken by them or by the local authorities under their control. The replies are not yet complete.

**Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** May I know the price of this edible oil ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I am afraid, I am not in a position to answer that question.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** May I ask, whether it is the policy of the Government to encourage adulteration of *ghee* in this country ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Not at all, Sir. As far as I have been able to gather from such replies as I have received, some Local Governments, at any rate, are taking action to prevent adulteration.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Then why did not the Government of India take action to stop the import of this oil altogether ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Because, as the Honourable the Leader of the House explained when a question on the subject was put during the last Session, the oil is used not merely to adulterate *ghee*, but also as a lubricant and for certain other purely legitimate purposes.

#### PAYMENT ON HALVES OF CURRENCY NOTES.

1002. **\*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total amount for which halves of ten-rupee notes as also mismatched halves of notes of the same denomination have been refused payment since the beginning of the financial year 1930-31 to July 31, 1933 ?

(b) Will Government please state the total amount of hundred-rupee notes and notes of higher denomination, of which the halves have been reported as lost, stolen or destroyed, for which half payments have been made since 1930-31 to the end of July, 1933 ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** The information is not available and will take about one month to collect. I have already undertaken in the recent debates on an un-official Resolutions on this subject to arrange for the consideration of the Currency Note (Refund) Rules by an Expert Committee, if that course is approved by the Joint Committee on the Reserve Bank Bill. I have given instructions for this information to be collected so that it may be laid before the Expert Committee.

#### UNSUITABILITY OF THE NEW FIVE-RUPEE AND TEN-RUPEE CURRENCY NOTES.

1003. **\*Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla :** Has any representation been made to Government regarding the unsuitability of the new five-rupee and ten-rupee notes ? If so, what action do they propose to take to satisfy the public complaint ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given to starred question No. 338 asked by Mr. Badri Lal Rastogi on the 1st of September, 1933.

#### INCOME SINCE THE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF THE POSTCARD.

1004. **\*Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla :** Is it a fact that since the price of postcard was raised last time, there has been a fall in the income from that source ? If not, has it resulted in increased income and if so, by how much ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** As a separate account of the sale proceeds of postcards is not maintained, accurate information of the kind required by the Honourable Member is not readily available. It is estimated, however, that the value of postcards issued from

treasuries to post offices during 1932-33 exceeded that during 1930-31, the last full year in which the old rate was in force, by approximately 6 lakhs of rupees.

ALL-INDIA ROYAL AIR FORCE EXAMINATION.

1005 \***Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal** : (a) Is it a fact that the All-India Royal Air Force competitive examination consists of written papers and of what is called 'record' and 'interview' ?

(b) What is the object and policy underlying the record and interview parts of the examination ?

(c) Is it a fact that the candidates who happen to be sons and relations of persons in military or other Government services are given more marks than other candidates, regardless of their intellectual merits ?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state what facts are covered by the term 'record' and to what extent they weigh with the examiners in giving marks ?

(e) Is it true that sometimes candidates who get the highest marks in written papers fail in record and interview, and *vice versa* ?

(f) Is it not a fact that the object of what is called the 'record and interview' part of the examination is to pull up certain candidates and pull down others ?

(g) Is it true that in the last examination some candidates who were given very high marks in record and interview failed to get the minimum pass marks in the written papers and on the other hand, there were candidates who got very high marks in the written papers but failed to get the minimum pass marks in record and interview ? If so, was it purely accidental or due to any settled policy of Government ?

(h) If the latter, are Government prepared to take steps to remove the above state of things ?

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham** : (a) Yes.

(b) To test the personality of the candidates.

(c) Not necessarily.

(d) The 'Record' comprises the family history of the candidate and his career at school and college both in work and games. To what extent it weighs with the examiners is left entirely to their discretion.

(e) Yes.

(f) No.

(g) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. Neither of the suggestions made in the second part is correct. It is the Public Service Commission that conducts the examination and is responsible for the marks awarded to the candidates.

(h) Does not arise.

REPRESENTATION OF MINORITY COMMUNITIES IN THE ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.

1006. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** : With reference to the answer to question No. 48 (d) asked by Mr. Muhammad Rafique in

this House on the 14th July, 1930, will Government be pleased to state the result of their enquiry about the adequate representation of minority communities on the staff of the Zoological Survey of India ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The Honourable Member is aware that this is a technical department and appointments to it cannot be made on a communal basis. Government, however, realise the desirability of recruiting Muslims, as vacancies occur, provided that candidates possessing the requisite qualifications are forthcoming.

#### OFFICER IN CHARGE OF THE ANDAMANS FISHERIES.

1007. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) Is it a fact that the present officer in charge of the Andamans fisheries has no qualification in marine biology ?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Muhammad Sharif, temporary Assistant Superintendent, could not be given the charge of the fishery work in the Andamans for want of qualifications in marine biology ? If so, why was the present officer given the charge of fisheries ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) No, the present Officer-in-Charge of the Andaman Fisheries has had a great deal of experience of marine biological work both in this country and in Europe.

(b) In asking the Public Service Commission to recruit an officer for the temporary post of Research Officer, Andaman Fisheries, the Government of India specifically asked them to consider the claims of Muslim candidates who might apply for the post. The Commission, however, recommended a Sinhalese who was appointed. The temporary post has since been abolished as a measure of retrenchment and an Officer on the staff of the Zoological Survey of India, who is fully qualified, is continuing the fisheries work in the Andamans.

#### UNSUITABILITY OF THE NEW FIVE-RUPEE AND TEN-RUPEE CURRENCY NOTES.

1008. \***Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria :** Will Government be pleased to state :

- (a) whether their attention has been directed to the fact that the new notes of five-rupee and ten-rupee denominations are flimsy, very small in size and easily liable to damage and deterioration ;
- (b) whether they are aware that people in the interior of the country hesitate to take them because they are easily lost or spoilt ;
- (c) whether they are aware that the printing of the number at one corner is an inconvenience to the trading community ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** (a) Government have received certain complaints regarding the new five-rupee and ten-rupee notes.

(b) Government have no information on this point.

(c) Payment can be made on a mutilated note even if the number is not identifiable provided that the missing portion is too small to be used in support of any other claim under the Rules. It is only in the case

of a cut half note that the number must be clearly identifiable on the portion presented by the claimant. The new design will therefore not adversely affect people whose notes suffer accidental damage.

DEMOTION OF CERTAIN INSPECTORS OF CREWS, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1009. \***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** : (a) With reference to the information laid on the table of this House in reply to starred question No. 646 of 6th March, 1933, will Government be pleased to state whether any notice of discharge or order communicating the terms of abolition of the Crew system was ever served on the Inspectors of Crews, East Indian Railway, in terms of their agreement of employment ? If not, why not ?

(b) Was any option to serve on reduced pay and allowances ever given to these Inspectors of Crews as an alternative to discharge ? If not, why not ?

(c) How long can a system be treated as temporary and is it a fact that the Railway Board at one of their meetings with the All-India Railway-men's Federation expressed the opinion that no temporary or probationary period would exceed three years, so that the person recruited as such may not be turned out as over-age and his future career marred for any other Government service ? If so, what consideration was given to those of the Inspectors of Crews, who have exceeded the age-limit, in respect of their age, in the new appointments under the Moody-Ward scheme ?

(d) Is it a fact that the Divisional Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Howrah, confirmed the appointments of Inspectors of Crews—*vide* his letter No. E.H.C.-202/13/28, dated 25th April, 1930, which reads " Please note that you are confirmed as Line Inspector of Crews on Rs. 150 in the grade Rs. 150—10—200 " ? If so, how far is the answer given to question No. 646 (b) (ii), i.e., " none of them were confirmed " correct ?

(e) Is it a fact that there is a break in the services of these Inspectors of Crews covering the period between the date of the abolition of the Crew system and that of their appointment under the new system on reduced pay ? If so, how do Government propose to condone it ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau** : With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 1009 and 1010 together. I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

DEMOTION OF CERTAIN INSPECTORS OF CREWS, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†1010. \***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** : (a) Are Government aware whether there is any difference between the nature of duties and responsibilities of the Inspectors of Crews under the Crew system and the Inspectors of Tickets under the new scheme on the East Indian Railway, which warranted the abolition of the former and the creation of the latter ? If not, what were the specific reasons for not confirming these Inspectors of Crews from the date they entered the Government service under the Crew system ?

(b) Is it a fact that the temporary service of these Inspectors of Crews under the Crews system is reckoned as continuous with their present permanent service under the new scheme towards leave and gratuity ?

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1009.



(c) Is it a fact that the normal channel of promotion and recruitment of the ticket checking staff is as laid down in the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff issued by the Railway Board ? If so, what were the special reasons for appointing these Inspectors of Crews on the abolition of the Crew system in grades higher than the lowest open under the new scheme ?

(d) Is it a fact that the following Inspectors of Crews under the Crew system were absorbed under the Moody-Ward scheme on salaries equivalent or higher than those drawn by them in the Crew system :

- (i) M. Latif, Chief Inspector, Crews, fixed as Chief Inspector, Tickets ;
- (ii) A. G. Khan, Inspector of Crews, fixed as Senior Inspector, Tickets ;
- (iii) C. Dunwell, Inspector of Crews, fixed as Senior Inspector, Tickets ?

If so, why ?

#### MEMORIAL OF THE INSPECTORS OF CREWS, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1011. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali :** (a) Is it a fact that an advanced copy of a memorial from the Inspectors of Crews, submitted in April, 1933, has been received by the Agent, East Indian Railway, Calcutta ? If so, what action had been taken by the said officer ?

(b) Is it a fact that the memorial addressed to the Agent, East Indian Railway, Calcutta, submitted by these Inspectors of Crews in April, 1933, through the proper channel has been withheld by the respective Divisional Superintendents ? If so, why and under what rules ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Government have no information, but are sending a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for any action that may be necessary.

#### MODIFICATION OF RECRUITMENT RULES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT STAFF.

1012. **\*Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur :** (a) Is it a fact that in temporary or officiating vacancies in the First and Second Divisions in Departments of the Government of India Secretariat, men holding permanent posts in the lower grades, who have qualified for the higher grades at one of the examinations held by the Public Service Commission, are promoted to the higher grades ?

(b) Is it a fact that these departmental men, who have thus been promoted to the higher grades in the temporary or officiating vacancies, are required to perform work of a much higher responsibility than that required in their permanent posts ?

(c) Is it also a fact that these men generally continue to officiate in the higher grades for a number of years ?

(d) Is it a fact that, when these temporary or officiating vacancies become permanent, they are given to young nominees of the Public Service Commission who have had absolutely no past experience of Secretariat work, and the experienced departmental men, who had actually officiated in those

temporary or officiating vacancies for a number of years, have thus to revert to the lower grades ?

(e) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of modifying the recruitment rules as early as possible ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** Departments have a large measure of discretion in filling temporary and officiating vacancies, and I understand that in the great majority of cases they give these vacancies to departmental men. I have no reason to suppose, however, that such vacancies usually last for a number of years, nor can I accept the implication that all the men promoted temporarily prove fit for the higher grades. Under the rules a proportion of permanent vacancies in the First and Second Divisions are filled by the promotion of departmental men and the rest by direct recruitment. These rules in the opinion of Government provide adequately for the interests of departmental men, and it is not proposed to alter them.

**RULES FOR RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

1013. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower :** (a) In connection with the reply to Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney's starred question No. 908 (b), given on 24th March, 1933, will Government please state whether the Agent of the East Indian Railway has since decided to publish in the *East Indian Railway Gazette*, the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway ?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government please state why these rules are withheld from the staff concerned ?

(c) Do these rules govern the posting of subordinates to officiating appointments ?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame the necessary rules ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 1013, 1014 and 1015 together. Government have no information, but have forwarded a copy of these questions to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for any action that may be necessary on the points raised in these questions.

**RULES FOR RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

†1014. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower :** (a) Is it a fact that no provision has been made in the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway, for the appointment and promotion of Assistant Trains Examiners and Trains Examiners ?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame the necessary rules ? If not, why not ?

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1013.

# RULES FOR RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†1015. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower :** (a) Is it a fact that in the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway under the caption "Guards and the normal channels of their promotions", mention of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards has been omitted?

(b) Is it a fact that there are different scales of pay for Gunner Guards, Pilot Guards and Guards?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the salaries of these posts, Company and State scales being set down separately?

(d) Will Government please state why vacancies in the Guards' list are filled in Divisions by recruitment:

(i) of outsiders without previous experience, and

(ii) sometimes by railway staff from other departments to the exclusion of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards?

(e) Do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame the necessary rules for the promotion of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards? If not, why not?

# IRREGULARITIES IN CHARGING SALARIES OF THE SUBORDINATES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1016. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower :** (a) Is it a fact that there are cases on the East Indian Railway where subordinates whose salaries are charged against one post, but whose services are utilised for the duties of a different post other than in an officiating chain of arrangements or on deputation?

(b) Do Government propose to issue instructions to the authorities concerned to put a stop to such irregularities? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** (a) Government have no information, but are making enquiries.

(b) There are instructions already in existence laying down that the salary of a Government servant should not be charged against any post other than that in which he is working.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Ten days notice is given in order to get information and not to say that Government have no information.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** The information which Honourable Members want sometimes takes much longer time than ten days to collect.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Is it quite legitimate for Government to say that they are collecting information, but it is not correct to say that they have got no information? Government is supposed to have information on all matters under their control.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** I am not aware that the Government ever pretended to be omniscient.

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1013.

**SENIORITY LIST MAINTAINED ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

1017. \***Mr. E. H. M. Bower** : (a) Is a common seniority list maintained on the East Indian Railway in order that promotions to posts as they fall vacant may be filled by the senior employees instead of by promotion being confined to subordinates in any one particular Division in which the vacancy occurs ?

(b) Is it a rule that vacancies in any one Division must be filled by employees in that Division to the exclusion of other suitable employees working in other Divisions and in the Head Office at Calcutta ?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the negative, will Government please state which posts are to be filled from among the employees on the several Divisions and the Head Office staff ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau** : I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**WELFARE SCHEMES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

1018. \***Mr. E. H. M. Bower** : (a) Is there a welfare scheme operating on the East Indian Railway by means of welfare committees posted on the Divisions for the benefit of subordinate staff ?

(b) Is it a fact that the subordinate staff of the Calcutta Head Office do not participate in the welfare scheme ?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions to include this category of employees in the welfare scheme ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau** : (a) Government are aware that a system of Welfare Committees is in operation on certain Mechanical Workshops and on certain Divisions of the East Indian Railway.

(b) and (c). Government have no information on this point. But I am sending a copy of the question and the reply thereto to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

**SURRENDER OF THE POST OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR, COMMERCIAL, ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

1019. \***Mr. E. H. M. Bower** : (a) Will Government please state whether the Deputy Chief Commercial Manager, Claims and Refunds, of the East Indian Railway, surrendered, as a measure of economy, the post of Transportation Inspector, Commercial, grade Rs. 280—20—500, attached to his office ?

(b) Is it a fact that on the recommendation of the same official, the Agent has sanctioned the creation of two new posts, namely,

(i) Clerk Grade I Rs. 170—218 ?

(ii) Clerk Special Grade Rs. 160—220 ? If so, why ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau** : Government have no information. These matters are entirely within the competence of the Agent, East Indian Railway, to whom I have sent a copy of the question.

## SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

### FORCIBLE ACQUISITION OF A BUNGALOW BY MILITARY ESTATE OFFICER IN PESHAWAR.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Have Government received the following telegram on or about the 16th September, 1933, from Mrs. Tekooram, Peshawar ?

“ In absence my son Harichand ill at Murree Military Estate Officer forcibly taking possession our bungalow, 5 Fort Road, turned out myself and servants posted military guard all my jewellery and valuables in bungalow, pray stop such high-handedness allowing us reasonable time according section 18, clause (2) Land Acquisition Act and section 38, Revenue Circular No. 54 to make other arrangements.”

(b) Are Government prepared to make an enquiry and state the facts of the case, and the steps taken to prevent hardships ?

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

(b) Government have no information as to the facts, but I may inform the Honourable Member that, as soon as I received the telegram on Saturday, even before receiving notice of his question, I telegraphed to the Military Estate Officer asking for a full report, and adding that the occupant of a house which was being acquired under the Land Acquisition Act must be shown every reasonable consideration. If the Honourable Member wishes, I will lay a further statement on the table as soon as the report has been received and considered.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I have also received a similar telegram ; and I shall be very grateful if the Honourable the Army Secretary will communicate the result of the enquiry, at a later date, on the floor of the House, and see that such preventable hardship do not occur in cantonment areas ?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham :** I am certainly prepared to do that.

---

## UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### CERTAIN ALTERATIONS IN “ D ” TYPE ORTHODOX QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

103. **Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daoodi :** (a) Are Government aware that the inner court-yards of the “ D ” type orthodox quarters in New Delhi are very small and the presence of a latrine on one side of them makes them still smaller and inconvenient for those who occupy them during the summer months ?

(b) Is it a fact that there is no separate room for servants in these quarters ?

(c) Is it also a fact that the question of the stoppage of the Simla exodus is under the consideration of Government ?

(d) If the replies to parts (a), (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to consider the desirability of enlarging the court-yards and providing a room for servants on the opposite side of the latrine in the new quarters that are going to be built in New Delhi ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** (a) The smallest courtyard in the “ D ” type orthodox quarters in New Delhi has an area of 400 sq. feet,



an area which is considered to be sufficient for all reasonable requirements during the summer months.

(b) No.

(c) Government have reached no decision beyond that stated on page 23 of the Summary of the Results of Retrenchment Operations in Civil Expenditure, copies of which are in the Library.

(d) The suggestions received from tenants regarding these quarters have been incorporated in the new plans so far as they are consistent with reasonable economy.

#### ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT OF INDIAN CLERKS IN NEW DELHI.

104. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** (a) With reference to the reply given to the starred question No. 1216 in this House on the 22nd March, 1929, will Government please state what improvements have since then been made in the arrangements for medical treatment of Indian clerks in New Delhi ?

(b) Is it a fact that a civil and military dispensary specially for Government servants like the one at Simla, has not been opened and that the small dispensary opened near the Indian clerks' quarters in 1923 has been closed ?

(c) Do Government propose to open a separate dispensary for outdoor patients at a central place near the Indian clerks' quarters ? If so, when ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) The Combined Hospital, New Delhi, has since been transferred to its new building in a more central place and is now called the Civil Hospital, New Delhi. It has accommodation for indoor patients, both Indians and Europeans. A new wing to be called Travancore Wing is being added to this Hospital for better class Indian and European patients and is expected to be ready for occupation by the 1st November, 1933. It has also been decided that the Military Assistant Surgeon and the Civil Assistant Surgeon, who attend on Government servants in Simla, should move down to Delhi during the winter months to attend on the migratory staff of the Government of India. Owing to the increased population in the Barakhamba area, a dispensary has been started under the charge of a Sub-Assistant Surgeon from the Civil Hospital.

(b) Yes.

(c) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to parts (c) and (d) of his unstarred question No. 84 on the 16th September, 1933.

#### ELECTRIC LIGHT IN " D " TYPE QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

105. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** (a) With reference to the reply given to the starred question No. 707 in the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd September, 1929, will Government please state whether an extra electric point has been installed in the " D " class quarters in New Delhi ? If not, when do they propose to do it ?

(b) Is it a fact that electric points have been provided in the bath-rooms and lavatories in the lowest class quarters for Indian clerks at Simla ?

(c) If the reply to (b) be in the affirmative, when do Government propose to provide similar points in the New Delhi quarters ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** (a) No. The additional electric points will be provided when funds are available for the purpose.

(b) A certain number of clerks' quarters are supplied with electric points in bath rooms.

(c) The answer is contained in the reply to part (a) of the question.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

106. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** (a) With reference to the reply given to unstarred question No. 484 in the Legislative Assembly on the 3rd April, 1929, will Government please state whether unorthodox quarters have been constructed in New Delhi for clerks drawing less than Rs. 225 ? If not, when do they propose to construct them ?

(b) Is it a fact that Government have sanctioned the construction of new residential quarters in New Delhi ? If so, how many of each class, where and when are they to be constructed ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** (a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative ; the second part does not arise.

(b) Yes ; Government have sanctioned the construction of 670 quarters of the following types :

A	..	..	9
B		..	61
C	..	..	151
D	..	..	299
E	..	..	150
			<hr/>
			670
			<hr/>

It is proposed to build the quarters, as soon as possible, on vacant sites in the developed area in New Delhi and in the undeveloped area between the old city wall and the main railway line in the vicinity of the Government Press.

#### LIQUIDATION OF THE INDARPRASTH STORES, DELHI.

107. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** With reference to the reply given to the starred question No. 719 in the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd September, 1929, will Government please state whether the liquidation of Indarprasth Stores, Ltd., Delhi, is now complete ? If not, do Government propose to enquire into the cause of ten years' delay ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré :** An enquiry has been made and the result will be furnished to the House in due course.

## NEW PENSION RULES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

108. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah** : With reference to the reply given to the starred question No. 721 in the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd September 1929, will Government please state how the question of new pension rules stands at present ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** : It has been decided that the proposal to frame new pension rules for present members of the Services is impracticable but new pension rules for those in the category of new entrants are now under consideration.

## HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCE GRANTED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA STAFF IN NEW DELHI.

109. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah** : Will Government please state if they allow house rent allowance to the clerical establishments of the Government of India offices if they make their private residential arrangements in New Delhi for want of Government quarters ? If so, what are the rules for it ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : Yes. Clerks residing in private houses in New Delhi who unsuccessfully apply for Government quarters, or who, if residing singly, are unable to obtain accommodation in the Chummeries in New Delhi, are eligible for a house rent allowance. The amount of the allowance depends on the amount by which the rent paid by the clerk exceeds 10 per cent. of his emoluments and is subject to a maximum laid down in the Home Department Resolution No. 1089-C., dated the 23rd February, 1918, a copy of which has been placed in the Library of the House.

## SHOPS ON BAIRD ROAD, NEW DELHI.

110. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah** : (a) Will Government please state :

(i) What is the number of municipal shops on the Baird Road in New Delhi ; (ii) how many of them were vacant on the 1st January, 1933, and on the 1st August, 1933 ; (iii) how many of them have not yet been let for the year commencing from September, 1933 ?

(b) Are Government aware that all the private shops in the same line were occupied last year and have been let for the next year also ?

(c) Are Government aware that the vacancy of municipal shops is due to rents being higher than their worth ?

(d) Is it proposed to reduce the rents of the municipal shops to prevent loss of revenue to the municipality due to vacancies ? If so, when ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to Mr. S. G. Jog's starred question No. 739 on the 7th September, 1933.

## INCOME-TAX AND SUPER-TAX PAID BY THE TEA-PLANTERS IN ASSAM.

**Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla** : Will Government kindly state the total amount paid by the tea-planters in Assam as income-tax and super-tax ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** The information is being obtained and will be laid on the table in due course.

#### RE-INTRODUCTION OF THE COUPON SYSTEM ON THE RAILWAYS.

**112. Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla :** (a) Are Government aware that during the General Discussion on the Railway Budget some Members suggested the re-introduction of the coupon system for the benefit of both the Government and the public ?

(b) Will Government please state if they have paid any attention to the abovesaid suggestion ? If not, have they considered whether it is desirable to give effect to the suggestion now ?

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

(b) The coupon system is in operation on certain railways. Government are not prepared to press for its extension on the other railways, most of whom have tried it out and discontinued it both on account of certain abuses that had arisen and because they were of opinion that the grant of this concession did not bring them any additional traffic.

In this connection, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to Mr. Thampan to question No. 646 on the 22nd September, 1932.

#### PROVISION OF AN ORTHODOX RESTAURANT AT CAWNPORE CENTRAL STATION.

**113. Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla :** (a) Is it a fact that representations for a restaurant at the Cawnpore Central Station for the benefit of the orthodox community have been made to the Railway authorities by Cawnpore people ?

(b) If the reply to the above question be in the affirmative, what action have the authorities concerned taken or propose to take in that respect ?

(c) Are Government aware that such a restaurant has been provided at Moghal Sarai ? If so, are they prepared to consider the desirability of making the same arrangement at Cawnpore central station as at Moghal Sarai ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** Government have no information but have sent a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for any action that may be necessary.

#### INCOME FROM INCOME-TAX AND SUPER-TAX FROM EACH PROVINCE.

**114. Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla :** (a) Will Government kindly inform the House of the amount of the income from the income-tax in each province separately during the last three years ?

(b) Will Government kindly state the income from the super-tax for the last three years from each Province ?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the increase in the revenue from the surcharge ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** (a), (b) and (c). A statement is laid on the table.

Statement showing income from income-tax, supertax and surcharge in each Province during the years 1930-31, 1931-32 and 1932-33.

Provinces.	Income-tax (excluding Surcharge*).			Supertax (excluding Surcharge).			Surcharge (Income-tax and Supertax).	
	1930-31.	1931-32.	1932-33.	1930-31.	1931-32.	1932-33.	1931-32.	1932-33.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1. Madras ..	1,23,85,058	1,33,56,559	1,32,78,063	18,45,565	12,89,924	10,19,887	14,35,898	28,50,757
2. Bombay ..	2,78,29,622	3,17,94,834	3,19,51,999	80,71,919	77,29,252	70,17,123	41,03,942	88,62,817
3. Bengal ..	3,12,95,842	2,51,01,568	2,34,73,933	2,30,39,147	1,50,26,224	1,11,01,136	47,94,138	82,76,465
4. United Provinces	68,49,188	78,78,946	92,34,616	18,23,482	16,84,721	13,67,981	9,86,667	20,03,105
5. Punjab ..	54,40,442	66,28,992	71,33,465	3,96,293	4,31,760	4,03,279	5,43,853	11,74,949
6. Burma ..	1,33,57,553	1,24,20,036	1,00,65,074	56,78,472	44,56,658	33,26,427	22,77,845	35,74,318
7. B. & O. ..	41,98,561	50,74,132	50,44,280	10,03,433	10,33,272	10,21,059	5,44,474	11,78,033
8. C. P. ..	37,83,618	40,46,432	35,22,116	7,14,060	5,39,841	2,41,996	4,98,804	7,01,031
9. Assam ..	21,83,717	21,36,111	18,63,814	5,14,062	2,42,683	1,54,998	2,15,460	4,47,060
10. N.-W. F. P. ..	7,75,372	9,90,407	9,66,770	31,525	32,963	45,697	85,523	1,69,438
11. Delhi ..	20,04,798	26,33,223	22,04,473	1,82,709	2,12,008	1,89,602	1,21,015	3,06,334
12. Minor Administrations and Central Departments.	1,11,54,045	1,66,52,181	1,53,22,285	1,51,299	1,80,920	1,95,747	61,653	1,58,047
Total ..	12,12,57,815	12,87,13,421	12,40,61,488	4,34,51,966	3,28,60,226	2,60,84,932	1,56,69,272	2,97,02,854

\* But including tax on incomes below Rs. 2,000 in 1931-32 and 1932-33.



# FILLING UP OF VACANCIES IN THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

115. **Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) Is it a fact that in the officiating vacancies in the First and Second Divisions of the clerical establishment of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, departmental promotions are made from Lower Divisions ?

(b) How many such vacancies have occurred in the Department during the last two years, and what are the names of the clerks who were appointed in those vacancies ?

(c) Is the seniority in service or in the Department or the fact of their having passed the prescribed test for the Division in which such vacancies occur taken into consideration whenever such vacancies occur ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) Yes, whenever possible.

(b) A statement is laid on the table.

(c) In making departmental promotions due regard is always paid to efficiency and seniority.

*Statement showing the number of officiating vacancies that occurred during 1931-32 and 1932-33 in the 1st and the 2nd divisions and the names of persons who were appointed thereto.*

Year.	First Division.		Second Division.	
	Number of officiating vacancies.	Names of persons appointed.	Number of officiating vacancies.	Names of persons appointed.
1931-32 ..	5	1. { Mr. Shamsuddin .. { Mr. H. G. Thapar  2. Mr. P. S. Sundaram. 3. Mr. P. S. Sundaram. 4. } Vacant. 5. }	8	1. { Mr. N. R. Srinivasan. { Mr. Kasturi Lal. { Mr. Mohamed Sana-ullah.  2. Mr. Kasturi Lal. 3. Mr. K. Narayana-swami. 4. Mr. Mufti Abdul Latif. 5, 6 and 7. Vacant. 8. Ramji Das Mohindra.
1932-33 ..	3	1. Mr. T. S. Krishnamurti  2. { Mr. Shamsuddin { Mr. Mohd. Hussain Sultan. { Mr. Shamoan Ahmed. 3. Mr. Shamoan Ahmed.	8	1. Mr. B. Chatterji. 2. Mr. Ramji Das. 3. { Mr. Ramji Das. { Mr. N. R. Srinivasan. 4. Mr. N. R. Srinivasan. 5, 6, 7 and 8. Vacant.

STAFF SERVING UNDER THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH  
IN CONNECTION WITH LOCUST CAMPAIGN.

**116. Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) What is the total number of clerical and technical establishment serving in connection with the locust campaign under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ? How many are Muslims ?

(b) How many members of the staff hold permanent appointments under Government ? How many of them are Muslims, and how many Hindus ?

(c) Is it a fact that the present Locust Research Entomologist holds a permanent post under the Madras Government ? What is his substantive pay under that Government, and what increase in pay has he been given on his temporary transfer under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ?

(d) Is it a fact that since last year there have been few locust invasions in the country ?

(e) If the reply to part (d) be in the affirmative, on what work are the Locust Entomologist and his staff employed ?

(f) Do the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research propose to finish the locust campaign, and disband the staff employed in connection therewith as early as possible ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) The total strength of clerical and technical establishment is 13 ; eight Hindus and five Muslims.

(b) Four : two Muslims and two Hindus.

(c) Yes. His substantive pay under the Madras Government at the time of his transfer to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research was Rs. 625 and he was given an increase of Rs. 375 which included compensation for the high cost of living in Baluchistan. His present substantive pay under the Madras Government is Rs. 675.

(d) Yes.

(e) The Locust Research staff is engaged on a biological and ecological study of the Desert Locust in those of its permanent or semi-permanent breeding grounds which lie within the frontiers of India. The object of this work is to ascertain the conditions which lead to the swarming and migration which result in locust visitations ; to ascertain to what extent the locusts which periodically cause damage in Northern India are bred within Indian limits and where the invading swarms originate ; to devise methods by which warning of coming visitations may be obtained in future so that control measures may be organised in good time ; and, if possible, to devise means of dealing with future locust visitations before they become wide-spread. Improved control measures are also being studied so far as conditions permit. Information of locust movements, and the results of research on locusts, in other countries, are regularly obtained and studied with reference to Indian conditions.

(f) The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has not financed a campaign of locust control operations at any time but, as explained in the answer to part (e), finances only a locust research scheme. It is not

proposed to discontinue this work at present which has proved very beneficial. Expenditure of money on locust research in the period between visitations is well justified.

RESEARCH WORK ON BEHALF OF THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL  
RESEARCH DONE AT AGRA.

117. **Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) Is it a fact that certain research work on behalf of the Imperial Council is being done at Agra ?

(b) What is the nature of that work, and under whose supervision is it being done ? How many are being employed thereon, and how many of them are Muslims ?

(c) Does the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research satisfy itself periodically that the work is being done on proper lines ?

(d) In what way does the Imperial Council satisfy itself that the grant given by it to private individuals, bodies, or Indian States is spent in the proper manner ?

(e) Are the Imperial Council prepared to consider the advisability of having such accounts audited more fully ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) and (b). The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has given a grant to the United Provinces Government for mycological research work on cereal Rusts at Agra. The work is being done under the supervision of Dr. K. C. Mehta, M.Sc., Ph.D., Professor of Botany, Agra College, Agra. There are five Assistants and one clerk employed under the scheme, none of whom is a Muslim. It is reported that no Muslim Assistants with necessary qualifications in Mycology were available.

(c) Yes.

(d) The Council receive annually progress reports on all schemes financed by it and these reports are examined by the Advisory Board and laid before the Governing Body of the Council with the Advisory Board's recommendations. The Vice-Chairman and Expert Advisers of the Council visit from time to time the research institutions and stations where schemes financed by the Council are in progress.

(e) Accounts are audited in accordance with the bye-laws of the Council which are considered quite sufficient for the purpose. A copy of the bye-laws will be found in the Library of the House.

TOURS OF OFFICERS OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS.

118. **Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) Is it a fact that the officers of the following departments are constantly touring :

- (i) Indian Stores Department ;
- (ii) Audit Office, Indian Stores Department ;
- (iii) the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ; and
- (iv) the Central Board of Revenue ?

(b) Will Government please state the number of occasions on which each officer of the above offices has gone on tour during 1932-33, and the

period for which each has remained absent from the Headquarters each time ? What was the purpose of each tour ?

(c) Will Government please state the reasons for the enormous expenditure on such tours in these days of financial stringency ? How far have the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee been observed in this respect ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** (a) Some of the officers of the Departments mentioned do tour but not constantly.

(b) Government do not consider that the value of the information asked for would be commensurate with the labour and time which would be involved in its collection.

(c) The General Purposes Retrenchment Sub-Committee did not make any recommendation as to restricting touring as a general proposition, but as a result of the retrenchment campaign budget provisions for travelling allowance were reduced and touring has consequently to be restricted to the reduced budget provision. Government consider that touring is absolutely essential in certain cases and they are satisfied that unnecessary touring is not done.

STAFF EMPLOYED ON THE " RESEARCH SIDE " OF THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

**119. Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) What is the number of the Headquarters staff employed on the ' research side ' of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ?

(b) Is it a fact that some of this staff are getting Rs. 100 per mensem, and others Rs. 75 per mensem ?

(c) Is it a fact that a clerk of the ' research side ' who was getting Rs. 100 per mensem has recently been given an increment of Rs. 20 in his pay ? If so, has this increment been given to him for some additional duties or responsibilities ?

(d) Is it a fact that another clerk on the ' research side ' who was drawing Rs. 75 per mensem has recently been given an increment of Rs. 5 in his pay ?

(e) Is it a fact that a third clerk who is drawing Rs. 75 per mensem and who had an equal claim for an increment, has been given no increment at all ?

(f) Have the increments referred to above been given according to some definite scales ? If not, on what basis or on what merit have they been given ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) Twenty eight (two gazetted officers, 17 clerks and nine inferior servants).

(b) Yes.

(c) A clerk who was drawing a pay of Rs. 100 was promoted to the more responsible post of an Assistant on Rs. 120.

(d) Yes ; the increment was granted in consideration of particularly good work.

(e) No.

(f) The post of Assistant referred to in the answer to part (c) was newly created. In the case referred to in the answer to part (d) the increment was fixed at a figure considered suitable.

**STATISTICAL SECTION OF THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.**

**120. Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan :** (a) Is it a fact that under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, there is a separate Statistical Section ?

(b) What are its functions ?

(c) Is it a fact that the section is composed of a highly paid Statistician, an Assistant Statistician, and a clerk ?

(d) Are Government satisfied that the statistical work of the Imperial Council sufficiently justifies the existence of these three officers ?

(e) Did the Imperial Council consider the possibility of getting the work done through the office of the Director-General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics ?

(f) Is it a fact that the rate of increment of the pay of the Statistician is Rs. 50 ? Is this the rate of increment ordinarily allowed to a member of an all-India Service or a Central Service ?

(g) Has the post of the Statistician been considered as important and responsible as any of the services referred to at (f) above ?

(h) In view of the fact that Government are seriously considering the question of a general reduction in the scales of pay of every service, was not a lower rate of increment in the pay of the Statistician considered sufficient or desirable ? If not, why not ?

(i) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of keeping a close watch over the manner in which funds of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research are being administered ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) Yes.

(b) The functions and duties of the section are :

1. The mathematical and statistical interpretation of the results of agricultural experiments with special reference to field experiments, yield trials, manurial experiments and the working up of other biological data.
2. To assist agricultural research workers, whether employed under Provincial Governments or on research schemes of the Council, in the proper planning and interpretation of field experiments.
3. The Statistical examination of data connected with live-stock.
4. To render general statistical assistance to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department in the course of its work.
5. To enquire into problems of agricultural statistics.

(c) The section is composed of one Statistician on Rs. 600, one Statistical Assistant on Rs. 180, one clerk on Rs. 75 and one peon on Rs. 15 per mensem.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes. The section was established after consultation with the Director-General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics.

(f), (g) and (h). The Statistician whose post is important and responsible was recruited in 1930 on Rs. 450 per mensem and was granted an increment of Rs. 50 on completion of one year's service. He was placed in charge of the Statistical Section established in 1932, and his pay was fixed at Rs. 550—600 with due regard to the nature of the duties to be performed by him.

(i) Government are satisfied that the grant made by them to the Council is properly administered.

#### BONUS PAID TO POLICY-HOLDERS BY POSTAL INSURANCE.

121. **Rao Bahadur B. L. Patil :** (a) Will Government please state what bonus they have paid from time to time to policy-holders of postal insurance during the last 12 years ?

(b) What amount (all told) has so far been paid to policy-holders since the establishment of the postal insurance and what amount has been kept in reserve out of the profits ?

(c) How do Government propose to dispose of these profits kept in reserve ?

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

---

#### MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

**Secretary of the Assembly :** Sir, two Messages have been received from the Council of State. The first Message is as follows :

“ I am directed to inform you that the Message from the Legislative Assembly to the Council of State desiring their concurrence in the Resolution recommending that the Bill to constitute a Reserve Bank of India be committed to a Joint Committee of the Council of State and of the Legislative Assembly, with instructions to report on or before the 20th November, 1933, and that the Joint Committee do consist of 28 members, was considered by the Council of State at their meeting held on the 16th September, 1933, and that the Resolution was concurred in by the Council.”

Sir, the second Message runs thus :

“ I am directed to inform you that the Message from the Legislative Assembly to the Council of State desiring their concurrence in the Resolution recommending that the Bill further to amend the Imperial Bank of India Act, 1920, for certain purposes, be committed to a Joint Committee of the Council of State and of the Legislative Assembly with instructions to report on or before the 20th November, 1933, and that the Joint Committee do consist of 28 members, was considered by the Council of State at their meeting held on the 16th September, 1933, and that the Resolution was concurred in by the Council.”

---

#### STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore** (Member for Commerce and Railways) : Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 308, 309, 310, 311, 312 and 313 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 31st August, 1933.

### ABSENCE OF MUSLIM OFFICERS IN THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*308. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c)

	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Europeans and Anglo-Indians	208	88.89
Hindus .. ..	25	10.68
Muslims .. ..	<i>Nil</i>	.00
Others .. ..	1	.43
	<hr/> 234 <hr/>	<hr/> 100 <hr/>

(d) and (g). Many of the posts require qualifications not at present possessed by Indians, for example there are 47 posts for which the incumbents require a Master Mariner's Certificate. With regard to other posts, the Commissioners have in their service Indians capable of rising to higher appointments now held by Europeans, but the rate of promotion depends largely upon retirements.

(e) and (f). The total number of posts which carry a maximum salary of Rs. 500 or over is 213. Of the total number of 234 posts referred to in answer to part (c), 174 are filled by men with engineering, marine and accountancy qualifications.

(h) Government have no information regarding the general educational qualifications of the Commissioner's staff.

### AMOUNT SPENT ON THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF THE OFFICERS UNDER THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*309. Yes.

### RECRUITMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*310. (a) No. There is a Mussalman Probationer in the Traffic Department.

(b) (i), (ii), (iii). *Nil*.

(iv) 2.

(v) 3.

(vi) 42.

(vii) 100.

(viii) 13. These figures are approximate and include only men who come under the Fundamental Leave Rules.

(c) No.

(d) (i) 4.

(ii) and (iii). *Nil*.

(iv) 1.

(v) and (vi). *Nil*.

(vii) 6.

(viii), (ix) and (x). Nil.

(xi) 4.

(xii) 1.

(xiii) 144.

(e) and (f). Vacancies for clerical posts are not advertised, as there is always a long waiting list. Vacancies for more senior posts are usually advertised and in these advertisements the minimum qualifications which the candidates must possess are always mentioned.

(g) No.

---

#### RECRUITMENT OF STAFF IN THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*311. (a) Yes.

(b) Europeans and Anglo-Indians	..	..	..	17
Hindus	..	..	..	107
Mussalmans	..	..	..	20

(c) No. Except in the case of a small number of high posts the power to make appointments to the services under the Calcutta Port Commissioners is vested by law in the Commissioners themselves.

A copy of these questions and replies will, however, be sent to them.

---

#### RECRUITMENT OF STAFF IN THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*312. (a) Yes.

(b) (i) 19.

(ii) 1.

---

#### VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF MUSLIM EMPLOYEES OF THE CALCUTTA PORT TRUST.

\*313. 4.

---

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands) : Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to question No. 740 asked by Mr. S. G. Jog on the 7th September, 1933.

---

#### PURCHASE OF PETROL BY THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

\*740. (a) No.

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

---

**Major W. K. Fraser-Tytler** (Foreign Secretary) : Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 654 asked by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 5th September, 1933.



SERVICE OF EUROPEAN INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE OR OTHER OFFICERS LENT  
TO PLACES OUTSIDE BRITISH INDIA.

\*654.

*Statement.*

Serial No.	Name of Officer.	Name of the place outside British India where the services of an officer have been lent.	Date from which the services of an officer have been lent.
<i>Indian Civil Service Officers.</i>			
1	Capt. A. W. Ibbotson, M.B.E., M.C.	Alwar State ..	29th January, 1933.
2	Mr. J. A. Mackeown ..	Bahawalpur State ..	11th November, 1929.
3	Mr. C. G. Herbert ..	Cochin State ..	7th October, 1930.
4	Mr. A. L. Binney ..	Hyderabad State ..	16th February, 1930.
5	Mr. T. J. Tasker, O.B.E. ..	Hyderabad State ..	February, 1927.
6	Mr. J. M. Sladen ..	Khairpur State ..	9th May, 1932.
7	Mr. G. P. Stewart ..	Manipur State ..	1st February, 1932.
8	Mr. B. G. Holdsworth ..	Pudukkottai State	18th November, 1931.
9	Mr. T. Austin, Bar.-at-Law ..	Travancore State ..	12th February, 1932.
<i>Political Department Officers.</i>			
1	Mr. F. V. Wylie, C.I.E. ..	Alwar State ..	16th March, 1933.
2	Major C. P. Hancock, O.B.E., M.C.	Bharatpur State	5th May, 1932.
3	Captain W. F. Webb, I.A. ..	Bundi State ..	16th January, 1932.
4	Lt.-Col. K. A. G. Evans-Gordon, I.A.	Cooch Behar State	1st April, 1931.
5	Mr. M. H. Jones ..	Faridkot State ..	1st November, 1932.
6	Major P. Gaisford ..	Gwalior State ..	1st March, 1929.
7	Lt.-Col. E. J. D. Colvin, C.I.E., I.A.	Kashmir State ..	27th February, 1932.
8	Mr. C. L. Corfield, M.C. ..	Rewa State ..	12th March, 1932.
9	Captain D. R. Smith, I.A. ..	Rewa State ..	16th October, 1932.
10	Major D. de M. S. Fraser, I.A. ..	Tonk State ..	23rd October, 1930.

