

4th February 1939

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume I, 1939

(3rd February to 15th February, 1939)

NINTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1939



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

1939

M39LAD

1-2

A

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

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

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

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

MR. A. AIKMAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUMTAZ AHMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistants of the Secretary :

MR. M. N. KAUL, BAR.-AT-LAW.

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT (*Upto 31st March, 1939*).

KHAN SAHIB S. G. HASNAIN, B.A. (*From 10th April, 1939*).

Marshal :

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

Committee on Petitions :

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

MR. A. AIKMAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

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

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.

VOLUME I.—3rd February to 15th February, 1939.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
FRIDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1939—		FRIDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1939—contd.	
Members Sworn	1	The Indian Oaths (Amendment) Bill—Appointment of Mr. C. J. W. Lillie to the Select Committee	82
Starred Questions and Answers	1—37	Reports of the Public Accounts Committee	83—111
Unstarred Questions and Answers	37—41		
Statements laid on the Table	41—76	SATURDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
Motions for Adjournment re—		Starred Questions and Answers	127—69
Economic and Penal Blockade against the Ahmadzai Tribe of the Tribal Belt between Derajat and Waziristan—Sanction of the Governor General not obtained	76—77	Motion for Adjournment re Anti-Indian Riots in Burma—Adopted	169, 201—18
Indianization in the Indian Army—Disallowed by the Governor General	77	Resolution re Withdrawal of India from the League of Nations—Discussion not concluded	170—200
Continued detention of Messrs. Vaishampain, Bhawani Sahai and Jawala Prasad—Disallowed by the President	77	MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
Derailment of the Dehra Dun Express—Adopted	77—78	Member Sworn	219
Statement re answering of questions	78—79	Starred Questions and Answers	219—43
Panel of Chairmen	79	Motions for Adjournment	263
Committee of Petitions	79	Message from H. E. the Governor General	264
H. E. The Governor General's assent to Bills	79—80	The Commercial Documents Evidence Bill—Appointment of Mr. C. J. W. Lillie to the Select Committee	264
Message from the Council of State	80	The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to, subject to further Amendments	264—89
The Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	81	The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Passed	289—95
Election of a Muslim Member to sit on the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to the Hedjaz	81	The Insurance (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	295—98
Election of a Member for the Central Advisory Board of Health	81	The Repealing and Amending Bill—Referred to Select Committee	299
The Insurance (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	82	The Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Referred to Select Committee	299—306
The Indian Naval Reserve Force (Discipline) Bill—Introduced	82		

	PAGES.		PAGES.
MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 1939— <i>contd.</i>		WEDNESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1939— <i>contd.</i>	
The Indian Naval Reserve Forces (Discipline) Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . .	307—22	The Employment of Children (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	551
TUESDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 1939—		The Motor Vehicles Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to . . .	551—58
Member Sworn . . .	323	Reports of the Public Accounts Committee . . .	558—68
Starred Questions and Answers . . .	323—37	THURSDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
Statements laid on the Table . . .	358—68	Member Sworn . . .	569
Motion for Adjournment re—Spending of Indian Revenues in the Military Training of Foreigners like the Afghans—Disallowed by the Governor General . . .	369	Starred Questions and Answers . . .	569—615
Government's refusal to consult the Legislative Assembly on the Recommendations of the Chatfield Committee's Report—Disallowed by the Governor General . . .	369	The Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded . . .	615—54
Indian Representation at the Palestine Conference—Disallowed by the Governor General . . .	369—71, 396	FRIDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
Message from H. E. the Governor General . . .	371	Member Sworn . . .	655
The Indian Naval Reserve Forces (Discipline) Bill—Motion to consider negatived . . .	371—93	Starred Questions and Answers . . .	655—87
Reports of the Public Accounts Committee . . .	394—412	Unstarred Question and Answer . . .	688
WEDNESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1939—		Resolution re—	
Member Sworn . . .	413	Withdrawal of India from the League of Nations—Adopted as amended . . .	688—90
Starred Questions and Answers . . .	413—549	Trade Agreement with Burma—Adopted . . .	691—709
Unstarred Question and Answer . . .	549—50	Cut on Salaries of Government Employees—Adopted as amended . . .	710—29
Election of a Member to the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to the Hedjaz . . .	550	Statement of Business . . .	729—30
Election of a Member to the Central Advisory Board of Health . . .	550	MONDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
The Standards of Weight Bill—Introduced . . .	551	Members Sworn . . .	731
The Coal Mines (Stowing) Bill—Introduced . . .	551	Starred Questions and Answers . . .	731—69
		Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	769—72
		Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1939-40 . . .	772—79
		The Indian Naval Reserve Forces (Discipline) Bill (As recommended)—Motion for leave to introduce negatived . . .	780—81
		The Indian Merchant Shipping (Second Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	781
		The Indian Cotton Cess (Amendment) Bill—Amendment made by the Council of State agreed to . . .	781—82