Serial No.	Name of Officer.	Name of the place outside British India where the services of an officer have been lent.	Date from which the services of an officer have been lent.
	<i>Indian Audit and Accounts Service.</i>		
	Mr. J. W. Young, O.B.E. ..	Jodhpur State ..	10th March, 1923.
	<i>Police Officers.</i>		
1	Mr. D. G. Holliday (Punjab Police)	Alwar State ..	18th June, 1933.
2	Mr. G. D. Perkin ..	Benares State ..	1st April, 1931.
3	Mr. G. W. Benton ..	Hyderabad State ..	2nd November, 1926.
4	Mr. B. C. Taylor ..	Indore State ..	25th February, 1932.
5	Mr. F. S. Young, C.I.E. (U. P. Police).	Jaipur State ..	1st May, 1931.
6	Mr. W. C. Edwards (Indian Police)	Junagadh State ..	1st October, 1931.
7	Mr. Archbold .. ..	Kashmir State ..	24th July, 1933.
8	Mr. E. G. B. Peel, C.I.E. (Indian Police).	Kashmir State ..	2nd January, 1933.
9	Mr. A. W. J. Brown (U. P. Police)	Tonk State ..	26th April, 1933.
10	Mr. F. W. Garrard, Indian Police, Bombay.	Shanghai .. ..	22nd December, 1931.
	<i>Medical Officers.</i>		
1	Capt. K. B. Gore, I.M.S. ..	China ..	31st July, 1930.
2	Capt. S. T. Davies, I.M.S. ..	Singapore ..	23rd January, 1933.
3	Dr. W. P. S. Mitchell, M.B.E., I.M.D.	Bastar State ..	5th November, 1910.
4	Major J. P. Huban, O.B.E., I.M.S.	Jaipur State ..	2nd January, 1932.
5	Major L. Oswald ..	Rewa State ..	Permanent.
	<i>Military Officers.</i>		
1	Lt.-Col. H. deN. Lucas ..	Bhopal State ..	1st October, 1930.
2	Lt.-Col. C. R. C. Lane, M.C., I.A.	Hyderabad State ..	November, 1931.
3	Capt. P. B. Sanger .. ..	Kashmir State ..	4th February, 1933.
4	Capt. F. D. S. Field, M.C., I.A. ..	Mewar (Udaipur) State.	5th April, 1932.
5	Capt. W. M. Fairley .. ..	Travancore State ..	18th September, 1932

Serial No.	Name of Officer.	Name of the place outside British India where the services of an officer have been lent.	Date from which the services of an officer have been lent.
<i>Military Officers—contd.</i>			
6	Lt.-Col. G. F. Turner .. ..	Travancore State ..	22nd May, 1927.
7	Lt.-Col. M. C. Lake .. ..	Aden .. ..	26th November, 1928.
8	Capt. B. P. Dicker .. ..	China .. ..	2nd March, 1930.
9	Bt.-Major G. T. Wards .. ..	China .. ..	13th January, 1932.
10	Major R. E. Alderman, C.I.E., O.B.E.	Iraq .. ..	13th November, 1919.
11	Capt. W. A. Lyon, O.B.E. ..	Iraq .. ..	27th January, 1919.
12	Capt. G. D. Pybus .. ..	Persia .. ..	1st July, 1933.
13	Capt. H. M. Smyth .. ..	Shanghai .. ..	1st March, 1932.
14	Capt. J. E. Fairlie .. ..	United Kingdom ..	1st September, 1931.
15	Capt. J. Wilson .. ..	United Kingdom ..	2nd February, 1933.
16	Major N. G. Hind, M.C. ..	United Kingdom ..	15th October, 1930.
17	Bt. Lt.-Col. G. B. Henderson ..	United Kingdom ..	22nd January, 1931.
18	Major C. W. Toovey, M.C. ..	United Kingdom ..	6th January, 1933.
19	Bt. Lt.-Col. J. G. Smyth, V.C., M.C.	United Kingdom ..	16th January, 1931.
20	Capt. D. B. Sangster .. ..	United Kingdom ..	10th December, 1932.
21	Col. H. L. Ismay, C.B., D.S.O. ..	United Kingdom ..	1st August, 1933.
22	Major H. E. Eve, M.C. ..	Hong Kong ..	24th February, 1932.
<i>Other European Officers.</i>			
1	Mr. E. N. Fenwick (I. S. E.) ..	Bahawalpur State	9th February, 1932.
2	Mr. W. S. Bray-Brooke .. ..	Bahawalpur State	19th December, 1932.
3	Mr. S. H. Bigsby (I. S. E.) ..	Jaipur State ..	12th August, 1924.
4	Mr. S. G. Edgar (I. S. E.) ..	Marwar (Jodhpur) State.	6th November, 1929.
5	Mr. A. G. Dix (I. E. S.) ..	Nabha State ..	1st September, 1931.
6	Mr. D. C. McDonald (I. F. S.) ..	Rewa State ..	10th February, 1933.
7	Mr. Hugh McPherson .. ..	Bamra State ..	29th July, 1922.

Serial No.	Name of Officer.	Name of the place outside British India where the services of an officer have been lent.	Date from which the services of an officer have been lent.
<i>Other European Officers—contd.</i>			
8	Mr. H. D. Christian .. ..	Gangpur State ..	6th February, 1922.
9	Mr. A. E. C. McGavin .. ..	Patna State ..	31st July, 1926.
10	Mr. J. H. L. Gordon .. ..	Rewa State ..	Date of appointment not known.
11	Miss Herths .. ..	Rewa State ..	Ditto.
12	Miss M. Mason .. ..	Rewa State ..	Ditto.
13	Mr. A. J. Booth of Survey of India, Class II.	Iraq Government ..	23rd January, 1920.
14	Mr. J. Parlyby, O.B.E. .. ..	Iraq Government (Baghdad).	23rd April, 1917.

### THE INDIAN DOCK LABOURERS BILL.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore** (Member for Commerce and Railways) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to give effect in British India to the Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading and unloading ships.

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore** : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

### THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA BILL.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member) : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That the following Members of the Legislative Assembly be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill to constitute a Reserve Bank of India, namely, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Mr. S. C. Mitra, Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali, Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Mr. Bhuput Sing, Mr. B. Das, Sardar Sant Singh, Rao Bahadur S. R. Pandit, Sir Leslie Hudson, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan, Sir Abdulla-al-Māmūn Suhrawardy, Sardar Nihal Singh and the Mover.”

The motion was adopted.

### THE IMPERIAL BANK OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member) : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That the following Members of the Legislative Assembly be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill further to amend the Imperial Bank of India Act, 1920, for certain purposes, namely, Sir Cowasji Jehangir,

[Sir George Schuster.]

Mr. S. C. Mitra, Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali, Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Mr. Bhuput Singh, Mr. B. Das, Sardar Sant Singh, Rao Bahadur S. R. Pandit, Sir Leslie Hudson, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan, Sir Abdulla-al-Māmūn Suhrawardy, Sardar Nihal Singh and the Mover."

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa : Muhammadan) : May I know what will be the quorum ? I do not find anything in the motion. On previous occasions the quorum used to be mentioned ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Under the Standing Order, there is no provision made for mentioning the quorum in the case of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses.

**Mr. R. S. Sarma** (Nominated Non-Official) : May I ask whether any experts are going to be associated with this enquiry ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** : I have already made a statement on the general intention as regards consulting experts in one of the speeches that I made in the course of the debate on the Reserve Bank Bill. The exact procedure will have to be determined by the Committee itself and an early meeting will be arranged for considering it.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** (Sind : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Have Government decided with regard to the experts who will be called ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** : No, Sir, it is implied in the answer which I have already given that the matter will be discussed by the Committee itself.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That the following Members of the Legislative Assembly be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill further to amend the Imperial Bank of India Act, 1920, for certain purposes, namely, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Mr. S. C. Mitra, Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali, Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Mr. Bhuput Singh, Mr. B. Das, Sardar Sant Singh, Rao Bahadur S. R. Pandit, Sir Leslie Hudson, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan, Sir Abdulla-al-Māmūn Suhrawardy, Sardar Nihal Singh and the Mover."

The motion was adopted.

#### MOTION *RE* FUTURE ADMINISTRATION OF ADEN.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The House will now resume consideration of the motion relating to Aden.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, the question about the transfer of Aden was dealt with in the communiqué published by Government on June 20, 1933. The communiqué shows that the British Government intend to take over the administration of Aden from the Government of India, and, in order to induce the people of India and the Government of India to comply with this request, they have offered in the communiqué a small bait of about 20 lakhs of rupees which is at present payable towards the military and political administration. Now, Sir, I think this sum of 20 lakhs is not the actual sum which the Government of India have to pay towards the military expenditure in Aden. Very recently, in the other place, a

question was answered by the Honourable Mr. B. J. Glancy in which it was said that the contribution for political and military expenditure in 1930-31 was £1,50,000, in 1931-32 it was £1,36,499 and, for the year 1932-33, up to March, 1933, it was £1,19,959. It will thus be seen that the charge which the Government of India have to bear is gradually diminishing, and at present stands at Rs. 16 lakhs.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member) : I would remind my Honourable friend that that is not the final figure. I will take an early opportunity of intervening in the debate to explain the financial position.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : I hope the Finance Member will take an early opportunity of laying the final figures before the House and also before the Standing Finance Committee for discussion of those figures.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** : Now I have to point out that, according to the figures which have been supplied, the civil expenditure and income are as follows. In 1930-31, the expenditure was Rs. 12,45,500 and the income was Rs. 10,27,558. In 1931-32, the income was Rs. 12,04,100 and the expenditure was Rs. 11,39,000 ; so there is a small profit. In 1932-33, the revised estimates show an income of Rs. 13,64,000 and an expenditure of Rs. 11,01,700 ; so there is a profit of considerably over two lakhs. So, if these two lakhs are deducted from the amount of 16 lakhs, the net charge which the Government of India have to bear comes to about 14 lakhs. Further, we have to take into consideration that the trade of Aden is in the hands of the principal merchants of Bombay and Calcutta and as their head offices are in those cities, they have been paying income-tax on the profits they make in the Settlement of Aden, at their head offices. If that is computed, the loss to Government, if Aden is transferred, will be about four lakhs. So, if that amount of four lakhs be again deducted from the amount of 14 lakhs, then the loss will be only 10 lakhs. Therefore, the bait offered to the people of India and the Government of India of a saving of 20 lakhs comes down, on further examination, to about 10 lakhs. At the same time, I have to point out here that the royalty on salt imported from Aden at the rate of eight annas per ton on about 2,80,000 to three lakh tons annually amounting to Rs. 1,50,000 payable to Government is not shown in the answer given there. In the details of income, the income from salt has been shown at Rs. 1,01,000, but I think this is the amount which the inhabitants of Aden have to pay on account of the salt consumed and I am not certain under what item this amount of royalty is included. Then there is the amount of ground rent payable by salt works to the Government of India amounting to Rs. 25,000 approximately annually, and there is also another item which I do not find in the details given, and that is that the salt works have also to pay a toll tax at two annas per ton of salt exported, amounting annually to roughly Rs. 38,000. Then the salt works have to pay a house and property tax of about Rs. 75,000, and so on. So the administration of Aden at present is not so expensive as it was previously, and, as we have seen, the military expenditure also is being reduced year by year. The aeroplanes have come to stay and the expenditure on garrisons has been considerably reduced both in Mesopotamia and in Aden.

Then, Sir, this was the inducement or bait offered to Indians in respect of the transfer of Aden from India to the Colonial Office. Another bait has also been offered to the people of Aden to induce them to consent to

[Mr. B. V. Jadhav.]

the transfer. This is not given in the communiqué. But if I understood the Honourable the Leader of the House the other day, he said that if Aden was transferred to the Colonial Office, the citizens of Aden would not have to pay Rs. 20 lakhs, but the Imperial Government would pay it. The plain meaning of this statement is, as the Imperial Government have been charging the Government of India a part of the military expenditure, so Aden, when separated from India, would naturally be expected to meet that expenditure. But the Government of Britain was going to be very considerate and generous and remit it to Aden. That was the impression I gathered the other day. This means, in other words, if Aden is under the Indian Government, the people of India, including the people of Aden, will have to pay this amount, but, as soon as Aden is transferred to the Colonial Office, that Settlement will not be asked to pay, but the burden will be borne by the Imperial Government.

I may here point out, Sir, that India today is financially not in a good position. Certain reforms have been promised. Federation is looming large on the horizon, and India is said to be on the way to dominion status. I am afraid, Sir, that, under the White Paper Scheme, dominion status is a very very far contingency. However that may be, the British Government is taking care to clip the wings of India. First they are clipping the eastern wings of India by trying to separate Burma, and, now, the western wing, which is the Aden Settlement, is also going to be clipped.

Now, Sir, arrangements are being made to separate Burma, and what is the ground advanced in justification of this action? It is said that the people of Burma desire to have separation from India; but this is not quite correct. No doubt, there is a section of the Burmese people who want separation of Burma and to have dominion status for Burma, and though that section is in a minority, it is a very strong minority. But the majority is against separation. But, in the case of Aden, the same principle of self-determination is not applied. If the people of Aden are consulted, I am sure, a very large majority will be in favour of remaining with the Government of India. They have expressed their will in public meetings and in every possible way they could. The other day the Honourable the Leader of the House flung in our face a representation by certain Somali traders in Aden, but somebody has whispered to us that those traders are only 30 in number, and they were not even permanent residents of Aden.

Sir, Aden has a population of 53,000, and it consists of Arabs, Jews and Indians, both Hindus and Mussalmans, who have made their homes there and who are the real residents of Aden, and, therefore, it is their voice which must prevail and which ought to be respected. Of course, there are certain people who are casual visitors for the purposes of carrying on trade. I do not mean to suggest that they cannot have any voice in the matter, but at all events the voice of the permanent residents of Aden ought to prevail, because they have got everything at stake there, while the others are mere birds of passage who merely go to Aden, remain there for a time for the purpose of trade and, as soon as their pile is made, leave the place, and as such they cannot have as much interest in the Settlement as the permanent residents who have settled there for years.

Sir, the Settlement of Aden had been for nearly a 100 years with the Government of Bombay, and the merchants of Bombay have made Aden

what it is today. They have their vast godowns, their wharves, their buildings and their salt pans and everything that makes Aden what it is today is due to the exertions and sacrifices which the Bombay merchants have made. Sir, a public meeting was held the other day at Aden of all the citizens of the place including Arabs, Jews and Indians, and they strongly protested against Aden being transferred to the Colonial Government, and they strongly expressed a desire to remain with the Government of India, as they have been for nearly a century, and they appealed both to the Government of India and to the people of India not to forsake them, and, above all, they strongly resented being handed over to the Colonial Office which is so notorious for its anti-Asiatic policy. They further pointed out that the Settlement of Aden had prospered under the Government of India, and the civil administration was not a burden on India, but it was self-supporting, and the Settlement promises to be more prosperous which was also in the interest of Indian trade and commerce. They pointed out the miserable condition of the neighbouring Somaliland ports of Barbara, etc., which were transferred to the Colonial Office, and this condition they attribute to the anti-Asiatic policy of the Colonial Administration. Sir, this is the opinion of the people of Aden, and I think, if a plebiscite were to be taken, it would be preponderating in favour of remaining with India.

An Honourable Member the other day, while speaking on this question, said that the transfer was in favour of the Arabs there. The Arabs, Jews and other communities, which make the total population of Aden, are enjoying equal rights. There is no discrimination under the rules of the Government of India, but the people of Aden, as well as the people of India, know that as soon as Aden is transferred to the Colonial Administration, in spite of the promises made in this communiqué that discrimination will not be made, there is genuine apprehension in the minds of the people that injustice is sure to be done to the people of Aden. We know from bitter experience what value to attach to these promises. The Colonial Office and the British Government often times made large promises that justice would be done to the Indians in South Africa, but we know, Sir, what their condition is. The Indians in Kenya and other Settlements....

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore** (Member for Commerce and Railways) : I do not want to interrupt my Honourable friend, but, since the matter has been referred to by more than one Member, I would like to state for his information that the figures I gave, namely, 29,820 were the figures of the Arab population of Aden.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** : Yes, but do they form part of the 53,000 and odd ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore** : Yes, Sir, certainly they form part of the 46,638 which is the number recorded in the Census of 1931.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** : The condition of the Indians in Tanganyika is also the same. The Arabs and other inhabitants of Aden know that, if they are transferred to the Colonial Office, their status and their position will be greatly prejudiced and they will not get as much freedom as they are getting under the Government of India. The people of Bombay and the people of India do not wish that Aden should be transferred. The Indian Legislature has been reiterating and discussing this question from the year 1921 again and again. I need not read to the



[Mr. B. V. Jadhav.] House the various discussions that took place and the conclusions arrived at and the various promises made by responsible officers of Government. I shall say cursorily that in 1921 when it was proposed to transfer the administration of the Settlement of Aden to the Foreign Office, not only Indians, but also the Arab and Jew residents of Aden protested against it and claimed their right of self-determination and demanded that they should remain with India. At that time, the Government of Bombay, through their official representative in the Council of State, supported the Resolution of the Honourable Sir Phiroze Sethna. At that time, Sir Denys Bray stated that the idea of transfer of Aden has long since been abandoned. That was in 1921, but now the abandoned idea seems to have been taken up again. In 1927, the Commander-in-Chief announced the transfer of the military administration of Aden to the Imperial Government. At the same time, he said :

“Honourable Members are aware that the Settlement of Aden itself is peopled to a very great extent by our fellow Indian subjects. The Government of India have thought it right that their welfare and interests should not go outside the ken of the Government of India. It will accordingly be retained as part of the Settlement and the municipality of Aden remains under the Government.”

Now, this Legislature has been given an opportunity of saying what the voice of the country is. Although these assurances were given that it was not the intention of the Government to transfer the control of Aden, I now understand that the Government of Great Britain has become alive to the necessity of the transfer and the reason they give is this :

“The reasons which suggest that Aden should not remain linked with India under the new constitution are that it is an area geographically remote from India ; that it would not naturally fit into the new federation, that it is already to some extent under Imperial control and that it is inseparable in practice from the Aden Protectorate, which has already passed wholly out of Indian control.”

Now, Sir, the chief reason given is that Aden is geographically remote from India. It has been geographically remote for the last 100 years and this point, that it will not fit into the new Federal Scheme, surprises me. We have in this vast country of India French Settlements at Pondicherry, at Chandernagore and at Mahe, and France, as is well known, is a republic. These Settlements fit into the administration of France and their representatives sit in the House of Deputies there. Portugal has also some settlements on the West Coast of India. There is Goa, Diu and Daman. In the old Constitution, it was a monarchy and, under the new Constitution, it is a republic. Still these possessions fit into the administration of the republic. Is it so very difficult, is it so much impossible to find out a scheme under which Aden can be fitted into the scheme of the Federation. I ask, whether the statesmanship of England is so very bankrupt that they cannot find out any other way than to separate Aden and put it under the colonial form of Government ? This Federation is no insuperable difficulty. Other nations have solved such a difficulty. The possessions of France and Portugal are more than 5,000 miles away. Aden is only 1,500 miles and the distance, owing to aeroplanes and other things, has been dwindling very perceptibly every year. So, this excuse about Federation is not a very sound one.

I shall now refer briefly to the history of Aden and how it came under the administration of India. It is well known that from time

memorial India, Arabia, Persia and Iraq were closely connected with each other by trade and commerce. Indian ships were visiting the ports of Arabia, Persia and Iraq, and Arabian ships were visiting the ports of India even before the British people or any Europeans set their foot on the Indian coast. When Britain acquired vast tracts of territory in India, they had to look to the politics of the neighbouring nations, such as Afghanistan, Persia and Arabia. They had trading interests in the Persian Gulf and in Arabia and the Government of India thought that it would be a very great advantage to have the possession of Aden which was a very important strategic position. So, the troops of

12 Noon.

India and the money of India achieved the conquest of Aden. Ever since the year 1839—94 years ago—Aden has been under the Indian rule. Ever since that time, India had been sending the military forces there. The expenditure incurred by India on that account from the year 1839 has been variously computed. According to Sir Denys Bray and Mr. E. M. Cook, the Secretary who gave these figures in 1921, it is computed that from 1839 to 1921—a period of 82 years—India has paid at the rate of about 50 lakhs annually. From the year 1921 to 1927—a period of six years, according to the figures given in 1927 by the Commander-in-Chief, the expenditure amounted to about 35 lakhs a year. From 1927 to 1932—a period of five years, the expenditure amounted to at the rate of Rs. 20 lakhs annually. So, if we capitalise the amount of money spent year after year according to this scale, it amounts to the enormous amount of 758 crores and 16 lakhs at the rate of 4½ per cent. The figures given by the Welby Commission in the year 1900 are very very moderate. I shall give those figures. From 1839 to 1914—a period of 75 years—India spent at the rate of 15 lakhs annually and from the year 1915, 50 lakhs annually and then 16 lakhs annually. This amount also comes to 169 crores approximately.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** Could my Honourable friend give me the reference in the Welby Commission's report which he is quoting ?

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav :** I think I shall be able to give that reference later on.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** My Honourable friend cannot give it now.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav :** No. So, it will be seen that, from a moderate computation, the amount India has spent amounts to Rs. 758 crores and, from another calculation, it comes to about 300 crores. So, I think the real amount must be somewhere between these two figures. I shall claim on behalf of India that, if England wants to take the Settlement, then all this money ought to be re-imbursed. Some may say that, although the Indian troops took possession of Aden, the policy was dictated by the Government of Britain. I am not going to dispute that point. The only question I would ask is : Did the Indian troops conquer Aden in the interests of India or in the interests of England and for her benefit ? If it is disputed that it was conquered for England and in England's interests, then the latter country would have immediately taken possession of it and would have met all the expenses incurred in the conquest and would have conducted its administration since that time. Instead of doing so, they have allowed India to administer the country as if it

[Mr. B. V. Jadhav.]

belonged to India for the last 94 years and to spend on its garrison. Therefore, the presumption is that the conquest was in the interests of India and for the benefit of India. But, for argument's sake, I allow that the conquest was for the benefit of England, and England has a prior claim to the possession of Aden. Then, it follows naturally that the position of India from the year 1839 to the present day is the position of an Agent. And, as this Agent has expended the money for the improvement of Aden and for its protection with the approval of the British Government, it stands to reason that even in that case England ought to come forward and pay the whole amount which India has spent in protecting the country and doing everything necessary. If India is to be looked upon as the owner, then, of course, the question of transfer does not arise. India is not at present in a position to enforce the reimbursement of the money spent upon the advancement of Aden. But if it is to be held that India was in possession of Aden as an Agent, then, I think, when the principal wants to take over the possession of the property, he ought to re-imburse the Agent for all the expenses he has rightfully incurred in the interests of the property.

Then, Sir, certain promises are here made for the satisfaction of the people of Aden—no racial legislation or segregation will be permitted by His Majesty's Government. All such promises were made previously in the case of South America, Kenya or Tanganyika, but we know what the worth of those promises is.

I wish to urge another point, namely, that the Government of Bombay themselves have spent certain amount of money on the public works of Aden and I think it would be right on the part of that Government to claim compensation for the works they have executed and the money they have spent.

In conclusion, the Government of India conquered Aden and have held it, administered it and paid the military expenses for its protection. As a matter of fact, the military force required for the protection of Aden alone will not be a heavy one. The tribes that surround Aden are not very powerful tribes and a powerful garrison is not necessary. But, as Aden stands on the trade route of the whole Empire, it has become a place of very great strategic importance. Therefore the interests of the Empire as a whole requires that Aden should be adequately garrisoned and protected. For that purpose a very heavy force has been stationed there from the very beginning. As a matter of fact, the military protection of that place ought to be a charge on the Imperial Government. By the promise that has been held out to the people of Aden that after the transfer of Government, the Government of Great Britain will undertake the 20 lakhs of expenses required for the military protection of the settlement itself shows that Great Britain admits that the charge is legitimately hers and it has been laid on the shoulders of India rather unjustly. The protection of Aden is in the interest of the whole Empire and, if necessary, the contribution ought to be levied from all the countries benefited by the retention of that station. India will willingly bear her share of the burden and up to this time India has been bearing the entire burden. India has spent about 400 crores or 500 crores on the protection of Aden for the past 94 years, and if

England wants to take possession of Aden and administer it through the Colonial Office or through the Foreign Office or in any other way, in justice she ought to refund this sum of 400 crores or 500 crores. Several British officers have made promises at various times that Aden will not be transferred. The population of Aden is not going to accept a transfer and they have unequivocally shown, at least a majority of them, that they are in favour of remaining under the Government of India. The Indian people also are not very anxious to get rid of Aden. They want Aden. They want to assist their own merchants in Aden and also in East Africa and Somaliland in their trade. India has great cotton piece-goods and wheat and rice and *jawar* and other food grains for which she wants a market outside. Therefore, it is in the interest of India and Indian trade that Aden should be retained although it may be a burden on the resources of India. But India is willing to bear this burden and, therefore, I recommend that this House should unanimously declare its decision that Aden should be retained under the control of the Government of India.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** Sir, I think it would be well to intervene at this stage to say something on the general financial aspect of this question. Very full details of recent expenditure and revenue of Aden were provided in answer to a question asked in the other House by the Honourable Mr. V. V. Kalikar on the 29th August and my Honourable friend, who has just spoken, referred to that information. I think, in order to see this question in its proper perspective, it is just as well to say something of the past history. I am afraid, I cannot, however, if I go back into the past history, meet my Honourable friend on the ground which he himself has chosen, a ground which leads him to calculate the value of the cost of the investment in Aden in what I think I can fairly describe as astronomical figures. I am totally unable to find out how my Honourable friend made his calculations, or on what they were based. But I do suggest for the consideration of this House that it is not very profitable to attempt to calculate the value of Aden by going back a hundred years and then adding up the expenditure and allowing it to accumulate at compound interest. If my Honourable friend likes to calculate his own value, that is to say, the cost which has been expended annually on his maintenance, education, etc., and allows that to accumulate at compound interest, I should imagine that, on his own methods of calculation, he would find himself to be worth something like five crores. But I doubt if my Honourable friend would command that price in the market. I think also it is fair to point out, when we are looking at the matter in that way, that there is something to be said on the other side. I think every one who lives in India recognises that the value of India's trade very largely depends on the existence of the British navy. Now, Sir, there—just to take one example,—is one field of expenditure which is to be entirely borne by the British taxpayer. If we were to go back to the early years of development of India's trade and reckon what the value of the services of the British navy to India had been,—adopting my Honourable friend's methods of calculation—we should find an item in the balance sheet on the other side which would balance anything that my Honourable friend has had to put forward. Some of us on this side see the matter, when we are talking in terms of financial burdens, from the point of view of the people who have to pay

[Sir George Schuster.] The English taxpayer is the most heavily burdened individual in the world, and that if we take a broad view of the cost of maintaining the British Empire and all that it means, the British taxpayer certainly bears a lion's share of that burden. Sir, I do think it is necessary to bear these broad considerations in mind in order to examine a question like this in its proper perspective. But, having said that, I wish to make it clear that we, representing the Government of India, in this debate, do not wish to appear in any sense as advocates of a particular side. We merely wish to give what assistance we can in presenting the true facts to the House.

Now, Sir, until 1900 the entire civil and military expenditure in connection with Aden was borne by India; but on examining the evidence, given before the Welby Commission, I have found that a certain share of the cost of fortification of Aden was actually borne by His Majesty's Government. However, that is a small amount, and, generally speaking, it is true to say that, until 1900, the entire civil and military expenditure was borne by India. As early as 1886, the Government of India had been actively urging the propriety of part of the expenses of Aden being borne by His Majesty's Government on account of the Imperial importance of Aden. In 1895, as Honourable Members know, the Welby Commission was appointed to examine this and other matters. They recommended that possibly an equitable solution would be for His Majesty's Government to pay half of the military cost and, as a result of that recommendation, from 1901, His Majesty's Government contributed annually £72,000. I find at the time, when the Welby Commission reported, the actual military expenditure was 21½ lakhs per annum. I suppose £72,000 was fixed for the contribution as being something near half the cost. From that date the military expenditure in Aden rose very considerably and I find that in 1926-27 the actual cost of military expenditure borne by India was no less than 47½ lakhs. That was the position when the arrangement was made that His Majesty's Government should become responsible for the whole political and military expenditure of Aden. As from the 1st April, 1927, His Majesty's Government became responsible for the whole of that expenditure, but the arrangement was that the Government of India should contribute £250,000 a year for three years and then £150,000 a year or one-third of the actual cost whichever was the less. I think it is important to call attention to that past history because, owing to the fact that His Majesty's Government have taken over already a major part of the responsibility for Aden, the taxpayer in India is being saved a very substantial amount indeed. It is not merely a question of 10 or 15 lakhs, but actually in 1926-27 we were spending 47 lakhs a year on Aden. The position now is that we have reached the second stage of that arrangement and our contribution is, as I have just said, £150,000 a year or one-third of the cost whichever is the less. And, as my Honourable friend, who has just spoken, pointed out, we paid the full £150,000 in 1930-31. In 1931-32, we paid £136,000 odd and in 1932-33, we have paid just under £120,000. I interrupted my Honourable friend to point out that the last figure was not yet the final figure, but I have no reason to suppose that that figure will be substantially altered. So we may take it that our liability now is in the neighbourhood of £120,000, but it

might, at any time, rise to £150,000. That is our contribution to the military expenditure. The reduction which has been effected since 1930-31 has been brought about, as my Honourable friend pointed out, because His Majesty's Government are experimenting on a fairly large scale in the substitution of air force defence for land forces at Aden. Possibly they may reduce the expenditure still further, but we have no information on that point; and I think it is important that the House should bear in mind that our liability at present may go up to £150,000 in any one year. Then we have to consider what has to be set against that as regards the balance of the revenue and expenditure on the account of the civil Government for which we are at present responsible. My Honourable friend pointed out that in the year 1932-33 there actually was a small surplus on account of Aden, a surplus of about 2½ lakhs. But if we take a broader view of the situation and take the average figures for a period of years, for instance if I go back to the year 1927-28 and take the average figures for seven years including the budget estimates of the current year, I find that there is actually a small debit balance on the average of about Rs. 66,000 annually. I do not think we can take the surplus of 1932-33 as a reliable figure, because, at present, as Honourable Members know, we have imposed very severe cuts on expenditure and we were able in the case of Aden to make some special economies. I do not think we can count on being able to maintain that position. Therefore, if one tries to put a fair picture before this House I think the fairest thing to do is to say that as regards the civil expenditure we can count on revenue and expenditure about balancing. Honourable Members must remember that, if there was a regular surplus, we should certainly have very urgent claims from the Resident at Aden that that surplus should be expended for the benefit of Aden, and it would be very hard to resist those claims, because there are very urgent works which they have been pressing for several years. I do not think, therefore, that we can maintain the position better than an even balance. Therefore, so far we have got this. We save the military contribution which at present is about £120,000 a year and may amount to £150,000; and as regards the civil expenditure we hand over an even balance.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend has referred to certain other items which he says are not included in the full statement that was provided in the Council of State. I find it rather difficult to follow exactly what my Honourable friend had in mind, but as soon as possible I will get a shorthand copy of his speech and verify what he has said. I do not think that any of the items to which he referred would in any case have appreciably affected the position, and I think that the statement which I have just given is really substantially correct. But there is one item to which he referred which I think one must put before this House. In calculating what is the revenue of Aden, we have included the annual income-tax receipts which come in under the heading of Aden. But, as my Honourable friend pointed out, there may be merchants who make their returns for income-tax in India and who include in those returns profits which might after separation become liable to income-tax in Aden; and in that case of course, under our provisions for double income-tax relief, we should have to lose part of that income-tax. It is quite impossible to give any reliable estimate as to what that figure might be; I do not think myself that it could be a very substantial figure.

[Sir George Schuster.] I think my Honourable friend reckoned something like four lakhs under that head. I think that must be a very considerable over-estimate, but if Honourable Members wish to have an exact figure, then they must bear that possibility in mind. There may be some slight loss on our income-tax under that head. That, Sir, I think is the position as fully and fairly as can be put as regards revenue and expenditure. We shall save something like between 15 and 20 lakhs a year on the military contribution as against which we may lose a lakh or two under the head of income-tax in the manner which I have just explained.

Then, Sir, my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, made on Saturday last the same point that has been made by the last speaker as to the value of the assets which have been or may be handed over ; and the feeling I suppose was that some sort of claim should be made against His Majesty's Government if they take over the whole administration of Aden. I have already rejected my Honourable friend's method of compound interest calculation and I have tried to find out exactly what the capital value of those assets might be. But I am afraid it is impossible at this stage of history to get back into the past and get an accurate figure. I would only just like to ask the House to consider what the various classes of assets are. There is first of all the harbour and the port. That belongs to the Port Trust. The Port Trust was set up in 1888, and as far as I can ascertain, when it was set up they took over the existing assets at a valuation and took over the liability on that account. Since then they have been entirely independent. They have been raising money on loans and they are responsible for those loans and there will be no change in the beneficial interest as regards the Port Trust as a result of this transfer. So that class of assets goes out ; the Government of India cannot make any claim under that head.

Then, as to the question of buildings, as regards Provincial Government buildings, we had, as a matter of fact, quite recently gone into that particular question when the administration of Aden was taken over by the Government of India from the Government of Bombay. A claim was made by the Government of Bombay and figures were gone into, and it was ascertained that the cost of the buildings amounted to something like nine lakhs, but we resisted that claim in the Government of India, because we said that we had already in other cases adopted the principle that when responsibility in administration in any sphere passes from one authority to another, the assets and liabilities connected with the ordinary administration should also pass free of payment. That is the sort of principle on which discussions as regards the separation of Burma, for example, have always been based, and I think perhaps my friends are inclined to take what is a misleading view of the situation in considering the possibility of making claims on account of assets of that kind. They are really part of the ordinary equipment of Government ; they have been provided out of revenue, and they have to be maintained out of revenue, but, ordinarily speaking, when an administration is handed over, it is not so much an asset as a liability, or at least one must take into account the fact that there is a liability as well, and we certainly have always taken the line in the Government of India that any claim based on account of the cost of buildings, which, as I say, are

only part of the ordinary equipment of administration, is a mistake. Rightly or wrongly, that has been our view. Therefore, we resisted the claim of the Bombay Government to that nine lakhs, and we have maintained that position.

Apart from provincial buildings, there are a few Central Government buildings—I have not got any details of their cost,—but their cost would be negligible.

Then of course, there is the question of military buildings, and here I must point out that when the control of the military administration was taken over by His Majesty's Government in 1927, all military buildings were transferred to His Majesty's Government, free of cost, on the basis of the principle which I have just explained,—the principle being, as I said, that they cannot be assessed at a commercial value, that they carry liabilities with them, and in this case of course the transfer of the military responsibility carried with it a very heavy liability which at the time of the transfer amounted to nearly 50 lakhs per annum. That, Sir, is the position as regards these liabilities.

There is only one other class of assets, and that is the Water Works, and there, according to the information which I have got, about three lakhs was spent on an aqueduct, and about 5½ lakhs was spent on water tanks. This expenditure was undertaken a very long time ago. The information which I am giving was taken from the Imperial Gazetteer of 1908, and apparently that expenditure was undertaken as a grant to the Municipal Committee.

That, Sir, I think, covers what we call all the assets which are to be taken over. I do not think that I have got anything further to add, but I can only say this, that if any other points are made, such as have been made just now by my friend from Bombay, we will most carefully check all statements that the Honourable Members make. If they want themselves to get the results of our investigations from checking these statements, I should be very pleased to forward them to them, and if we find that we have been wrong in our figures, we will certainly take that into account in considering the matter on behalf of the Government of India after this debate, and we will see that correct information is forwarded to His Majesty's Government.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhamadan) : Sir, I am thankful to the Government for giving us an opportunity of discussing this important question. I also recognise with appreciation the decision of the Government to observe an attitude of neutrality, and to confine the discussion only amongst non-official Members of this House. My friend, Mr. Anklesaria, in the course of his speech, said that he was looking for guidance and advice from Government. Sir, my friend is accustomed to look for guidance and advice from the occupants of the Treasury Benches, but those of us, who sit on this side of the House, claim to judge every question on its own merits, and come to a decision irrespective of what the views of the Government Members may be.

Sir, as Honourable Members are aware, Aden was captured in 1839 by Major Baillie, who was sent out on behalf of the Government of Bombay. Even before that time, Indians were in Aden under the Sultanate of Lehaj ; and, since the acquisition of Aden on behalf of the Government of India, it remained under the Government of Bombay, and all



[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

expenditure in connection with its administration was borne by Government. What was then, Sir, a mere barren rock at the time of its capture was converted, in course of time, by Indian labour, Indian capital and Indian industry into a flourishing port of first rate strategic and commercial importance, a first rate harbour and a distributing trade centre. Sir, the question of the transfer of Aden had been looming large on the horizon since the year 1921, if not before. On the 28th of February, 1921, the Prime Minister of England stated in the House of Commons, that the responsibility for administration and policy in Palestine, Mesopotamia and Aden was to be transferred to the Colonial Office; and then, later on, the Right Honourable Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons on the 14th July, 1921, made the following statement. I shall read out only one paragraph from his statement, as giving an indication of the working of the mind of the Cabinet in England, and the motive which prompted them to arrive at this decision. This is what he said :

“ There is another possibility of a reduction of expenditure in Aden. The India Office has very kindly handed over Aden to the Colonial Office, and my acceptance of the gift ; ”

—please mark the words carefully—

“ the India Office has very kindly handed over Aden to the Colonial Office, and my acceptance of the gift has only been delayed by the financial negotiations because India has hitherto played a great part, and I certainly should not be serving the interests of the British taxpayer if I assumed the whole burden without any of the funds which are necessary to maintain a fortress of first consequence to India. . . . ”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Will you please read it out again, I mean the portion relating to the gift—it is a very important point.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :**

“ There is another possibility of a reduction of expenditure in Aden. The India Office has very kindly handed over Aden to the Colonial Office, and my acceptance of the gift has only been delayed by the financial negotiations because India has hitherto played a great part, and I certainly should not be serving the interests of the British taxpayer if I assumed the whole burden without any of the funds which are necessary to maintain a fortress of first consequence to India, but I hope for a happy solution. In fact, I think in a very few days we shall have reached an agreement and the moment that Aden is transferred to the Colonial Office, it will be possible to amalgamate the administration of Aden and Somaliland. Somaliland and Aden are really the most happy marriage that could be made. They are really necessary to one another. The high ground, five or six thousand feet high in Somaliland, will afford a Hill station to which the British soldiers in Aden under the most trying conditions all through summer could go company by company, in night's journey across the sea to Somaliland. You could not have a more harmonious minor proposition, and if this amalgamation be carried out in such a way as to effect perhaps, a saving of £200,000 to £300,000 a year in the reduction of military expenditure, it will repay the trouble which it takes to arrive at such a conclusion. ”

This is what Mr. Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons on the 14th July, 1921.

Then, again, on the 26th September, 1921, the Honourable Sir Phiroze Sethna moved a Resolution in the other place which stated that the administration of Aden be continued under the Government of India and not be transferred to the Colonial Office. Speaking on that occasion, the Honourable Mr. Pratt, who was then, I believe, the official representative of the Government of Bombay in that House, stated as follows :

“ Mr. President, the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office is a question in which the Government of Bombay is deeply and closely interested. Towards that question, the attitude of the Bombay Government cannot under any circumstances be one of neutrality

and I have been authorised to give expression to the provisional views of the Bombay Government at this stage of the discussion of this question. Their position is that they have had very little notice, and indeed very little time for the consideration of this question. They have had very little information as to the grounds on which the transfer is being considered. It is also a fact that public opinion both in Bombay and Aden has expressed itself very strongly against the proposed transfer. Very strong protests have been recorded by the trading communities of Bombay and Aden and for these reasons for the present the Government of Bombay objects to any change in the status quo."

In this connection I should like to remind my Honourable friend, the Nominated Member from the North-West Frontier Province, who claimed to speak on behalf of the Arab population of Aden and said that the Arabs in Aden did not object to this transfer, of what the Honourable Sir Muhammad Shafi said on behalf of the Government of India. He admitted in so many words that the people of India as well as the Arab people in Aden were opposed to the proposed transfer.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury).]

Sir Muhammad Shafi said :

"I can assure the House that the Government of India will take note of the opinions expressed in this House by various members representing different interests. They will note the fact that Indian sentiment according to the various speakers is entirely opposed to this transfer. They will also take note of the fact, which has been positively stated by the Honourable Mr. Sethna and is endorsed by the Bombay Government that local opinion in Aden as well as in Bombay is also opposed to the transfer."

Then, Sir, on the 3rd March, 1927, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief made an astounding statement on the floor of this House in which he stated that the political and military control of Aden had been definitely transferred to His Majesty's Government in England. That statement took our breath away, because we were not prepared for this transfer without an opportunity being given to this House to express our views. However that may be, the Commander-in-Chief at that time stated as follows :

"As Honourable Members are aware, the settlement of Aden itself is peopled to a very great extent by our fellow Indian subjects. The Government of India have thought it right that their welfare and interests should not go outside the ken of the Government of India. It will accordingly be retained as part of the settlement and the municipality of Aden will remain under the Government of India."