	PAGES.		PAGES.
MONDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1939— <i>contd.</i>		TUESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 1939 <i>—contd.</i>	
The Employment of Children (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	782—814	The Code of Criminal Proce- dure (Amendment) Bill— (Amendment of section 205)—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded .	900—04
The Coal Mines (Stowing) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	814—19		
TUESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 1939—		WEDNESDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1939—	
Starred Questions and Answers	821—58	Member Sworn	905
Statements laid on the Table	858—63	Starred Questions and Answers	905—51
The Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill—Passed as amended	863—94	Ruling <i>re</i> Moving of Resolu- tions	951
The Code of Criminal Proce- dure (Amendment) Bill— (Amendment of section 386)—Referred to Select Committee	895—99	Resolution <i>re</i> — Hand-made Matches— Adopted	951—82
		Position of Women under the existing laws—Dis- cussion not concluded .	983-96

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 4th February, 1939.

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

STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(a) ORAL ANSWERS.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Questions Nos. 34 and 36 refer to the same subject, and so I would like to put them together.

INAUGURATION OF FEDERATION.

34. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House state:

- (a) whether Government have received replies from any of the Princes signifying their assent to the Instrument of Accession sent to them as referred to in the Governor General's speech in Calcutta;
- (b) if so, from how many; and
- (c) when they expect the inauguration of Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) I am unable to give a precise date. The early achievement of Federation remains the considered policy both of His Majesty's Government and of the Government of India.

INAUGURATION OF FEDERATION.

36. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House state:

- (a) at what stage the negotiations with the Princes with regard to Federation are;
- (b) whether any of the Princes have signified their assent;
- (c) if so, how many of them; and
- (d) when Government propose to inaugurate Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply which I have just given to his starred question No. 34, to which I have nothing to add.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (a) of the question, may I know, Sir, whether "No" refers to both parts of the question, that is to say, that the Instruments of Accession have not been sent to the Princes, and the Princes have not signified their assent?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I answered the first part by saying No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether these Instruments of Accession have now been sent to the Princes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That was published in the papers.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know whether the information published in the papers is correct information or not.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The only portion which I admit to be correct is they have been sent to the Princes.

Mr. Mann Subedar: May I know, Sir, to how many States have these Instruments of Accession been sent?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I cannot say that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have they been sent to all Princes, or only to some select Princes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am unable to answer that without notice. If notice is given I shall then consider "Public interest".

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know whether they have been sent to all the princes.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am unable to answer it without a little more time, and I cannot say whether I shall answer it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, Sir, whether these Instruments of Accession have been sent along with any covering letters to the Princes or they have been merely sent to them without any covering letters?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not prepared to make any statement on it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the question about the inauguration of Federation in clause (c) of question No. 34, my friend said that the early inauguration of Federation still remains the policy of His Majesty's Government and of the Government of India. May I know, Sir, whether Government, with a view to carrying out that policy, have any programme in their minds to interpret the words "early inauguration", and, if so, how soon will this programme be carried out?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have repeatedly said I am unable to explain the programme; but surely Government have a programme.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if these Instrument of Accession are treated as confidential papers and have been confidentially sent to the princes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: They are supposed to be confidential and that assured their publication in the papers.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: While forwarding these Instruments of Accession, may I know whether the Government of India have set any time limit within which the Princes should reply.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am unable to give an answer to it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, if the Princes have been given any directions as to the attitude of the Government of India in case some of the States do not accept these Instruments of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I give the same answer.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR INDO-BRITISH TRADE AGREEMENT.

35. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member state:

- (a) at what stage the Indo-British Trade negotiations are;
- (b) whether any agreement has been reached between the two Governments; and
- (c) whether they expect to place before the House before the end of this Session the results of the negotiations?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a), (b) and (c). Government are not in a position to say whether, and if so when, a new trade agreement between India and the United Kingdom is likely to be concluded, but it is hoped, however, that the negotiations may be brought to a conclusion at no very distant date.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, whether the Government expect to place the matter before the House before the end of this month?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I cannot say, but the draft agreement will be placed before the House as early as possible.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the earlier answer given by my Honourable friend to the effect that Government have made up their minds that, whatever may happen, the Ottawa Agreement will not be continued till the end of this Budget Session, may I know whether Government are in a position now to say that they will be able to place the draft agreement before this House before the end of this Session?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: They are hoping to be able to do so.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know, Sir, whether in any case the reports of the non-officials will be made available to Members of this House?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I cannot say in any case, but if a draft agreement is placed before the House, then such relevant material as might be useful to Honourable Members will be made available to them.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know, Sir, whether adequate time will be allowed to Honourable Members to study all these Reports, and that the discussion on those Reports will not be fixed immediately after the papers have been made available to Honourable Members?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government will make an effort to allow as much time as possible to enable Honourable Members to study the draft agreement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact, Sir, that opinion in England is sought to be influenced by publication of various reports and suggestions by the Lancashire cotton interests, will the Government of India consider, with a view to educating public opinion in this country, the desirability of publishing, before Government make up their minds finally with regard to any agreement to take the place of the Ottawa, the Report of the non-official Advisers, so that India's point of view also may be kept prominently before the public eye?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Before Government finally make up their minds, they propose to bring the matter before the Legislature, and then of course there will be publication of all material placed before the Legislature.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know, if the Honourable Member has seen a threat that if certain favourable terms are not granted to the textile industry in the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom will boycott the purchase of Indian cotton?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There is a question down to that effect.

CONTRACTS MADE FOR FOREIGN WHEAT AND FLOUR.

†37. ***Sardar Mangal Singh:** Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- (a) the amount of foreign wheat and flour for which contracts were made with the foreign importers at the time the duty was imposed;
- (b) the amount of wheat and flour that were actually landed in India after the duty was reimposed in December last; and

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner being absent.

- (c) the amount of wheat and flour that was diverted to other places on account of the imposition of duty?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Government have no exact information, but, in December last, it was estimated that forward contracts amounted to 1,25,000 tons approximately.

(b) From the 8th December to the last week of January, 35,800 tons of wheat and about ten tons of wheat flour were imported into India.

(c) Information is not available.

TALKS WITH ITALY FOR A TRADE AGREEMENT.

†38. ***Sardar Mangal Singh:** Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- (a) whether talks with Italy have begun for the conclusion of a trade pact with that country;
- (b) whether the talks are being carried on by the Government of India direct, or through His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom;
- (c) when they are likely to be finished; and
- (d) whether this House would be consulted before the final decision is arrived at in this matter?

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

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

LEGISLATION FOR THE CONTROL OF THE IMPORT AND MANUFACTURE OF DRUGS.

†39. ***Sardar Mangal Singh:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether a Bill for the control of the import and manufacture of drugs will be brought forward during this Session; and
- (b) when the motion for introduction of the Bill is likely to be made in this House?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). As the Bill would regulate matters enumerated in the Provincial Legislative List, the Provincial Governments were asked on the 6th July, 1938, to have the resolution required under section 103 of the Government of India Act, 1935, passed by Provincial Legislatures, authorising the Central Legislature to legislate *inter alia* for the manufacture, storage and sale, etc., of drugs and medicines for the whole of British India. The Bill will be introduced as soon as possible.