It will be observed that throughout these transactions the Bombay Government were not consulted in the matter. Even if they had been consulted, their opinion was ignored. Sir, there was a discussion on this question in the Bombay Legislative Council on the 10th March, 1927, on the Aden Civil and Criminal Justice Bill, and, on that occasion, the then Home Member stated as follows :

"Since the Bill was introduced the situation has been materially changed by the announcement made by His Excellency the Commander in Chief at Delhi that the question of the future arrangements for the administration of Aden has been settled by agreement between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government."

This clearly indicates that the transaction took place over the head of the Bombay Government, and they were not consulted in the matter at all. He added :

"That announcement came as a surprise to the Government of Bombay as much as to the general public. I am obliged to stress this point because during the discussion on the Bill both I and my Honourable friend the Chief Secretary assured several

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:]

Honourable Members that we had no reason to suppose that a decision was imminent, and indeed pointed to the fact that the Government of India had instructed us to proceed with this Bill as evidence that no immediate change was probable. The details of the future system of administration of Aden are not yet known to the Government of Bombay which indeed knows no further than what has appeared in the press."

Reference has been made to the statement of Sir Denys Bray in this House in January, 1929, in the course of which he said :

"I repeat my promise that the transfer of Aden from India will not be effected without this House being taken into consultation. I hasten to add that all idea of such a transfer has long since been abandoned."

A representative deputation led by Sir Chunilal Mehta waited on his Excellency the Viceroy on the 30th November, 1931, with a view to laying before His Excellency the feelings of the people, and to bring to his notice their strong opposition to the contemplated step. Turning now to the proposals contained in the White Paper, I find that on page 39, clause 5, the following statement occurs :

"The settlement of Aden is at present the Chief Commissioner's province. The future arrangements for the settlement are however under consideration and accordingly no proposals in respect of it are included in this document."

There also very surreptitiously the proposal of transferring the civil administration of Aden for the first time found a place in a corner of the White Paper. This resulted in an influential deputation led by His Highness the Agha Khan to wait upon Sir Samuel Hoare, the Secretary of State. That was on the 30th May, 1933. Sir Samuel Hoare, in course of his reply, referred to the difficulty of including Aden in the Federation which consisted of provinces. At the same time, he added that the difficulty was not insurmountable.

I will now refer very briefly to the Press Communiqué which was issued by the Government of India on the 20th June last. The reasons given for the contemplated step are many, and the first reason given is that Aden is geographically remote from India.

Now, Sir, with regard to a question which I asked my Honourable friend, the Foreign Secretary, a few days back, I said that Government must have taken notice of the obvious geographical fact that Aden was far nearer to India than it is to England. The Andamans and the Nicobar Islands are also at some distance from India, and is that any reason why these two Islands may also be taken away from our control ? Do I understand, that the proposed transfer of Burma from India is contemplated, because of the geographical position of the two countries ? Burma is far nearer to India than she is to England. Why then His Majesty's Government have seriously proposed the separation of Burma from India ? India herself is very far away from England. Is that any reason why England should relax her hold on India and allow us to govern ourselves ? Or is it their contention that India has been managed very badly all these years, because she is so far away from England ? This plea of geographical remoteness will not hold water for a minute. The next ground on which this proposal is sought to be given effect to is that Aden would not naturally fit in with the plan of Federation. Sir, if different Indian States, in their different processes of administrative and political evolution, can come into the picture of Federation, I do not understand why Aden should be singled out as not fitting in with the scheme of

Federation in the future Government. It is also stated that Aden is already to some extent under the Imperial control, and so we should not object to the transfer of the civil control of the Settlement. This step was taken in the midst of the Great War, and only as a temporary measure. And, now, we are to be deprived of the remnant of control over the civil administration of Aden which we were having all these years. Some of us recognised at that very time that the partial transfer of the control of Aden to the British Government was only the thin end of the wedge, and it has now come to be true. It is stated in the communiqué that India would be relieved of the annual contribution of approximately 20 lakhs at present payable towards the military and political administration. Sir, I am thankful to the Honourable the Finance Member for having given us a full account of the financial position of Aden, and its implications in the consideration of the question. I do not want to speak with regard to that point, but I would like to say very clearly that in this calculation the income which the Government of India has been deriving from salt duty, income-tax and super-tax has also to be taken into account. I am speaking subject to correction by the Honourable the Finance Member that the revenue which is being derived by India from these and other sources amounts to something like 10 lakhs of rupees. If this is so, then out of 20 lakhs we shall be losing 10 lakhs of revenues if the civil administration of Aden is taken out of our control.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I think my Honourable friend is definitely incorrect. We have included in the revenue statement all the income-tax receipts from Aden. As I explained, there is only one small marginal receipt from income-tax we might lose, that is to say, to the extent we now get income-tax from business men assessed in India in respect of profits made in Aden. To that extent we may find that we lose a little income-tax, but it will be quite a small sum.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I am glad to stand corrected. However that may be, this 20 lakhs is not much when considering the position of Aden with regard to the future constitution of India, as it is regarded as the Gibraltar of the East.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) :** It is not 20 lakhs ; it is 15 lakhs.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** It is about 16 lakhs this year.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** However that may be, is it the contention of the Government that every administration which has a deficit budget, or which is being carried on at the expense of the Government of India should form no part of our territory ? For instance, the North-West Frontier Province is a deficit province, and it has been swallowing about a crore of rupees every year. Will that be the reason for taking it away from India and putting it under the Colonial Government ? Sind is also going to be a deficit province, and so I think Orissa for some years. But that is no reason for taking away those portions of our territory and annexing them to the Colonial Office. The same is the case with the Andamans. Will His Majesty's Government give back all the money we have spent in Aden for nearly a century ?

Now, Sir, it is stated that the right of appeal in judicial cases to the Bombay High Court would be maintained. Is that a very great concession ? If the right of appeal to the Bombay High Court is not retained, what will be the result ? The right of appeal will go to His Majesty's

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

Government in England which is over 6,000 miles away from India, and a long way off from Aden. So, in their own interests and, in the interest of the public of Aden, it is but natural that the right of appeal should be retained by the Bombay High Court. It is also stated that His Majesty's Government would maintain the existing policy of making Aden a free port unless some radical change in the present economic situation should take place. Sir, in the first place, there is no unequivocal guarantee that Aden will continue for all time to be retained as a free port. It is qualified by the statement that if some radical change in the present economic situation should take place, Aden will cease to be a free port. Radical change in the present economic situation of the country or in the world economic condition is not a very remote possibility. It might take place in the near future. When that contingency happens, Aden will cease to be a free port. What has happened to the other free ports in that area which Government claimed to retain as free ports? Somaliland, near Aden, was at one time a part of India, and it was administered by the Bombay Government. So long as it was administered by the Bombay Government, its three ports, namely, Barbara, Bulhar, and Zaila were prosperous, and were flourishing ports of trade. But when Somaliland was transferred to the Colonial Office, they ceased to be flourishing ports. As a matter of fact, duties began to be imposed to meet the increased cost of administration, and they ceased to be free ports thereafter. The Indian, the Arab and the Jewish traders in course of time left those ports, and they have now become desolate places. This, I am afraid, will be the fate of Aden if such a contingency happens.

It is further stated in the communiqué that His Majesty's Government would do their utmost to maintain the present standard of administration, and would not impose any additional taxation unless such a course became in their opinion absolutely necessary. Sir, this stipulation is not worth the paper on which it is printed. We know the condition of our countrymen under the Colonial Office. We know how Indians are being treated in South Africa, in Kenya, in Fiji, in Mauritius and in so many other places overseas inspite of the assurances of the Government. Myself, as well as other Honourable Members, have been responsible for bringing to the notice of this House the conditions of our fellow countrymen overseas from time to time, and the racial and other kinds of discrimination which has been imposed upon them in the exercise of their political as well as economic rights in the colonies in which they have settled. I do not pin much faith in the assurance that the imposition of any additional taxation will not be undertaken unless such a course became absolutely necessary. I take it, whenever additional taxation is imposed, it is assumed that such a course is necessary, so the value of this stipulation is nothing. Only tomorrow fresh taxation might be imposed upon Aden, and it may be pleaded in justification that such a course was necessary. It is again stated in the communiqué that the proportion of Indian service administrative personnel would be retained in Aden for some years after the transfer takes place. It is to be noted that it is only a proportion of the Indian service administrative personnel and not the whole personnel which will be retained, and that also for some years only after which the Indian personnel will very likely be eliminated altogether from the service in the Aden administration.

Now, the last point which has been urged in the communiqué is that no racial discrimination or segregation would be permitted by His Majesty's Government. We know the value of such promises with regard to the fate of our countrymen overseas. The history of British India is strewn broadcast with fragments of broken promises and unredeemed pledges ; and this is likely to be the inevitable fate of our fellow countrymen in Aden if it is snatched away from India and transferred to the control of the Colonial Office. This proposal has evoked unprecedented opposition from all quarters both amongst the people in India and in Aden. The other day, we read that a meeting was held in Calcutta presided over by Sir P. C. Ray recording the protest of the citizens of Calcutta against the proposed transfer. I also received a telegram from Mr. A. K. Aziz, Secretary, Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, which states :

" The Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, strongly protest against the separation of Aden from the Indian Government as it will be greatly detrimental to commercial interests of India in which the Bengali's share is quite important."

The Imperial Indian Citizenship Association, Bombay, the Indian Merchants' Chamber, the Buyers and Shippers Chamber, Karachi, the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, have all protested against the proposed transfer. A public meeting was held in Aden on the 16th April last which was attended by the Arab and the Indian citizens of Aden in which resolutions of protest were passed. A representation has been addressed to the Chief Commissioner, Aden, and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief by 500 Arab residents in Aden protesting against the proposed transfer. The Jewish residents of Aden, in a meeting held there on the 25th May last, have similarly protested. It will, therefore, be seen that all the communities and interests concerned, whether in India or in Aden, are united in offering their vehement protest against the proposed transfer.

Sir, with regard to the amendments that are under discussion, there is one amendment of my Honourable friend, Mr. Bhuput Sing. Personally I would have thought that it was the best amendment, inasmuch as it not only records our protest against the contemplated transfer, but also demands retransfer of the political and military control which has already passed into the hands of the Colonial Office. The other amendment is that of my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, which limits itself to a condemnation of the military and political control of Aden passing out of our hands, and protests against the contemplated step of transferring the civil control to the Colonial Government. I think, as he has himself suggested that my Honourable friend, Mr. Bhuput Sing, will not press his motion ; and we should concentrate our attention upon the amendment of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad and pass it unanimously without any dissentient voice. (Cheers.)

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi** (Tirhut Division : Muhammadan) : Sir, for the last two days, I have been ill and I feel very weak now, but the great importance which this question of transfer of Aden has assumed in the country has compelled me to come to this House for a few minutes and say a few words on this question. The few words that I will say would mean a great deal. I would confine myself only to the great feeling that is prevailing in the country on this question. A growing suspicion has arisen in the minds of both Indians, of all creeds and castes, as well as Adenese of all creeds, Muslim, Jew, Christian,

[Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi.]

etc., that the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office would mean a decline of all those relations which have developed between India and Aden during the last so many years while it had been under the control of India. Since this question has been actively discussed in the country, the evidence has been so great that I would only be surprised if the Government ignore them and have their own way of dealing with this question. I have correspondence with so many people both in Aden as well as in India that I can undoubtedly say that the feeling is genuine, it is by no means engineered. The feeling is that the conditions of Indians as well as the Adenese will be much worse when they go to the Colonial Office. The feeling has gained ground and I do not believe any amount of argument on the part of British Government could remove those feelings from their minds. If a genuine man could give any advice to the Government on this question, it will be not to disturb the minds of Indians and Adenese at such a moment on such a vital question. They should remember that it is sentiment which plays a great part in such questions rather than financial considerations which the Honourable the Finance Member has chosen to put before the House. On the question of finance, many Honourable Members who are of better health than I am will be able to reply, but I know there is very little in that question. I, therefore, lend by wholehearted support to this question.

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. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) in the Chair.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi** (Burma : Non-European) : Sir, I had given notice of an amendment which I cannot move, because the time prescribed for it is past, but, with your permission, I shall refer to it as part of my speech. My amendment reads as follows :

“ That for the original motion the following be substituted :

‘ This Assembly, after duly considering the Government of India Press Communiqué of June 20th, 1933, resolves and recommends that Indian interests as well as indigenous Arab interests should be sacrificed, and that the Civil Administration of Aden should be transferred to the Colonial Office with a view to safeguarding and promoting Imperial interests ’.”

(Laughter and Cheers.)

Sir, there are two Members of this House who are specially qualified to speak on this subject. One is my Honourable friend, Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan who hails from the North-West Frontier Province, and the other, I venture to suggest, is myself representing the North-East Frontier Province of Burma. I am in agreement with the Honourable Nawab that Honourable Members who hail from Bombay and Madras and who lead lives of, I think the Honourable Member said, licentious ease (Laughter), can never realise the difficulties of frontier people. The Nawab's province, Sir, stands between India on the one side and Afghanistan and Russia on the other side ; similarly my province stands between India on the one side and China and Japan on the other side. And we have cultivated a mentality which can think in Imperial terms, whereas my,

Honourable friends sitting on the Opposition Benches can think only in parochial terms. (Laughter.) We, Sir, the Honourable Nawab and myself, are capable of rising above parochial thoughts and, on this occasion, we have done so.

Sir, the communiqué of the 20th of June, 1933, issued by His Majesty's Government, I think, has, in a great many parts, been misunderstood by the Opposition Benches and more particularly by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh. In that communiqué he has read a number of pledges. I think he is doing injustice to His Majesty's Government. In that communiqué, Sir, I read no pledges. I think it is a very honest communiqué, which gives plain warnings (Laughter and Cheers), and I shall now try to convince my Honourable friends sitting on the Opposition Benches that it is so. Amongst the various reasons given in that communiqué for the transfer of the Civil Administration of Aden to the Colonial Office, the first reason is that "Aden is an area geographically remote from India". I think, Sir, nobody can quarrel with that proposition. Aden is certainly geographically remote from India. It has taken His Majesty's Government more than a century to discover this profound truth (Laughter and Cheers), but, having discovered it, surely it is their duty to place the truth before the country. They have done so and I really fail to see what grievance this House can have about it. The second reason given in the Communiqué is that "the Aden Protectorate has already passed wholly out of Indian control". This reason, Sir, if properly elaborated, should read as follows: "the Aden Protectorate has already passed wholly out of Indian control *by an act of God*". The Aden Protectorate was taken out of Indian control without our consent, and, therefore, I think it should be treated as *an act of God*. (Laughter.) In that Communiqué, Sir, His Majesty's Government contemplate that certain conditions will be established as a result of the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office. First of all, a reference is made to the financial relief which will be afforded to India. Whether the annual saving to India will be 20 lakhs or only 16 lakhs, as my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, insisted this morning, it will be a substantial relief. Now, Sir, when His Majesty's Government shows so much solicitude for the welfare of the people of India and when they desire to save annually for the Indian taxpayer 16 lakhs of rupees, should the Opposition Benches in this House condemn it or praise it? (Laughter.) The Opposition Benches may rightly or wrongly accuse His Majesty's Government and the Government of India of having misspent or wasted large sums of Indian money in the past. It may or may not be so; but that His Majesty's Government have developed a different mentality and are very anxious to see that not a single penny of the Indian taxpayers' money is wasted, so far as Aden is concerned, I think it is a change of policy which should be welcomed by the Opposition Benches. (Laughter.)

Then, Sir, coming to the third condition, His Majesty's Government, I think, have made it clear that radical changes in the economic situation are taking place and further radical changes will undoubtedly take place in the near future; and, therefore, they give a warning,—they give no pledge but a warning, and a very honest warning,—that, as a result of radical changes in the economic situation, which are bound to take place, the existing policy of keeping Aden a free port cannot be maintained.



**Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur** (North Madras : Muhammadan) : May I know if my Honourable friend is a nominated Member ?

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi** : No, Sir, I am an elected Member, but there are occasions when elected Members should think in Imperialistic terms. (Laughter.) Furthermore, Sir, there is no bar to an elected Member indulging in satire or sarcasm. (Cheers.)

Then, Sir, coming to the fourth condition, His Majesty's Government have sounded another warning that it will be necessary for them to impose additional taxation on the people of Aden. His Majesty's Government are perfectly honest. They say that they will impose additional taxation and they give us ample warning about it.

The fifth condition is that the present Indian Service Administrative personnel cannot be retained in future and that it will be abolished as quickly as possible.

The sixth condition is that "no racial legislation or segregation would be permitted by His Majesty's Government"—what they mean is that "no racial legislation or segregation would be *willingly* permitted by His Majesty's Government". If they are unwillingly forced to permit racial legislation or segregation, that cannot be helped. Now, take the case of South Africa. His Majesty's Government are not willingly permitting racial legislation or segregation in South Africa, but *unwillingly* they are forced to permit it, and, in the case of Aden also, they sound a warning, a very honest warning, that they will not be a *willing* party to any racial legislation or segregation, but if that course of action is forced on them, they will have to permit it *unwillingly*. So far as this particular communiqué is concerned, I think it is one of the most honest communiqués ever issued by any Government Department. (Laughter.)

Now, Sir, to my Honourable friends sitting on the Opposition Benches who think in terms of the parish pump (Laughter), I commend a memorable passage from the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Anklesaria, who preached a novel doctrine of patriotism ; and I apprehend that certain Honourable Members have missed the full significance of that doctrine. Mr. Anklesaria said that if he was convinced that the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office was necessary in Imperial interests, if he was convinced that it was necessary in Imperial interests to hand over Aden to the Colonial Office or to the Foreign Office at the sacrifice of Indian interests, he would be prepared to support that action. He went further and exclaimed : "Is there any Member in this House lacking in Empire patriotism ?" There is no such thing as Indian patriotism according to my Honourable friend, Mr. Anklesaria. His doctrine of patriotism places the Empire first and India last. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, let us translate Mr. Anklesaria's doctrine of patriotism and apply it to our Honourable friend, Mr. James. If Mr. James was called upon to give up England to Germany so that the rest of the Empire may prosper, will Mr. James or any Member of the European Group in this House agree to part with England to Germany so that the rest of the Empire may prosper ?....

**Mr. F. E. James** (Madras : European) : No, certainly not.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi :** This is disappointing. I felt that Mr. James and Mr. Anklesaria always thought alike on Imperial questions. (Laughter.)

**Mr. F. E. James :** Not after lunch.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi :** Since my Honourable friend, Mr. James, does not agree with Mr. Anklesaria, may I express the hope, a hope which is entertained by the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, that he will take part in this debate and tell us what views the European Group holds with regard to the contemplated transfer of the Civil Administration of Aden to the Colonial Office. I think Europeans in this country are as much interested in Aden as Indians, and it is only right and fair that their able spokesman should proclaim their policy in this House. (Applause.)

Now, Sir, it has been urged by the Opposition that Aden has been built up by Indian enterprise and Indian capital, and that the Indian taxpayer's money has also been spent by the Government of India to build up a large and prosperous port from a barren rock. But following the line of argument which I have taken up, and in which I have the support of my Honourable friend, Major Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Laughter), that is no reason whatever why the British Empire should not have the benefit of something which India has built up, even though such benefit be at the sacrifice of Indian interests. (Laughter.) Moreover, how is it possible for India to have an increasing measure of control over Aden which is an important strategic link in the chain of the Empire route? I, therefore, feel, Sir, that the arguments which have been advanced against the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office are all of a parochial nature, and if my friends on the Opposition Benches try to think seriously and take a broadminded view, they will come to the conclusion, that although, at the first blush, His Majesty's Government's action may seem to be wholly indefensible on any grounds, and particularly indefensible on moral grounds (Laughter), still on grounds of high Imperial morality, this is the only step possible for His Majesty's Government. Sir, it seems to me that Aden is already lost to India and that this debate is of purely academic value. (Applause.)

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju** (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Mr. Deputy President, after a debate on this motion for a day and a half on the floor of this House, after the debate in the Council of State, and after the very exhaustive review of my friend, Mr. Jadhav, the *Ex-Minister* from Bombay, and the flood of literature which has been brought to bear upon the discussion by my friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, and the biting sarcasm of the last speaker which has enlivened this debate, ordinarily I would have considered that enough has been already said and that I should not take part in the debate, but the intense feeling which His Majesty's Government's proposals have created in this country, which is as profound as it is intense, has compelled me to say a few words. Furthermore, Sir, this morning, the Finance Member was pleased to make one or two remarks about which I am a little disturbed. Sir, a few months ago, we were discussing a similar question, and that question was with regard to the separation of Burma. This morning when the Honourable the Finance Member said that there were certain principles which guided us for assessing the assets and liabilities of Aden, I thought that we were guided

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.] today on this motion by a different set of principles from this which we had followed in regard to the separation of Burma. Sir, with regard to the question of Burma, Honourable Members are aware that the Standing Finance Committee was asked to go into the question of the settlement of accounts, I mean into the assets and liabilities both of this country as well as of Burma, and the whole question of financial obligations involved was to be taken into consideration. But, Sir, we find today that the methods of approach for a proper assessment of the assets and financial liabilities involved are not the same. However, when I refer to the financial aspect on this motion, I should like to say a few words.