OFFICIAL DEPUTATION FROM MALAYA.

40. ***Mr. Abdul Qayyum:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether an official deputation from the Malayan Government has either visited, or is about to visit, India;

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner being absent.

- (b) whether any talks have taken place, or are proposed to take place between it and the Government of India;
- (c) whether the Central Indian Association of Malaya has sent its own deputation to the Government of India;
- (d) the facilities given to the non-official deputation to put forward the Indian case; and
- (e) the decisions arrived at, if any, and, if so, the nature thereof?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a), (b) and (e). The Malayan Delegation which is now here has held discussions with the Government of India from the 30th January onwards; no decisions have yet been reached.

(c) and (d). The deputation sent by the Central Indian Association of Malaya is also here and is being given facilities to place its case before Government.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know, Sir, if the Madras Government is being associated with these conversations?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Yes, Sir; not only through prior consultation, but through the presence throughout these discussions of the Labour Commissioner in Madras.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: In view of the statement issued by the non-official delegation, is it a fact that the Indian labourers in Malaya have to work for as much as 63 hours a week?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I should like to have notice; I could not say that off hand.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know, Sir, if the right of association and collective bargaining is denied to Indian labourers in Malaya?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: There is no provision in law in Malaya which in any way prevents the right of association; it may be exercised by any labourer.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know, Sir, whether there are any trade unions or trade associations in existence in Malaya as far as the Indian labourers are concerned?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I submit that is a question relating to the contents of the representation submitted by the Malayan deputation; it does not arise out of the question I have answered.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Is it a fact that even ordinary rights of citizenship are denied to Indian labourers in Malaya; there is discrimination made in the matter of public services, political rights, and representation in local bodies?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to have put down a question like that.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: It refers to the grievances of Indian labourers, that is my last supplementary question, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot raise all sorts of points in one question.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: My question is, when do Government expect to come to a decision on the representation made by the non-official delegation?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: All that I can tell my friend is that in our discussions with the Malayan delegation, the representation made by the Indian deputation from Malaya will be taken fully into account.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, Sir, whether Government propose to bring about a meeting between the Standing Emigration Committee of this House and the Malayan Delegation with a view to discuss the outstanding questions, and if so, when?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: It is the intention to bring the Malayan delegation into touch with the Standing Emigration Committee provided that our discussions with the delegation indicate that such a meeting will be useful

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, whether on the question of wages, which is perhaps the most important and urgent question, the Government of India have ascertained the opinion of the Government of Madras, and may I know what is the stand—if my Honourable friend can say it to the House,—I won't press him to do so, if it will make things more difficult,—they propose to take, and whether they have come to any decision with regard to the minimum wages they should insist for Indian labourers?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My friend will appreciate that it is not possible while the negotiations are in progress to indicate in detail the line we are taking but what I can tell him is that the stand we have taken is in full consonance with the views and wishes of the Madras Government.

STATISTICS OF MIDDLE CLASS UNEMPLOYMENT.

41. *Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Will the Honourable Member for Labour please state:

- (a) whether the Central Government have been, or are in communication with Provincial Governments and other public bodies regarding the collection of statistics of middle class unemployment, and whether, as a result of the communications, the Central Government have decided to take any step for collection of statistics, or to take any other measure towards the solution of the unemployment question; and
- (b) whether the Central Government suggested any measure to sort out for State employment, students at an early age of their academic course; if so, how the suggestion has been received, and the final decision of the Government?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes. With regard to the collection of statistics by educational institutions, all Provincial Governments, except Madras and the Punjab, have issued instructions

to the institutions concerned, and the Bureau of Education have decided to co-ordinate them in due course. With regard to statistics of middle class employment in industry, the Legislatures of all Provincial Governments, except Madras and Bengal, have passed resolutions empowering the Central Government to undertake the necessary legislation. Madras have decided not to co-operate in the scheme, while Bengal have not given their final answer. With regard to other measures, I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I gave to Mr. K. S. Gupta's starred question No. 1640 on 30th November, 1938.

(b) Yes. The suggestion has generally not been well received. The Central Government are awaiting replies from the Governments of Bengal and Bombay before taking any decision.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: May I know if there was any communication with the Sind Government, and if so, if there was a reply from them?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Whenever the provinces are addressed the Sind Government is not excluded.

Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Oshettiar: If I heard the Honourable Member aright, he said that Madras has decided not to co-operate in this matter. May I know whether the Madras Government have given any reasons for that?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I would require notice of that.

Mr. Brojendra Narayan Oshadhury: Is any legislation in order to take power for the collection of statistics of middle class unemployment, under contemplation by the Central Government?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Obviously no decision can be taken till the views of all Provincial Governments are received.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: May I know if the Bihar Government have addressed the Government of India regarding giving effect to the recommendations made in the Bihar Unemployment Committee's Report?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I cannot disclose the contents of their communication.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: What is the reason of the Government of Bengal not replying to the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I cannot say.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: How long have they taken.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have not got the dates here.

Mr. Brojendra Narayan Oshadhury: What is the answer to the latter part of part (a) of my question—namely, whether the Government have decided to take any other measures towards the solution of the unemployment question?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have stated that communications have been received from certain Provincial Governments and what action is being taken with regard to the rest. We must await the replies of the other Provincial Governments.

Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: May I know what are the further measures which are the subject of the communication?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I cannot add anything to what I have already stated.

Mr. Abdul Qayyum: May I know whether Government will consider the desirability of absorbing these unemployed young men in the army in place of the aliens who are now there? There are thousands of them in our army.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a question to be addressed to the Defence Secretary.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Has any reminder been sent to the Bengal Government in order to expedite reply?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I cannot say. I have not got all the papers here.

CLOSURE OF THE CALCUTTA BOOK DEPOT.

42. *Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Will the Honourable Member for Labour please state what action has been taken upon the representation sent by the Indian Chamber of Commerce, urging the inconvenience that will be caused by the closure of the Calcutta Book Depot, and the economy, if any, the closure is calculated to effect?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The representation of the Indian Chamber of Commerce is receiving consideration. I am not at present in a position to give an estimate of the economy that will be effected if the Depot is closed down.

INDIAN AGENT IN BURMA.

43. *Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether there is at present in Burma any Agent of the Government of India to look after the interests of Indians in Burma; and
- (b) whether the said Agent has taken steps to look after the trial going on in the Magistrate's court of Rangoon for the murder of Ghulam Rosul, an Indian; and if so, what steps?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) The incident was unconnected with the riots and the Agent has not been instructed to watch specially the judicial proceedings to which it has given rise.

Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Is the Honourable Member aware that the case has recently been disposed of and that two out of the three accused have been sentenced to an imprisonment of six months only. Is the Honourable Member satisfied that in this trial the prosecution was conducted with full vigour and efficiency?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have seen a press report to the effect mentioned by the Honourable Member. We are asking the Agent for official information, and, if necessary, the matter will be taken up by the Government of India.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: Did the Agent or the Government of India make any protest to the Burma Government about their attitude and the occurrence of all these troubles?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: This particular question, as I have already stated, relates to an alleged assault by two European soldiers on an Indian. It does not relate to the general question of rioting in Burma.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: In this particular case did they make any protest?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have asked from the Agent for official confirmation of the information which has been given by the Honourable Member to the House now, and on receipt of that information we shall certainly consider whether a protest to the Burma Government is needed.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: Does the Honourable Member mean that the Agent does not report of his own accord, and that he wants some sort of an initiative from the Government of India to report? What is the Agent for?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The Agent, as my Honourable friend will realise, is primarily concerned with the difficult and tense situation which exists throughout Burma at the present moment.

DUMPING OF BURMA RICE AT UNECONOMIC PRICES IN BENGAL.