Turning now to the question of the Settlement of Aden, one thing cannot be gainsaid, that this Settlement had been won by Indian arms, that it had been developed by Indian labour, that it had been maintained by Indian enterprise, and that it had been sustained by Indian money. That cannot be gainsaid. All that was not the work of His Majesty's Government. A barren rock across the bay was not converted into a prosperous Settlement in a day. It was the work of nearly a century attended with grave risks—and that was the work of Indians in this country. Sir, for what end was all that done? Was it done merely for the purpose of providing a link in the Imperial chain of aggression? No, Sir. The cautious Indian merchant, in his affluence, the groaning tax-payer of India, in his poverty, would not have contributed but for the assurances given by the then Government that Aden would ever remain a part of the Indian Empire. This question of separation of Aden from India was not a question of yesterday or today. It has been a live question from the day when popular control was sought to be introduced into the Legislatures of this country. When the reforms of 1919 were introduced, it was contemplated that Bombay should be deprived of Aden, because, under the Constitution, the Provincial Governments would have an admixture of popular element. But the actual transfer was only made after the report of the Simon Commission when it was found that provincial autonomy was at any rate inevitable under the Constitution. The transfer from Bombay to Delhi was made in the teeth of opposition of the Bombay people and the rest of the country. It was openly said by the public of this country that this was only a step in aid to take it ultimately under the control of the Imperial Government. We were then assured that it was not so. But today we find that that apprehension was not misplaced. His Majesty's Government would have us believe that we should have trust in them. I would like to ask why that trust should be on our side alone? Why do not they extend the charity of their confidence a little to us when they expect some trust from us? They were always speaking of self-determination. Only a few hours ago, Mr. Jadhav referred to it. When they wanted to separate Burma, they impressed upon us the virtues of self-determination. Where is that self-determination now? Do they propose to give self-determination to the people of Aden? The Arabs, the Jews, the Somalis and the Indians, one and all have been repeatedly protesting against the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office. Why is there no self-determination for them now? When it suits their purpose, the Government talk of self-determination. If it does not suit them, they hunt for excuses and reasons. What is the most formidable reason that they advance today for transfer of this possession?

As a bait to us, as an inducement to us, for favourable consideration of their proposal, they say that it will relieve a portion of the burden upon the taxpayer of this country, because, by the transfer of this settlement, we will be saved so much money under military expenditure. May I respectfully ask, did His Majesty's Government think that there was such a person as a taxpayer in this country whose burden had got to be relieved when crores and crores of rupees were being spent upon, what is called, the military expenditure in this country, an expenditure which is out of all proportion to the actual requirements of this country, and certainly out of all proportion to the capacity of this country to bear? Where was this taxpayer then? Why did they not think of the taxpayer's burden? Why are they thinking of a few lakhs now? The reason is not far to seek. A few years ago, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, *ex-Secretary of State*, admitted that the military expenditure that we had been incurring, and had been found charged upon the revenues of this country for the purpose of keeping a big army of this country, might be, to some extent, a legitimate charge upon the Imperial revenues. He wanted to give an assurance that the whole question would be examined, and that only such portion as India could legitimately bear would be apportioned to her. A tribunal was constituted for that purpose; but we do not know what the award of that tribunal was. But if an impartial judgment is given by that tribunal, there can be no doubt that much of this expenditure, whether it is incurred at Peshawar or whether it is incurred at Aden, would be a legitimate charge upon His Majesty's Government rather than upon the taxpayer of this country. Therefore, it is a bit complicated to bring in the question of the Imperial aspect of the defence of Aden into the profit and loss account of this possession. However, when we come to discuss the financial aspect of the question, we can give it due consideration. This morning, Sir George Schuster was pleased to state that up till 1900, the entire cost of the civil and military administration of Aden was borne by India. The fact is admitted that so far as the civil expenditure is concerned, that civil expenditure has been more or less evenly balanced. Assuming for the moment that the figures for 1933-34 which would show even a favourable balance to us should not be taken into account, taking the average which was given by the Finance Member for the last seven years, even then, it would show that it is evenly balanced. Therefore, the civil expenditure need not trouble us. The question, then, is the question of military expenditure. When we consider it, we have to consider the purpose for which the Settlement was founded. Honourable Members are fully aware of the fact that Aden is just across the Bay. Without India there is no Aden, and there can never be an Aden. That Aden is very vital to the defence of India, cannot be gainsaid. Whatever may be its position, whatever may be its importance for the purpose of protection of the trade routes passing that way, it cannot be gainsaid for a moment that its position is such that it is mainly essential for the defence of India. Then, why should we be deprived of that possession, and why should we be told that we need not pay or incur any expenditure in that behalf. When it is so essential for the Defence of India, it is our right to possess that defence post, and it is our duty to incur expenditure on that account. And we are prepared to do that. If it is not the concern of India, and if it is not an essential part of our defence, may I ask, what right had they to spend all these years the taxpayer's money for a purpose which was not India's? Even according to Sir George

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

Schuster, several lakhs of rupees have been spent every year on military expenses and the figure was Rs. 47½ crores one year.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** As my Honourable friend is mentioning my name, I must ask him to speak up. I have not heard even five words of what he has said so far in his speech.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** I was stating, Mr. Deputy President, that according to the figures which were given by Sir George Schuster, the expenditure that was incurred for military purposes at Aden was sometimes even as much as Rs. 47½ crores.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I never used a figure of that kind.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** Then my note is incorrect, because I have got here Rs. 47½ lakhs.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** Lakhs, yes, and not crores.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** I made a mistake, I meant lakhs ; it is Rs. 47½ lakhs.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** That was the figure in 1926-27.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra** (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : For these years it will be crores.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** Since 1839, from 16 lakhs of rupees to the peak figure of Rs. 47½ lakhs can be said to be the expenditure that had been incurred for the purpose of military control there.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** That was not expenditure in 1839. The expenditure in 1839 was a mere fraction of that.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** I am afraid I am misunderstood. What I am saying is this, that from 1839, up to the present moment, whatever may be the variations, the figures range from Rs. 16 lakhs to Rs. 47½ lakhs at the highest.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** No.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** Was it ever less than Rs. 15 lakhs ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I have no information as to what the expenditure in 1839 was. The expenditure in 1900 was about Rs. 20 lakhs a year.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Was it not in one year something like Rs. 60 lakhs also ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I have already said to my Honourable friend that in 1926-27 the net cost to India was about Rs. 47½ lakhs. Therefore, as His Majesty's Government was paying £72,000, the total cost must have been very nearly Rs. 60 lakhs.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** There is a little difficulty about these figures.

3 P.M.

Mr. Jadhav gave certain figures which were not admitted by the Honourable Sir George Schuster, who, in his turn, gave some figures. I have a third set of figures with me. To reconcile them is rather difficult. The difficulty is due to the fact that we have not gone fully into these figures in any Committee. But nobody

can dispute that large sums of money have been spent on the military expenditure at Aden. If the total amount is to be taken, assuming that we are not to calculate compound interest, it would go to several crores. If the control of the Settlement is going to be taken over, what right has England to ask us to bear this money which was spent? If they want to take it away, they must refund every single pie that had been spent by the taxpayer of this country. We are not claiming compound interest or even simple interest. We simply claim that the money that had been taken from the exchequer of this country should be refunded to us. I venture to submit that the assets which have been taken from this country should be assessed on the same principle that had been followed in the case of the separation of Burma.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** The Honourable Member refers to the separation of Burma. When I addressed the House this morning, I pointed out that, as regards Aden, we have followed exactly the same principle, which has been proposed in connection with the separation of Burma, that is to say, when the military and political administration was taken over, the buildings which were part of the normal equipment of the Government were transferred without any charge. That is the principle which is being suggested as regards Burma.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** I heard this morning Sir George Schuster to say that they made a free gift of the barracks and other buildings to His Majesty's Government.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** What I stated was that when His Majesty's Government took over the responsibility for the military and political administration of Aden with all the cost that that involved, the buildings necessary for carrying out such functions were transferred. But what we transferred to His Majesty's Government was not an asset, but a very heavy liability.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju :** There is one other aspect of the question. Unless we have a proper profit and loss account, we cannot properly consider the financial obligations really involved.

I now come to the civil administration of Aden. I for one consider that the question of the civil administration is not so important as the military control. Important as it may appear to a few merchants in Bombay, I think the question does not assume the same proportion as the military control does. Without the military control, the possession is not of much use to this country. It is essential that for the defence of this country such an important outpost, which is so vital to us, should be with us. It may be that that post also protects the trade routes of other colonies, in which case we are entitled to get a fair contribution from those who get the benefit of this port. So I venture to submit that the military control and the civil administration are inseparable and, so far as we are concerned, we are not going to accept anything short of that. The argument advanced for transfer is that Aden will not fit into the Federation that we are going to have. The reason advanced about its geographical position has been already dealt with by other speakers. The Secretary of State has said that Aden does not form a province and, therefore, it will be a misfit in the Federation. If Aden does not form a province or a part of the province, whose fault is that? It was till lately a part of the Bombay Presidency. It was deliberately transferred from the province of Bombay to Delhi. We

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

were not parties to it. We protested against it. It is the Government that brought about this situation by separating it from Bombay and, having brought that about, they find fault with it. It is not fair. With all these autocratic Princes coming into the Federation, I do not know if the Federation is going to be a proper fit, but if Aden, being a non-provincial unit, is a misfit in the Federation, the remedy is to restore Aden to the province of Bombay from which it has been taken. I am glad to note from the reply that the Secretary of State has given that the difficulty about Aden was not insurmountable. I do hope that the obstacle will soon be surmounted. One thing more and I have done. It is said that Aden is so far away and remote from India. Why, in that case, I ask, should it be linked with the judicial administration of Bombay still? That would go to show that the connection of Aden could not be separated altogether from Bombay, however much they may want it. Further, it will not pay them to do so. With these few remarks, I venture to submit that it is the unanimous opinion not only of this House, but of the whole country that the administration of Aden, civil and military, should never be separated from India with which it has been connected so far.

**Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I had given notice of a motion which I do not propose to move, but which I certainly proposed to place on record, after hearing the speech of the previous speaker :

“ This Assembly, after duly considering the Government of India Press Communiqué of June 20th, 1933, submits that whilst no longer objecting to the transfer to Imperial control of the political and military administration of Aden, as it exists at present, it is definitely of opinion that its civil administration be continued with the Government of India or, if thought necessary, to be retransferred to the Government of Bombay, but that such civil administration not be transferred to the Colonial Office.”

Sir, I personally am not very much charmed by the motion of my Hon-ourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, which begins by saying :

“ While recording their emphatic protest against the complete transfer to the Colonial Office of Aden Settlement, etc.”

But if I propose to support it, it is because it is a compromise between Mr. Bhuput Singh's motion which wants the re-transfer to India of the military and political control and the motion that was moved in the Council of State which I wanted to be repeated in this House. Therefore, as an agreed proposition, I hope that it will be put to vote and carried unanimously. If I do not record my emphatic protest against the transfer of military control and political control of Aden to Great Britain, it is because I do not believe in doing things too late. Six years ago, this transfer took place. This Assembly has been in existence for the last six years and it wakes up today. Six years ago, the matter came up for discussion. We have been quoting the reply of Sir Denys Bray and criticising that reply today and reading meanings into it which are not accepted by the Government. This Assembly, which is competent and has been clever and sometimes even clumsy in making motions for adjournment on matters of great or trivial importance, could certainly have moved all these six years or, after the accomplishment of the transfer, an adjournment motion of protest. Not having moved it, I do not personally like to protest : I like to bow to the inevitable. We, with open eyes, missed our opportunities. We have shown silence of which we have not been generally capable on matters on which we felt deeply. Having acquiesced in the transfer of military and

political control, I personally am willing to bow to the inevitable. What I would not agree to is the transfer of civil control and I shall tell you why. The civil control is necessary for our trade purposes. Aden is an important factor in the promotion of India's trade. It is also necessary from a sentimental—Indian as well as British—and a military point of view. Sir, I believe in British connection ; I believe in Dominion Status : I tore away from a national organisation when it was committed to a policy of independence.

**Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar** (Nominated Non-Official) : Suppose there is a dispute between the civil and the military administration, what would my friend suggest ?

**Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer** : I am coming to that. Sir, I tore away from an important political organisation when it declared war on British connection. If I say that Aden should be under India's civil control, it is because Aden is under England's military control. My gallant friend over there, who is always anxious to know the connection between civil and military matters, can be easily answered. When there are emergencies and crises, naturally the military control dominates the civil control. The master of military and political affairs is certainly the master of the situation when civil authorities will not be powerful. As for the question of distance between India and England in this world, where we can cover long distances by air, the distance between England and Aden has shrunk. It has also shrunk between England and India. Aden is an important centre between India and England, and it must remain so, so far as military and political affairs are under England's control, for it is England's Gibraltar of the East. I am willing to place England in that position knowing as I do that my country has a large seaboard and no navy of her own. We are very much dependent upon the British navy, for we have a vulnerable seacoast which many of us oftentimes choose to forget. But trade is of very great importance to us. The money that we have invested in Aden is of equal importance. Indian brain and Indian money has improved the Aden of today and it is but fit and proper that Great Britain, which believes in British connection, should leave the civil control in our hands so that we may feel that, in some sport in the middle, Great Britain and India are working together. It is, from this point of view, to illustrate the Indo-British connection, that I would insist that the civil control should rest with us. I am not chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of military control. Some one said that Aden was like a kettle which had gone into the sea. Aden is not under the sea. On the contrary, it is, as it were, the watch tower of the East and, from there, it views and surveys the sea. Sir, as these are the times of depression and as the trade of India is important to Aden as well as to India and to countries from which our goods are distributed, I would suggest to His Majesty's Government that they should not, against the unanimous wish of this House and of the Council of State, take away the civil control from our hands. I hope they will not take away the civil control, for I believe they will not like to estrange us on an important matter like the civil control of Aden. Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the House mentioned, I believe, the question of constitutional changes which are probably worrying either some people in Aden or His Majesty's Government. But there are no constitutional difficulties in re-transferring Aden to Bombay's control if Aden must come under



[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

the Federation. Aden was under the control of Bombay before, and the Bombay Government could carry on the civil administration. It is provided even in this communiqué of the Government that the Bombay High Court will be of use to Aden subjects even after the completion of the transfer. I think I am right in saying so, because I have not got the communiqué before me, and I am speaking from recollection. If that is so, and if distance does not come in the way in this particular respect, I cannot see why civil control should not be in Bombay's hands as it has been hitherto. I hope and trust that, in the constitutional adjustment, Aden will not be taken away from us so far as the civil affairs are concerned.

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza** (Nominated Non-Official) : Mr. Deputy President, with your permission, I should like to intervene for a few moments in this debate, because I am interested in Malabar and, to some extent, in the trade of the West Coast. You are aware that Aden is the distributing centre for a considerable portion of the produce of Malabar consisting of pepper, tobacco, spices, plantation products and timber. The trade in these articles is handled by Arab merchants who are financed by Indian bankers resident in Aden who allow them credit from three to six months at a time. They buy these articles in Malabar and carry them in Arab bottoms built at Aden out of Malabar timber and distribute them in Persia, Iraq, Arabia and the east coast of Africa. This trade has been roughly estimated to amount to something like half a crore.

When it was announced by His Majesty's Government that the control of Aden was to be transferred to the Colonial Office, considerable perturbation was caused in Malabar among traders as well as producers as to what was to happen to this trade. We all know that trade follows the flag, but it has been the unfortunate experience of Indian trade that it has never flourished under the Colonial Flag. On the contrary, whenever a Colonial Administration has taken charge of Indian trade, a blight seems to have overtaken that trade. You have only to look across the water and you will find that Somaliland, when it was administered by the Government of Bombay, had a flourishing trade and its seaports of Barbara, Zaila, Bulhar were thriving ports ; the port of Barbara had a population of 20,000 with busy docks, wharves and warehouses. After the Somali war, the Government of that Colony was handed over to the Colonial Office and the result was that these ports are now practically dead. Indian merchants, unable to bear the heavy taxation and the discrimination against them made by the Colonial Administrators, gradually left the Colony and in their wake followed the Jewish and the Arab merchants. For the same reasons, in Kenya, it appears that the Indian wheat trade has been practically eliminated, that the Indian transport trade has been suppressed and that attempts are being made to eliminate the Indian maize trade. The reason seems to be that the Colonial Administrator does not understand the Indian settler at all. He knows the European trader and settler. He knows the native of the Colony which he is administering ; but the Indian settler, an Asiatic who claims equality of opportunity with the European, has no place in his philosophy. In the result, we find that whenever the Colonial Office has taken over the administration of territory where Indians are settled, the trade of India suffers very severely.

The Aden trade with Malabar will suffer for another reason, viz., that the neighbouring African Colonies of Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda are very serious rivals to Malabar with regard to the produce which Malabar exports. Only the other day, I heard that there was a trade mission sent under the ægis of the Government of Kenya to Aden to negotiate an agreement for the sale of the plantation produce of Kenya. As it happened, the Indian bankers at Aden refused to give credit to the merchants and the English bankers also refused to give credit, because their credentials were not satisfactory. We all know that the planters in Kenya have very powerful connections and have friends at Court and there is no doubt that they will in a short time be able to eliminate the Malabar produce from the Aden market if Aden is transferred to the control of the Colonial Office.

This debate has been initiated by my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, with a motion that this House do take into consideration the communiqué of the Government of India. The communiqué contains the following words :

“ Already Aden (Settlement) to some extent is under Imperial control and it is inseparable in practice from the Aden Protectorate which has already passed wholly out of Indian control.”

If I understand these words rightly, they seem to imply that if the Settlement of Aden continues to remain under the control of the Government of India, there would be divided control—a sort of dyarchy—which, in time of war, will be unworkable. That seems to be the most reasonable interpretation to be placed upon this communiqué. If that is so, it is clear that the mind of His Majesty's Government is already made up with regard to the transfer of the civil control of the Aden Settlement. Unfortunately the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches have their lips sealed under an Ordinance, whether it is a self-denying Ordinance or an Ordinance imposed by the Secretary of State, I do not know. We do not know what really are the reasons which have prompted His Majesty's Government to take the course which they propose to do. Therefore, not knowing the reasons underlying the action of His Majesty's Government the arguments advanced by the several speakers in this House against the measure seem to be more or less like tilting at a wind-mill. But, being a Subordinate Legislature, we have no reason to complain.

Be that as it may, it seems to me that the most reasonable explanation to be placed upon the action of His Majesty's Government is this. During the war, the strategic importance of Aden, as a military and a naval base, in case of a future war, was discovered. His Majesty's Government is unwilling to disclose the implications of this discovery, because it would not be in the public interest to do so, and I venture to think that that is the reason why they have imposed a seal of silence upon the lips of the occupants of the Treasury Benches. If that is the correct explanation, it seems to me that it is idle to charge either the Government of India or His Majesty's Government with breach of faith or violation of pledges. Because, as my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, pointed out, here we are functioning not in the moral plane but in the plane of high politics ; and we all know that to a politician as well as a diplomat, language is given to conceal his

[Dr. F. X. DeSouza.]

thoughts. Then, again, it is idle to urge our moral claims to the retention of Aden, claims based upon Aden having been developed from a barren rock with a population of 3,000 to a flourishing port, the entrepot for the trade of the middle east, with a population of more than 50,000. It seems to be idle to urge our moral claims, because, if it is Imperial policy that dictates the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Government, there is no answer. *Salus patriae suprema lex.*

What then should this Assembly do? Should we, as was said by my Honourable friend, Mr. Puri, whom I am sorry not to see here, fold our hands in silence and offer Satyagraha; because, as he said, it is useless to try to bargain with an opponent with overwhelming strength? Or shall we say, as my Honourable friend, Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan, suggested, that the people of Bombay and Karachi and the other ports affected should look upon this as a loss caused by an act of God, say by an earthquake? Of course, it is very easy to preach resignation under other people's misfortunes. But these seem to me to be counsels of despair. I do not think that that is an attitude of mind with which we should meet the situation. A similar situation on a vastly larger scale offered itself to the British Government in framing a scheme for the Federation of India. They had to hand over the immense trade of the British nation with India to the future Federal Government. Did they fold their hands and say: "We do not care what happens to this trade; let it take care of itself"? No; they insisted upon constitutional safeguards being inserted in the Constitution that no discrimination shall be allowed against British trade by the future Federal Government. I wish our Honourable friends, the Members of the European Group, would help us and tell us how a similar guarantee may be inserted in the Instrument of Transfer, transferring the administration of Aden from the Government of India to the Colonial Government. It is true that there are certain vague promises which are offered in this communiqué. But, as pointed out by every speaker on the Opposition Benches as well as on these Benches, these are hedged round with so many "ifs" and so many "ands" that they are certain to be treated as mere scraps of paper.

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

What we want is a categorical guarantee, specially with regard to clauses 3, 4 and 6 of the communiqué, viz., that Aden will be maintained as a free port, that no further additional taxation will be imposed and that on no account will any racial legislation or segregation be permitted by His Majesty's Government.

Sir, enough has been said about compensation which ought in justice be paid to India and I do not wish to dilate further on this point.

But whatever the compensation granted may be, I feel certain that there will be deep and sullen resentment in the mind of political India caused by the action proposed to be taken by His Majesty's Government. Sir, at a time when every other country and every other nation is endeavouring to capture foreign markets by appointing Trade Com-

FUTURE ADMINISTRATION OF ADEN.