44. *Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce please state:

- (a) whether he has received any representation from the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce, or any other party, asking for notice to be given not later than 31st March, 1938, for the termination of the "India Burma Trade Regulation Order of 1937" with a view to reopening negotiations for a substituted agreement under which Burma rice will not be allowed to be dumped into Calcutta and other Indian ports in unlimited quantities and at prices unremunerative to the cultivators of rice in India, by speculative merchants in Burma;
- (b) if so, whether the representation has been considered, and the decisions arrived at;
- (c) whether the facts stated in the representation that the production of rice in Bengal is short of the quantity required for consumption in Bengal by medical standards, and that the net quantity available for consumption in Bengal after accounting for imports and exports is still below the requirements of the population by medical standard, are correct; and
- (d) the upward or downward trend of price of rice in the Calcutta market and in *muffasil* markets for the last five years?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Government of India have under examination the practical working of the India and Burma (Trade Regulation) Order in all its aspects and

will in connection with that examination give the fullest consideration to the matters raised in the Chamber's representation.

(c) The representation contains no statements to this effect.

(d) I lay on the table a statement showing the wholesale prices of rice at Calcutta for a series of years. Prices for mufasil markets are not available.

Wholesale Prices of Rice at Calcutta.

(at the end of each month).

Period.	Calcutta.		Ballam No. 1.	
	(per Bazar Md. of 82-2-15 lbs.).			
	1934-35.		1935-36.	
	Rs.	A. P.	Rs.	A. P.
April	3	9 0	3	10 0
May	3	13 0	3	12 0
June	3	13 0	3	12 0
July	3	13 0	3	12 0
August	3	14 0	3	10 0
September	3	14 0	3	7 0
October	3	11 0	3	12 0
November	3	11 0	3	10 0
December	3	9 0	3	8 0
January	3	6 0	4	0 0
February	3	9 0	3	12 0
March	3	8 0	3	12 0
Average	= 3 10 10		3 10 13	

Price per maund.

	1938-39.	1937-38.
<i>Secta—</i>		
(a) Throughout October 4-3-6		4-2-6 to 4-3-0.
(b) November Dropped to 3-15-0. Rose to 4-6-0		4-4-0 to 4-2-0.
(c) December Steady 4-6-0		4-2-0 to 3-10-0.
(d) January 4-6-0, 3-13-0, 3-14-0, 3-14-0		3-12-0 to 3-10-0.
<i>Patnahi Boiled—</i>		
(a) Steady 3-13-0		3-10-0 steady.
(b) Dropped to 3-11-0 Rose to 3-15-6		3-8-6 rose to 3-11-0.
(c) 3-15-0 rose to 4-2-0		3-11-0 to 3-6-6.
(d) 4-2-0, 3-10-0, 3-10-0, 3-10-0		3-6-6, 3-7-0, 3-7-0, 3-7-0.
<i>Ballam—</i>		
(a) Steady 4-1-0		4-1-0.
(b) 4-0-0, 3-8-0, 4-4-0, 4-4-0		4-2-0 to 4-0-0.
(c) 4-0-0, 4-4-0, 4-4-0, 4-4-0		3-8-0 steady.
(d) 4-4-0, 3-11-0, 3-12-0, 3-12-0		3-8-0, 3-5-0, 3-5-0, 3-5-0.
<i>Nagra—</i>		
(a) 3-2-0		3-2-0 to 3-3-0.
(b) 3-2-0 to 4-1-0		3-2-0.
(c) 3-14-0 to 4-2-0, 4-0-0		3-2-6 to 3-4-0.
(d) 4-2-0, 3-8-0, 3-9-0, 3-9-0		3-3-0 to 2-15-0.
<i>Burma small Mill—</i>		
(a) 3-2-0 steady		3-2-0 to 3-3-0.
(b) 3-2-0, 2-15-0		3-2-0.
(c) Not quoted		3-2-6 to 3-4-0.
(d) 23rd January 2-10-0		2-15-0.

*Wholesale prices of Rice at Calcutta.
(at the end of each month).*

Calcutta, Ballam No. 1.

Period.	(per Bazar Md. of 82-2-15 lbs.).								
	1936-37.			1937-38.			1938-39.		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
April	4	0	0	3	14	0	3	14	0
May	4	2	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
June	4	2	0	4	3	0	4	0	0
July	4	2	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
August	4	2	0	4	0	0	4	4	0
September	4	4	0	4	0	0	4	4	0
October	4	8	0	4	2	0	4	4	0
November	4	3	0	4	0	0	4	2	0
December	4	3	0	4	2	0	4	0	0
January	3	12	0	3	14	0			
February	3	12	0	3	12	0			
March	3	13	0	3	11	0			
Average			4	1	3	3	15	6	4
(April-March).									(April to December.)

Mr. Brojendra Narayan Chaudhury: Have the Government of India any knowledge that, though the production of rice in Bengal is not sufficient for the requirements of its population, still a certain quantity is exported and export is greater than the import?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I think there is a question down to that effect.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know the earliest point of time at which notice of termination of this agreement can be given?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know whether representations have been received by Government with regard to excessive imports of rice and paddy into India which are at present depressing the prices both of rice and paddy in India at the principal ports?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Representations with regard to imports of rice and paddy have been received, but from the statement that I have laid on the table it would appear that the average price is not lower than last year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether, in deciding the question of giving notice to Burma of the termination of this Indo-Burma Trade Regulation Order of 1937, Government will also take into consideration the present precarious position of Indians in Burma and have it settled satisfactorily, before we conclude a fresh trade agreement with Burma?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid a trade agreement can concern itself only with the regulation of trade between two countries.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason why Government may not take into consideration the position of Indians in Burma in deciding whether to give notice or not of the termination of the present trade agreement between India and Burma, as they have promised to do in the case of the trade agreement between Ceylon and India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: In the case of Ceylon the question of labour had already been raised and it was felt that all the questions that were pending between the two Governments could not be decided in the course of ordinary trade negotiations. That is why trade negotiations with regard to Ceylon were kept apart from the rest of the trade negotiations with the Board of Trade. With regard to Burma what is under examination in the Commerce Department is the working of the Trade Regulation Order alone and I am afraid that Department is not concerned with the question that the Honourable Member has raised and which is being dealt with by the Department of Education, Health and Lands.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether the Commerce Department will get into touch with the Department of Education, Health and Lands with regard to the position of Indians in Burma, so that India may use her powerful weapon in the matter of trade between the two countries to secure for her nationals safety of life and property at least in Burma?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I do not know that that would be the best way of dealing with the question. As I have said, the question is already being dealt with by the Department of Education, Health and Lands, and I am hoping, if I am not intruding into what concerns the Department which my Honourable friend Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai represents, that it may be satisfactorily settled before the Trade Regulation Order comes under revision.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government take into consideration that question in deciding as to giving notice of termination of the agreement, that is to say, will they keep in touch with the progress of the matter in the other department, in making up their minds to give notice to Burma to terminate this agreement?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I could not, on behalf of the Commerce Department, give that undertaking today.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On behalf of the Government of India, may I have some undertaking that the position of our nationals in Burma will be safeguarded, that Burma will not be allowed to trade with India to her great advantage, and at the same time not give our nationals even the protection of life and property?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a large question of policy, but the Honourable Member may rest assured that the question of safeguarding the interests of Indians will not in any way be neglected.

LOW PRICES OF PADDY IN INDIA.

45. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce please state:

- (a) whether the paddy cultivators in India are realising unremunerative prices;
- (b) whether the low prices are mainly due to large imports of Burma rice into India;
- (c) whether Government propose to take the initiative for a new trade agreement with Burma;
- (d) whether notice of termination of the existing India and Burma Trade Regulation Order will be given; and
- (e) if not, what steps Government intend to take to check the fall in the prices of rice?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Recent enquiries into the cost of production of rice in certain areas do not support the conclusion that prices to the cultivators in those areas are unremunerative. Precise information as to the cost of production in all producing areas is not available.

(b) The course of prices is determined by a number of factors the relative importance of which must be a matter of opinion.

(c) and (d). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer just given by me to parts (a) and (b) of Mr. Chaudhury's question.