1803

missioners and otherwise to develop the trade of their country, here we are asked to sacrifice a large market amounting to eight crores of rupees, at our very door, created by our enterprise. And while unemployment is acute, we are asked to sacrifice a not inconsiderable field for the employment of our nationals, not only in the service of Government, but also in mercantile houses. And, above all, we are asked to give up to an unsympathetic administration a flourishing Colony which has been developed at the expense and by the enterprise of Indian nationals. And when, in course of time, the Colonial Office takes charge of Aden, and, in the picturesque language of the *Statesman* newspaper, the Indian population exchanges the whips of the Government of India for the scorpions of the Colonial Office there will be one more cry raised from Indians overseas and that cry will stir political India deeper than any other cry of a similar kind has stirred it before ; because, it will be a cry raised not from the descendants of indentured coolies as in South Africa or from segregated hawkers and shopkeepers as in Kenya and Tanganyika, but it will be a cry raised by powerful mercantile interests with influential connections in Karachi, Bombay, Rangoon and all the other important ports of India. And, therefore, in all humility, I ask His Majesty's Government to pause before they decide to take the action they propose, and if the blow is inevitable, then, so far as lies in their power, to soften the blow.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Sir, I rise to support, I believe it is a Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad. I understand, the intention of Government in allowing the non-official Members of this House to express their opinion is to enable Government to realise the feelings of all Indians on this question. I should have thought that by now, Mr. President, all Honourable Members on the opposite side had fully realised the strong feelings,—you may call it sentiment if you like or you may, if you like, call it bad argument combined with sentiment,—that exists throughout the country ; that the step now proposed by His Majesty's Government, namely, the transfer of the civil administration of Aden to the Colonial Office is strongly resented. Sir, every one of us has been supplied with a considerable amount of literature. I have got it in front of me, and, I am sure, my friend, the Honourable the Leader of the House, must have got two copies each sent to him. (Laughter.)

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré :** Not even one.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Then, Sir, may I present him with this bunch of pamphlets on the question of the transfer of Aden,—and every one of these pamphlets protests against the proposed transfer. Sir, my friends who have already spoken have left very little for any one else to say, but the fact that, even after what little I shall have to say many more will rise to their feet, will, I trust, convince Honourable Members opposite, if they are not already convinced, that the proposed transfer of Aden has not got the approval of the people of this country. Now, Sir, the latest contribution that has been made to this subject is this communiqué. I think my friend, Mr. Munshi, from Burma was rather enamoured of this communiqué, and, lest anybody might misunderstand him, he candidly said that it was one of the worst arguments ever put forward by Government, but his sarcasm went to such

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

an extent that it was liable to be misunderstood ; as a matter of fact, I quite agree with him that this was one of the worst arguments ever put up by Government to my knowledge with regard to the transfer of Aden. Now, Sir, what are the reasons given in this communiqué which we are seriously asked to consider ? The first point is that Aden does not naturally fit into the new Federation. Well, Sir, I presume there are other Federations in this world like Germany, United States, and so on—they all have colonies. Do Government seriously mean to contend that if India is to be a Federation in the future, she should give up all hopes of having colonies, or do they mean that it will be difficult to attach Aden to any one province ? Sir, I honestly say that when the administration of Aden was transferred from the Government of Bombay to the Government of India, we never realised that it would be brought up as an argument in favour of transferring Aden to the Colonial Office,—for that is the meaning of this argument. If it had remained with Bombay, there would have been no justification for putting forward this argument that Aden will not fit into a Federation. Shall we be said to exaggerate when I say that we had apprehensions of some such thing when Aden was transferred from Bombay to the Government of India ? As a matter of fact, I know very well that many of my friends in Bombay said that this was merely a thin end of the wedge, and the next step would be that it would have to go to the Colonial Office ; but the very strong language, in which we were told that Government had no such intention, allayed our apprehensions. I do not want to worry this House by reading again the words of the then Foreign Secretary uttered in the presence of the Viceroy to a deputation that waited on him in 1931, when he told the deputation that Government had no ulterior motives in making the transfer from the Government of Bombay to the Government of India, and that it was only a question of administration. Now, Sir, personally I did not really even then fully understand the great difficulty of administration. I had something to do with the administration of Aden for several years, and although there was some delay on account of the Bombay Government having to get the approval of the Government of India in many of their proposals, it was not an insuperable difficulty. Such delays occur every day in the administration of this country. Provincial Governments have to get the orders of the Government of India on many questions which cause delay and inconvenience, but it is no use crying over spilt milk. The transfer was made, but we never expected that that transfer would be flung in our faces as an argument in favour of again transferring the administration of Aden to the Colonial Office. Sir, it is a poor argument to put forward after what fell from the lips of responsible officers of the Government of India.

Then, Sir, we are told that to some extent the control has already passed into Imperial hands. Now, who agreed to that transfer ? We were never consulted. And what is much more, an undertaking was given that we would be consulted. Mr. President, not even the Government of Bombay was consulted. Far from being consulted, they heard of it for the first time when the Home Member for the Bombay Government was actually on his feet moving a Bill in the Legislative

Council of Bombay for Aden—he heard of it for the first time in the Legislative Council when he was actually moving a Bill, and he was taken by surprise. His only answer was that all he could say was that the Government of India had approved of his moving the Bill, and he was not responsible. Now, Sir, if that is an argument for the transfer of the civil administration to the Colonial Office, my answer is, re-transfer the military and foreign control to the Government of India, and you will get rid of this argument. If you have caused a difficulty for yourself, then undo the wrong you have done already, but don't bring it up as an argument at this stage, for it was your action and not ours, your action without our approval.

Then, Sir, we come to this question of money. We are told that we shall be let off £150,000 a year, that is what it comes to. If I have understood the Finance Member correctly, the budget of the civil administration balances itself and the contribution of £150,000 we pay a year to His Majesty's Government will be saved if we agree to the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office. In these matters we do not look at all questions from the point of view of pound, shilling and pence. Suppose it does cost us £150,000, it is much less than what it cost us in 1926-27, which was Rs. 47 lakhs, and if against our will and against our wishes this burden was taken off our shoulders, it is no use now coming forward and telling us, "We will relieve you of a further burden of £150,000". We did not pass any Resolution in the Imperial Legislative Council, or in the Legislative Assembly, or in the Council of State, asking for this relief. It was a relief given to us because it was convenient to somebody else. We did not ask for such reliefs. No. 2 is too absurd for words, that the right of appeal in judicial cases will remain with the Bombay High Court. Take it, for goodness's sake, to the High Court in England. We do not want it. If you are to transfer Aden to the Colonial Office, I think the Government of Bombay would be justified in saying, "We shall have nothing further to do with you and we shall not have our High Court helping you to administer justice". It is a convenience to yourself; it is not a convenience to us. Why put it down as an argument in favour of transferring Aden to the Colonial Office? If it is put here as a bait to my friends in Aden that they won't have to go so far to England for their justice, then they might reply, "We shall have to go 1,600 miles, as we do now, for our appeals. We shall all the same have to go 6,000 miles when we want justice in all other directions". It is said that Aden will remain a free port if it is transferred to the Colonial Office. Has it ever been contended that it would not be a free port if it remained under the administration of India? What is this? Is this an assurance given, or is it meant to be said that if Aden remains with the Government of India it will no longer be a free port? What is this assurance to us? It is qualified. My Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, can, without even consulting his colleagues, give exactly the same assurance on behalf of the Government of India that if the *status quo* is maintained Aden will remain a free port so far as it is possible, and I am sure that there would be no objection, without consulting even a single one of his colleagues, to his giving us such an assurance and giving the Adenites that consolation. The same thing applies to taxes. But No. 5 is much more important. Sir, I hear from Aden that notwithstanding no

[**Sir Cowasji Jehangir.**]

action having been taken, no decision having been arrived at, still some officers in Aden have taken it for granted that the administration is to be transferred to the Colonial Office, and all appointments that were given to Indians are now being given to others. I have heard that for the last two years, for certain for the last one year, but I refused to believe it. I do not know where these orders emanated from; they may not have emanated at all; but I am distinctly given to understand from Aden that posts that would ordinarily have gone to Indians are now being filled by others. This assurance means that all Indians in service in Aden will be sacked as soon as possible, that some Englishmen whose services have been lent to Aden by the Government of India may continue to retain their posts so long as they are wanted, and then all appointments will be made by the Colonial Office as they are made for the other colonies. And in these hard times when unemployment is rampant we are asked to accept the position that many Indians should be sacked to make room for others.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhole :** May I interrupt my Honourable friend just for a moment? So far as my information goes, I can assure him that no orders have emanated from the Government of India on the lines suggested by him just now.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Will my Honourable friend then issue orders that posts that have been held by Indians up to now should be filled by Indians, until at least this transfer is decided on?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhole :** I have no doubt that the normal practice which has prevailed in the past will prevail in the immediate future.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** I am glad to hear that, and I trust that my Honourable friend's words will reach the administration in Aden and that no further Indians will, I do not say, be dismissed, but when vacancies occur, Indians will get those posts as they have got them for the last number of years.

**Sir Leslie Hudson (Bombay : European) :** On a point of information, Sir. May we be told what those posts are which have been taken away from Indians?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Education Department.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** I am not talking of the Education Department; I am not going to enlighten my Honourable friend and I tell him why. For a simple reason. One post was brought to my attention a fortnight ago. I know it. It was in the Port Trust.

**Sir Leslie Hudson :** Is that a Government department?

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** It is a semi-Government department. If my Honourable friend wants to know the posts, what they are, and what people in Aden are saying, I will refer him to those who will be able to give him the names of the men who have been employed. I do not desire to bring these personal matters before the Assembly. It is against my principles to talk about any posts, but I make the statement, a general statement, and I say it is a correct one.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore :** May I bring to the notice of my Honourable friend that appointments under the Port Trust are not under the control of the Government of India ?

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** That may be so. I know it is so. But the idea prevails that Aden is going to be transferred to the Colonial Office and preparations should be made for that purpose.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Only a fortnight ago, many persons spoke to me about it when I was in Aden.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Now, Sir, as to racial discrimination No. 6.

4 P.M.

I have not the slightest doubt of the *bona fides* of this assurance. Government do intend that no racial discrimination shall take place but I have my strong suspicions that Government will not be able to do it. We have had bitter experience, Mr. President. What is the use of repeating those experiences over and over again here. They have been brought to the attention of Government, of the Colonial Office. Commissions have been appointed. People have had to go out to the colonies to investigate the injustice to our countrymen. Do we desire to add one more grievance to the many grievances that this country has with regard to the preferential treatment shown to others, as compared to Indians in the colonies ?

**Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Nominated Non-official) :** There is a Persian proverb which says :

“ Een ham bar sari alam.”

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** Translate it. If I am interrupted in Persian, I cannot reply.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** Reply in Gujarati.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir :** You will rule me out of order, Mr. President, if you find out the meaning of my Gujarati. (Laughter.) At any rate, Sir, we do not desire to take any further risks with regard to Aden, because a good percentage of the population of Aden are Indians and if after all anything went wrong and there was discrimination against Indians, I am afraid the trouble would assume a character which I do not like even to visualise. This bitterness between our two countries has increased greatly on account of the ill-treatment of Indians in some of the colonies. We do not want to add another cause of bitterness. Sir, we have heard a good deal about discrimination in India. Nobody wants to discriminate but we do ask those who ask us not to discriminate in India to help to see that there is no discrimination against Indians in the British Empire and if they cannot help us effectively, which they cannot with all the desire in the world, let them at least stand side by side with us in fighting, to see that we do not have another colony where there will be discrimination, a colony which has been administered by India. If there was discrimination in that colony, it would never be forgiven in this country and for that reason alone it would be to the interests of both countries that Aden shall never be transferred to the Colonial Office. It is not discrimination against Indians in favour of Englishmen. It is discrimination against Indians, because they are Asiatics, in favour of Europeans. The English population of Aden is next to nothing. There are Frenchmen, Italians and Germans in Aden. Do



[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

you desire that there shall be discrimination in their favour against Indians? We know that in some of the British colonies, there is discrimination against the British citizens of this Empire in favour of men who are citizens of other countries because they happen to be Europeans. That is the strongest argument against this transfer. I am not going to repeat how Aden became a part of the British Empire but let me remind Honourable Members opposite that if the administration of Aden remains with India, Aden shall remain a part of the British Empire, at the service of not only England and India but at the service of Australia, the Straits Settlements and other countries in the Far East, colonies in the British Empire, which Aden serves just as well as it serves India.

Now, Sir, I will just refer to one more point. It has already been made. That is, that if this transfer is inevitable, if as rumour has it, it is an accomplished fact,—personally I do hope and trust it is not an accomplished fact,—then I do appeal to the Government of India to see that justice is done to the taxpayers of this country. I have just now said that Aden serves not only India but it has been of equal service to Australia and the Straits Settlements. We have paid out of our monies for the defence of Aden up to the year 1926. A contribution was paid by Great Britain. We shall still continue to pay a contribution, while a major portion of the expenditure will be borne by the British exchequer but if Aden is transferred, then I think it is only justice and equity to the taxpayers of this country that the monies that we have spent out of their money for the protection of Aden should be refunded to us, not with compound interest but so far as can be ascertained without any interest at all and my main argument for that is, and I will repeat it, that Aden is and has been maintained as a fortress not only for India but for the Empire as well and for certain parts of the Empire in particular and all should put their hands into their pockets. Why should India be called upon to contribute £150,000, even if the administration remains with India? Why not Australia? Why not Straits Settlements? I would like that point to be considered by the Government of India. In any case, whether it is left with the Government of India or whether it is transferred to Great Britain, in both cases all parts of the Empire should contribute. Why should England alone bear the burden? Why should England pay a contribution or why should we pay a contribution? Are there no other parts of the Empire which are benefiting and are there no other parts of the Empire which are being protected? Sir, I have nothing else to say except to reiterate that I do not think there is a single Honourable Member, an elected Member, of this House who is in favour of this transfer. I confidently say that not one elected Member is in favour of the transfer, and we do hope that the Government of India will convey to His Majesty's Government the strong resentment that this country will feel if the transfer does take place. (Applause.)

**Sardar G. N. Mjumdar** (Gujrat and Deccan Sardars and Inamdars : Landholders) : Sir, I rise to support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Bhuput Sing. Though I represent the Landholders of the Bombay Presidency proper, I have to look to the welfare of India in general and of the Bombay Presidency in particular.

I think it, therefore, my duty to protest against the transfer of Aden from the Government of India to His Majesty's Government. Not only the people of Bombay, but also of India and even of Aden are strongly against this transfer. On the 13th September last, a big public meeting was held at Calcutta which unanimously protested against the transfer. It is a very sad thing that Aden is being snatched away from us after our very long and happy connection with her for about a century. The people of Aden, comprising of Arabs, Jews and Indians, live in Aden together as brethren, and there has never been any sort of inequality of status, which state of things we prize the most. Even with regard to commerce, industry and employment, every one in Aden feels secured. The present prosperous condition of Aden is only due to the efforts of the Bombay Government and the people of Bombay and India, who went and established themselves there. The tax-payers of India in general and of Bombay in particular have annually contributed lakhs of rupees for a number of years to make it what it is today. I know very well of what great importance our connection has been with Aden and how, therefore, in the mutual interest of Aden and India, every endeavour has been made by Indians to make Aden a prosperous port and a market for our produce. Whenever any question came before our Legislature regarding the improvements at Aden, we have been most sympathetic and I must say we have all along felt that Aden was a part of our own. Aden is about 1,600 miles from Bombay, yet with the recent improved shipping, it has come nearer to us than many parts of India for the transport of our produce, and hence it is very valuable to us.

Sir, we felt very much when Aden was transferred from Bombay to Delhi and Simla, but we felt safe on the assurance given by His Excellency the Viceroy to Sir Chunilal Mehta's deputation in November, 1931, that the transfer would not cut off Aden from India and that our trade and commerce would be the special care of the Government of India. Sir, on such an assurance, we, in the districts, did feel and still do feel that our Government will not let us down. To us this proposal of transfer has come as a surprise. It is really unthinkable, after so much sacrifice on our part, and when the Settlement of Aden has become prosperous, that our Government could be a party in Aden being taken away from us and that, too, against the desire of the people. I am sure, Sir, our Government will respect the feelings of the people and will also take into consideration our sacrifices. Sir, Aden is a central distributing port and through Aden our produce is being distributed in the whole of Arabia and even Africa. Aden has been our valuable market and, in these days of depression, when the condition of our agriculturist is so miserable, I ask, is it not the duty of this Legislature and of this Government to do all they can to encourage Indians and the people of Aden to keep up and even improve their connection with India?

Sir, what is going on everywhere in the world? Every nation is doing its best to find out markets for its produce and to try to find out employment for its people. Why was the World Economic Conference held? Why did the President of the United States make his first duty to improve the depression and increase the value of its produce? I ask, Sir, why the Japanese and Lancashire deputations are coming to Simla? When the nations of the world are doing all this, what do we find here? Our people are being driven away from South Africa and from East Africa, and now it is proposed that we should be a party to an action

[Sardar G. N. Mujumdar.]

which would drive away Indians from Aden and Arabia. Is this position not pitiable? Should we be a party to such an action and thereby create more starvation? I think it is the duty of our Government not only to retain Aden, but, as often promised by them, to try and improve the condition of Indians outside India and to establish connections in the world at large for the disposal of our produce and thus improve the half-starving conditions in India.

Sir, when in 1921, an attempt was made to transfer Aden, the Bombay Government strongly protested, as will be seen from the proceedings of the Council of State. Again, in 1927, when the question of Aden came up in this House, not only Members of this House, but all the important bodies strongly protested against the transfer and even the Government of Bombay, through its Honourable Member, Sir Ernest Hotson, and its Chief Secretary, expressed surprise at such an action in the Bombay Legislative Council. Sir, this is our position. I appeal strongly to Government to consider seriously our position and take courage in their hands and tell the British Government that they cannot be a party to their desire, as it is entirely against our wishes and interests. Sir, after all, the Government of India is also a part of the British Government, and what is the fear if Aden is with us? Why should they have any kind of suspicion? The people of Aden have stood by the Empire at all times and have contributed to the exchequer as willingly as the Indians. Even during the Somaliland war and the Great War, their sacrifices have been as great as those of any part of the Empire. If not for anything else, for the sake of sacrifices that the Aden people have made and for what Indians have done, I appeal to Government to respect their wishes and their trade relations. I assure Government that, if they respect them, they will always be having their good sympathies and it is that alone, I believe, Government must prize the most. Sir, with these words, I protest against the transfer of Aden. In conclusion, I may be allowed to ask our Finance Member to enlighten as to the total amount the Government of Bombay and the Government of India have spent on Aden for the last 80 years. I know it is a very big amount. Several crores of rupees have been spent by the Bombay Government and the Indian Government too. Will the British Government pay this large amount back to us? So far as civil population is concerned, we will lose crores of rupees. The Honourable the Leader of the House had made a very important statement, the day before yesterday, with regard to the payment of annual contribution by India, towards the military expenditure at Aden, and, if this side of the House has rightly understood him, with the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Government, the citizens of the Aden Settlement will be relieved of this payment and the Imperial Government will pay it. May I ask, why this discrimination? Is it right that India should pay this amount if Aden stands connected with India and if it is transferred to the Colonial Government, the Imperial Government should come to the rescue of the Colonial Government? I say, Sir, India is not rich enough to bear this burden and Indians hope that the Imperial Government will not look after her with a step-motherly affection. This is really an expense for the safeguard of Imperial trade-routes, and justice demands that it should be borne by the Imperial Government hereafter and, I hope, the Imperial Government will be generous enough to refund the enormous

amount collected on this account from poor India for all these years. Sir, with these words, I support the amendment.

**Sir Leslie Hudson :** Sir, neither I nor any of my Group have had the advantage of being supplied with the library of pamphlets which the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has exhibited to the House. I am sorry because I have no doubt that I should have been able to add to my knowledge of the history of Great Britain's taking possession of Aden and the reasons for which it was taken.

My recollection of it is that it was consequent on the wreck of an Indian sailing vessel from the coast of Madras, belonging to the Nawab of Carnatic, at Aden, and the plunder of its cargo and the robbing of its crew and passengers, the survivors of whom managed to reach the port of Mocha where they got into contact with the agent of the Government of Bombay, that in due course an expedition was sent from Bombay to Aden, an expedition consisting of 700 British and Indian troops under the command of Commander Haines. That was the reason given for taking possession of Aden, but the actual reason for gaining a foot-hold in the port and harbour of Aden was to furnish a harbour and a coaling station for those early steam vessels that have just begun to ply in the ocean between Bombay and Suez. Such a depôt was necessary, because those vessels could not take sufficient coal for the long voyage between Bombay and Suez. Aden was the place chosen upon and the real reason for taking possession of Aden was for the formation of a coal depôt there. Ever since that time, for nearly a hundred years, Aden has been one of the main fuelling stations of coal and oil throughout the world and, while I agree that large sums of Indian capital have been invested in Aden, there have also been very large sums of British capital invested in Aden. I should like Honourable Members to recollect this, for we have heard quite a number of Honourable Members opposite saying that, because of these Indian investments in Aden, there is a very strong case for India to retain civil control of Aden.

When I heard Member after Member getting up and making use of that expression, it brought to my memory almost exactly similar arguments which I frequently heard when I was in England, namely, that in view of the vast amount of British capital invested in India, Great Britain should retain her control in India. I wonder, if Honourable Members opposite will agree that the same argument should, with justice, apply. Although there appears to us on these Benches to be an obvious advantage in the unification of the control of Aden we do recognise and sympathise with the obvious desire in India that she should continue to control the civil administration of Aden. There is considerable strength in that sentiment. There is also something else besides sentiment behind that desire and that is the financial interests of Indian merchants, and that too will carry weight with Honourable Members opposite.

I repeat that we have considerable sympathy with the desire of India to retain the civil control of Aden, and no doubt His Majesty's Government will take full note of the debates in this House and in the Upper House. So, while we cannot support the motion of Mr. Bhuput Sing, we shall not oppose that of Dr. Ziauddin.

There is just one other point I should like to make. Ever since the late lamented Dr. Woodrow Wilson gave expression to the word "self-

[Sir Leslie Hudson.]

determination", that has become one of the hardest used phrases throughout the world and I wonder whether Honourable Members opposite have realised that possibly there may be a certain amount of desire for "self-determination" on the part of those inhabitants of Aden who do not happen to be Indians.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** (Burdwan Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir (Laughter), the complete unanimity of the House in protesting against the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office should set the question at rest. The Leader of the European Group is also in sympathy with our sentiment and that is a matter for congratulation. Sir, I don't know why my rising to take part in this debate should create laughter even amongst my friends, Messrs. Mitra and Singh.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra** : We laughed because three or four Members stood up at the same time, and not because the Honourable Member got up to speak.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** : I was rather a little surprised, because I was never given such a reception in the House before. Be that as it may, the reason for my standing up is this. There has been an appeal to the feelings of the Bengalis in this matter by a certain paper which calls itself "the friend of India" and also the "*Statesman*". It was really a friend of India in its infancy when it was nursed by Indian milk, but I cannot say that it is so now. It has tried to rouse the feelings of the Bengalis in these words :

"The sooner Aden is cut loose from India, the better will Bengal be placed. It is hard to avoid using libellous language about the extra 4½ as. salt duty imposed over two years ago in the interest of a handful of merchants working from Aden."

Sir, I take this statement as a libel upon Bengali patriotism. Sir, Bengal has always given the lead in every matter in India formerly, but unfortunately at the present moment we have not got such outstanding personalities as Messrs. W. C. Bonnerji, Mano Mohan Ghose, Lal Mohan Ghose, Ananda Mohan Bose, Sir Surendra Nath Banerjee, and others. Sir, some years ago, that great politician and patriot of Bombay, the late Mr. Gokhale, remarked that what Bengal thinks today India will think tomorrow. That was the compliment paid to Bengal in those days. He said : "Do not try to trifle with the feelings of the Bengalis. A race which can produce a scientist like Sir J. C. Bose, a jurist like Sir Rash Bihari Ghose and a poet like Rabindra Nath Tagore is not a race to be trifled with." That the editor of the *Statesman*, having lived so many years amongst us, could think that the Bengalis can be induced to support a motion like this, namely, the transfer of the port of Aden to the control of the Imperial Government, I consider nothing but a libel upon the posterity of that race of stalwarts and patriots. Sir, as I have said, I am at one with every one of the speakers who have opposed this proposal of transfer ; and there are two amendments and I may make it clear that I would have willingly supported the amendment of Mr. Bhuput Singh, for I believe that, by remaining with India for nearly a century, Aden is and has become a part and parcel of India and we have a right to demand that Aden should be linked with India.

Sir, I think my friend, the Leader of the European group, gave rather a little incorrect history of the Protectorate of Aden as also Aden

itself. Here I find in an authoritative book, the authenticity and the correctness of which cannot be challenged, namely, the Indian Year Book, that :

“ Aden was the first new territory added to the Empire after the accession of Queen Victoria. Its acquisition was the outcome of an outrage committed by local Arabs upon the passengers and crew of a British Indian buggalow wrecked in the neighbourhood.”

**Sir Leslie Hudson :** I think that is what I said.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt :**

“ Negotiations having failed to secure satisfactory reparation the Government of Bombay despatched a force under Major Baillie which captured Aden on January 19th, 1839.”

My Honourable friend wanted to give us an idea that it was in order to get a harbour and a coal depôt, but here we find a different reason given. The troops were mainly composed of Indians and not, as my Honourable friend would make us believe, Indian as well as European. Sir, I shall not repeat what has been said by other speakers about the reason why Aden should be with India, and the criticism, that has been levelled against the so-called advantages that might be gained by separation, has also been dealt with amply. So I do not think it is necessary for me to go over the same ground again and, if I have taken up a few minutes of the time of the House, it is in order to show that we Bengalis do not lag behind any of our Indian fellow-countrymen in protesting against a measure like this, although I am painfully aware that at times Bengal is not fortunate enough to get the same support from the people of other Presidencies.

**Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur :** Mr. President, before I address myself to the question of the transfer of Aden, I wish just to read out a few lines from the column of the *Statesman* of the 16th instant where you, Sir, have been referred to as the dumb President. The opening paragraph reads :

“ It was unfortunate that, throughout the discussion of the Reserve Bank motions, the only non-official Member of the Assembly who really understood the subject was the necessarily dumb President.”

Then towards the end, referring to the debate on the question of the transfer of Aden, the paper says :

“ Perhaps it is fortunate for everyone that the Assembly so seldom has time enough to take stock of what it is doing and saying from one day to the next. The Opposition, for instance, urges that the press should be completely at liberty to plague the rulers of Indian States but should be prosecuted with all rigour if it says what it thinks about Mr. Gandhi. The same will probably happen on Monday in the discussion of Aden's future. The Opposition will use precisely those arguments for whose employment they most bitterly criticise their opposite numbers in England. The parallel will run somewhat after this fashion :

**Opposition M. L. A. :** Aden has been under British Indian rule for nearly a century.

**Lloyd-Churchill :** India has been under British rule for over a century.

**Opposition M. L. A. :** Indians have put crores of money into Aden's development.

**Lloyd-Churchill :** The British have put hundreds of crores of money into India's development.

**Opposition M. L. A. :** The separation of Aden will be a blow to Indian trade.

**Lloyd-Churchill :** Self-government for India will be a blow to British trade.

[Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur.]

*Opposition M. L. A.* : The Arabs who want Aden's transfer are not really representative.

*Lloyd-Churchill* : The vocal Indian politicians who talk of Swaraj are not really representative of the masses.

*Opposition M. L. A.* : Aden and India are ours and must remain ours.

*Lloyd-Churchill* : Aden and India are ours and must remain ours."

That is how it concludes. I think, Sir, that what is really meant is the Home Government and that, instead of using the words "Lloyd-Churchill", it would have been much more appropriate to have said "The Home Government".

I have very closely followed the debate on the motion of the Leader of the House and I think three outstanding facts emerge from what has actually happened regarding Aden during all these years for nearly a century and from the communiqué which we are asked to discuss. The first one which strikes me as the most important is that the Home Government have long had an eye on the Settlement of Aden. But the idea in their mind appears to have been that, in this particular case, it was better to play a waiting game. They did not like the idea of taking possession of a lean calf. On the other hand, they said : "Let it grow fat and then we shall have it."

Then the next point that occurs to me is that whenever the Government of India profess to express a defined policy which the Home Government is pursuing or is going to pursue, their statements can only be taken as an expression of opinion which might or might not be carried into effect. Specially is this so when the matters relate to foreign and colonial policy. The third is that the burden of the annual contribution by India has been steadily on the decrease. There can be no two opinions on this aspect of Aden's finances.

I think, Mr. President, we have now reached a stage at which Aden, instead of her being a burden to India, which it has been for so many years, will begin to show ever increasing returns on the credit side of India. As a matter of fact, I can say with confidence, that, in the space of another five or six years, the debit side will be completely wiped out, and the credit side will begin to swell. Mr. President, I am not going to enter into a controversy with my Honourable friend, Sir George Schuster, in relation to the financial effects of the transfer of Aden. I shall take the figure which the Honourable the Finance Member has stated to be almost a correct one representing the burden to India this year—1932-33—and he put that figure at 15 lakhs and 60,000. As against that, we have to bear in mind that India will be losing every year something like one lakh and sixty thousand by way of loss in income-tax earnings on the principle that there cannot be double assessment to income-tax. I believe, if I have understood the Honourable Member correctly, the loss would come to about one lakh and sixty thousand rupees....

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** : I told my friend that it was impossible to give an exact estimate, and that all I could say was that it would not be a large sum.

**Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur** : Conceding, then, Mr. President, that the burden to India is something like 15 lakhs this year, — that at the present moment the expenditure and the income balance each

other so far as the civil administration is concerned, that the income to India is steadily rising, and that India is entitled to claim from the Colonies for the safety of their trade route to the East a share of her annual contribution to Aden,—is it too much to expect that henceforth from year to year the revenue income to India from Aden will begin to swell to an extent that the necessity of a subvention by India will cease to exist?

Mr. President, I shall not devote any time in dealing with the ancient history of Aden. I shall refrain from paying my tribute to Major Bailey and to the other Colonel to whom my friend, Sir Leslie Hudson, referred. But, I think, I shall have to point out, that, in the course of the discussion on this motion, when my friend, Dr. Ziauddin, said that Sir Denys Bray had made two statements which could not be reconciled, the Honourable the Leader of the House stood up and said, that the statements taken together purported to convey what we exactly were doing now. Now, Sir, this is what Sir Denys Bray said. I shall quote his very words:

“ I repeat my promises that the transfer of Aden will not be effected without the House being consulted.”

Then, Sir, in the same speech, the Foreign Secretary has also said:

“ I hasten to add that all idea of such a transfer has long since been abandoned.”

—referring to the civil and municipal administration of Aden. Now, taking those two statements together, I am in entire agreement with the Honourable the Leader of the House that opportunity has in fact been given to us to discuss this motion, and if I have to reconcile with the communiqué under discussion the other statement made by Sir Denys Bray, namely, that the Home Government had given up all ideas of a transfer, then, it appears to me that I need only repeat what I said just now, that on questions where the Government of India professed to speak on matters relating to foreign and colonial affairs, the last word lay with the Home Government and not with the Government of India, and their statements and utterances in this House could at best be taken only as mere expressions of opinion and no more. As a matter of fact, they reflect the utter helplessness of the Government of India in these matters.

Sir, I shall now address myself to the obstacles which have stood so far in the way of the Home Government effecting their purpose. It was only the day before yesterday that my friend, Mr. Puri, while speaking on this motion, said,—what is the use of discussing this motion, the Home Government have already come to a certain decision, and all our talk here will be a waste of time,—indicating thereby that the Home Government had already made up their minds and the matter which we are discussing now has already once for all been settled. Sir, while I am confident on the one hand, that what the Home Government have done already will not now be undone, that is to say, that the military and political control of Aden will not be retransferred to India any time, I do trust, on the other, in spite of what my friends, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, have said regarding the entertainment of Europeans in place of Indians in Aden for the last few months and the permanent establishment there of the National Bank two or three months ago replacing the small banks which were doing business formerly and the employment further in the Education Department of a European in place of an Indian who was holding that office for a long time,—although all these things may tend to show in a way that the Home Government was contemplating a transfer, I do hope that, when the point of view of this House and that of



[Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur.]

the Council of State is placed before that Government, they will see the reasonableness of our demand, and that they will give up pursuing the line which they appear to have taken.

Now, Sir, I shall not go deep into the whole case, but I shall just say a few words on what I feel, in regard to three or four points. As regards the grounds which are set out as points indicating the desirability for the transfer of the civil and military administration of Aden, I find that the first ground deals with geographical remoteness. Sir, arguing on those lines, I submit that Ceylon is very close geographically to India, and, as such, would the Home Government be prepared to make a sporting offer to India of that small island? Can India expect that Ceylon would be given to us in exchange for Aden? It is geographically closer to India than Aden, and so, I ask, would they ever make that sporting offer? Then, again, where at all is the Colonial Office? Not at Suez surely, nor at Malta, but as many as 5,000 miles away in Downing Street. Sir, in these days of conquest of speed over distance, geographical remoteness for purposes of administration has no meaning at all. The next point made is that Aden will not naturally fit into the Federation. I wonder what those words "naturally fit" precisely mean. I ask, do those tiny little Indian States in the north naturally fit into the federating structure? Is the dovetailing of the Federation so very perfect? The last ground taken is that Aden is already to some extent under Imperial control. To this, I retort, "Was that of our making?" Was not the transfer of the military control thrust upon us suddenly by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in 1927 when he made the announcement on the floor of this House that the control of Aden had been definitely transferred to the Colonial Office? That was a bombshell that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief dropped in this House. After 1927, deputations have been coming up to Simla and Delhi to wait on His Excellency the Viceroy, the last one, I believe, waited on His Excellency Lord Willingdon in 1931, a few months after His Excellency assumed the reins of office. There had been references and resolutions in both Chambers suspecting that the announcement of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief was but a first step towards the transfer of the entire control of Aden to the Colonial Office.

The communiqué is very cautiously worded. Mr. President, if you will only turn to the last sentence of the first paragraph, which I shall read out :

"If it should be decided that the administration of Aden should be separated from that of India, His Majesty's Government contemplate that the following conditions would be established"—

they would not commit themselves to saying that—

"these conditions will prevail",—

or that—

"His Majesty's Government vouchsafe to Aden the following conditions."

They simply contemplate that the following conditions would be established. And what are those contemplated conditions? The first of them is the relief afforded to the Government of India in the matter of the annual contribution of £150,000 sterling or about 20 lakhs a year. I need not further develop that point, because, I have already pointed out how in the coming years there is a very real prospect of Aden yielding to India

an income which would cover the expenditure which India might have to incur for carrying on the military as well as her civil and municipal administration. The present has been found to be the most opportune moment for the Home Government to take over the control of the civil and municipal administration, because they are afraid that, if Aden is allowed to continue any longer under the Government of India, the effect will be that the income from Aden will go on increasing and it might be that, in the course of a few years, the Indian Government may be able to pay the cost of the military expenditure also from the revenues derived from Aden. One thing which makes me feel what I have just said is that in the matter of income-tax, the law that is prevalent in Aden is not the law which is prevalent in India. I am quoting it from a book, Sir, it is not of my own imagination.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I may inform the Honourable Member that the income-tax law in Aden is the Indian income-tax law.

**Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur :** May I know from the Honourable the Finance Member whether the average for six years is not calculated in assessing income-tax in Aden ?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster :** I do not know what my Honourable friend has in mind, but the Indian income-tax law applies to Aden.

**Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur :** I think I have got the pamphlet. However, for the present, I shall not dilate on that point. Another thing which has struck me as rather remarkable is that the Home Government have consciously or unconsciously waited for nearly a century after the conquest of Aden, without having cared to take up the entire administration from the very beginning. It is only now, after as many as 93 or 94 years since it came into the possession of Great Britain, that any attempt is being made to take over the civil and municipal administration, and why they have delayed taking action earlier is not at all explained. On the floor of this House, the Commander-in-Chief stated in 1927—I am probably quoting his very words—that in consideration of Indian welfare and Indian interests the control of the civil and municipal administration of Aden would continue to be exercised by the Government of Bombay. That statement was made on the floor of this House by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and I think the Home Government felt it rather awkward that, in the face of such a definite statement by a responsible Member of the Government, in the face of definite public opinion which had gathered round this question both in Aden and in Bombay, and of the attitude of the Bombay Government itself on this question which had expressed itself rather strongly,—because of these three things, Mr. President, the Home Government thought that they should delay the matter until people had to some extent forgotten what had happened and until the Home Government could find a much stronger weapon than the ones at their disposal at that moment. That weapon they had discovered now—I mean the weapon of Federation. That is the main ground that is now advanced for a transfer. The second condition is the maintenance of the right of appeal to the Bombay High Court. But I need not discuss this matter at length, because as Sir Cowasji Jehangir has already said, it simply maintains the *status quo* and does nothing more. The third condition is : “ His Majesty’s Government would maintain the existing policy of making Aden a free port ”. But, Mr. President, there is a grim

[Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur.]

"unless" tacked on. It reads: "unless some radical change in the present economic situation should take place". Mr. President, even without the "unless" and the rest of it, what is it that they are doing? They are doing nothing in advance of the prevailing conditions. With the "unless" and what follows it, it is indeed worth nothing. In the fourth condition also, they use the word "unless". It says, "unless such a course became in their opinion absolutely necessary". We all know what is the significance of this word "unless" in Parliamentary papers and documents. It is so easy to create the desired causes and then say that the step sought to be taken is absolutely necessary and they have got to do it. The fifth one deals with retaining in the Aden Service a proportion of Indian Service Administrative personnel for some years, which, when paraphrased, only means that at the end of a few years, you would not have one Indian in the Aden Administrative Services. The last one, Mr. President, is much more definite than all the other conditions, and it says:

"No racial legislation or segregation would be permitted by His Majesty's Government."

Sir Cowasji Jehangir has already dealt with this point and I need not dilate on it over again. I shall merely say this, that

5 P.M.

from our experience of Kenya, the Fiji Islands and other Colonies, the treatment accorded to Asiatics in those countries is something which every Indian resents. That, Sir, is a matter of common knowledge. There is no doubt that the Indians in the colonies are segregated and if tomorrow severance of control does take place in regard to Aden, what is there to prevent the European element there from insisting on a uniform law with regard to the Whites in all the Colonies. The European population which is sure to grow in Aden, if transfer is effected, will doubtless claim that the law which prevails in the other colonies should be made applicable to Aden and I doubt whether the Home Government would be able to resist the claim of the European element.

Lastly, I would refer to the strategic position which Aden occupies on the principal trade route to the East. Who are all the people who are getting the benefit of that most important station?—Australia, Ceylon, East and South Africa, the Federated Malay States and some other Colonies. I ask my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, why then the expenditure incurred on Aden should not be treated as an Imperial charge. Should not the other Colonies such as Australia, who share the benefit of this trade route, be called upon to bear a share of India's annual contribution equally with India, and let me assure you, Mr. President, that that is exactly what is going to happen once the transfer of control is effected.

I do not think I need take up the time of the House any more except, with your permission, to digress a bit and to point out, that, for the past few months, the trend of legislation and communiqués that are brought forward before this House has taken a most reprehensible turn. Only the other day we were discussing a Bill to prevent the activities of the British Indian press and the Indian public in regard to the Rulers of Indian States. The principal reason stated in its Statement of Objects and Reasons, as necessitating such a measure, was that the Federation was being set up in the near future and a Bill of that kind was absolutely necessary and we are now told that for the same reason a step, like the one that is now contemplated in the Government communiqué, has become desirable.

Both these have a common presiding deity, namely, the Goddess of Federation. Mr. President, I feel I cannot do better than invoke the aid of that dubious Goddess and say to her, "Federation, what sins are committed in thy name!"

**Several Honourable Members :** I move that the question be now put.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra :** I like to make the point clear about the voting on this closure motion. Let those who had a chance to speak vote against us. There are others who feel very strongly that they should get a chance to speak on this important motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair would remind Honourable Members once again about the rule relating to closure. The Standing Order says that, where a closure has been applied, the Chair shall accept it, unless it is satisfied that there has not been a fair debate. Therefore, unless the Chair is satisfied that there has not been a fair debate, it is a mandatory injunction on the Chair that the closure shall be accepted. Twenty Non-Official Honourable Members have already spoken for a day and a half. The Chair finds that the number of Non-Official Members present is, on the average, about 30 or 32 and, under these circumstances, the Chair is not prepared to say that there has not been a fair debate. The Chair would like those Honourable Members who want a division on the closure to stand up in their seats. (After counting.) There is no general consensus of opinion in favour of continuing the debate and the Chair proposes that the division be not taken.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra :** Is it your ruling that I cannot claim a division ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Not on closure. So far as the closing of a debate is concerned, the Chair, even without the application of a closure motion, can always put the question, when the Chair is satisfied that there has been a full and fair debate. Therefore, applying that principle, the Chair does not think that it is bound to put the closure to a division, when only one or two Honourable Members wanted a division.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra :** It is more than half a dozen Members that are claiming a division.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Even half a dozen Members wishing a division on a closure motion is not indicative of a general desire on the part of the House to have the division taken up.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra :** There is a large number of Members on this side who are likely to speak ; so, if there is a division, it should be confined to Members on this side only, because Official Members are not going to speak on this motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair is paying consideration only to the non-official side. Does Mr. Bhuput Sing want his amendment to be put to the vote ?

**Mr. Bhuput Sing** (Bihar and Orissa : Landholders) : No, Sir. As the purpose of my amendment will be equally served by Dr. Ziauddin's amendment and, in order to concentrate attention on one motion, I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

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

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The original question was :

“ That the Government of India communiqué, dated the 20th June, 1933, regarding the future administration of Aden, be taken into consideration.”

Since which the following amendment has been moved :

“ That for the original motion the following be substituted :

“ While recording their emphatic protest against the complete transfer to the Colonial Office of Aden Settlement which has for about a century been an integral part of British Indian administration, the Assembly requests the Governor General in Council to convey to His Majesty's Government the strong desire of the people of India that the proposed transfer should not take place ’.”

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable the President of the Council of State has been requested to convene a meeting of the Joint Select Committee on the Reserve Bank and Imperial Bank Bills tomorrow afternoon at 2-30 P.M. Honourable Members will get due notice of this meeting.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 20th September, 1933.