(e) Does not arise.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if it is not a fact that prices are likely to rise if there is a check on imports of rice from Burma?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if this Indo-Burma Trade Regulation Order will automatically lapse in April, 1940, or whether a notice will be necessary for termination of that order.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Honourable Member had better read the terms of the Regulation Order.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Are Government aware that large forward contracts have been made with regard to the importation of paddy from Siam and there is an apprehension in the mercantile community that as soon as the goods arrive the prices will fall?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Has not a representation been received by Government to this effect?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I could not say without notice.

RICE PRODUCED IN INDIA AND IMPORTED FROM BURMA.

46. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce please state:

- (a) the amount of rice produced in India in the latest year for which figures are available; and
- (b) the amount of rice imported from Burma during each of the years 1937-38 and 1938-39?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The total production of rice in India for 1937-38 is estimated at 26,544,000 tons.

(b) A statement is laid on the table.

Import of Rice from Burma into India since April, 1937.

	Rice (including broken rice). Tons.	Paddy. Tons.
1937-38	1,197,734	33,233
1938-39 (April to December)	755,600	28,303

DUMPING OF BURMA RICE AT UNECONOMIC PRICES IN BENGAL.

47. *Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether he is aware that in spite of the fact that Bengal is a deficit Province in regard to the production of rice, the price level of rice and paddy is on the down grade in Bengal, and is causing great hardship to the cultivators?

(b) Is this due to the dumping of rice from Burma into Bengal at uneconomic prices?

(c) Have Government considered the necessity and advisability of taking effective steps to put a stop to the dumping of rice from Burma at uneconomic prices in order that cultivators of paddy may obtain remunerative prices for their crop?

(d) In order to achieve that object, have Government considered the advisability of terminating the India and Burma (Trade Regulation) Order of 1937, and having in its place a new trade agreement providing for the proper regulation of the import of Burma rice into India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). The statement of prices which I have laid on the table shows that as compared with last year prices are generally higher and that the premium for local Bengal rice over Burma rice has increased.

(c) and (d). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer just given by me to parts (a) and (b) of Mr. Chaudhury's question.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I know whether the Honourable Member is aware that after a short spurt of rise prices in Madras have gone down to below the usual level of the last three years?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: These questions have been directed to prices in Bengal. With regard to prices in Madras, I must ask for notice.

TARIFF BOARD REPORTS ON CERTAIN INDUSTRIES.

48. *Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether the Tariff Boards appointed to enquire into the question of continuance of protection to the paper and paper pulp, magnesium chloride and sericultural industries have submitted their report?

(b) Have Government examined those reports and formulated their decision thereon?

(c) If so, what are those decisions?

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

(b) The reports are still under examination.

(c) Does not arise.

APPLICATION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF BOARD ON SALT.

49. *Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether any application has been received from the salt industry for the appointment of a Tariff Board to secure a reasonable price in the Calcutta market? If so, what decision, if any, has been reached thereon?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The question should have been addressed to the Honourable the Finance Member.

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF BOARD FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY.

50. *Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government have come to any decision regarding the appointment of a Tariff Board for the textile industry?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: According to the information in the possession of Government, may I know what is the latest date before which they will have to appoint this Tariff Board, taking into account the time the Tariff Board will go into the matter and the time that Government will take to consider its report?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That would depend very much on whether a trade agreement is finally concluded with the United Kingdom and given effect to.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that Government will make up their mind one way or the other after consulting this House about the fresh agreement to take the place of the Ottawa Agreement?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It is only then that the scope of the activities of the Tariff Board which may be set up to deal with the textile industry can be determined.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When does the period of protection end?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I believe on 31st March, 1939.

Mr. Manu Subedar: What would be the position of the textile industry in the meantime—in the interval between the appointment of the Tariff Board and the receipt of its report and the decision of the Government on it?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Honourable Member had better wait and see.

Mr. Manu Subedar: I want to know whether the industry will continue to receive protection on the old basis or a new basis or any temporary basis. What will be the position during the few months that this enquiry will take?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: My answer is the same.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government realise the vital interests involved, or do they propose to take the industry by surprise after 31st March, 1939? Do they realise the danger to the interests of the industry as a whole?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: They appreciate all the considerations that have been suggested.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is it a question of threat to the textile industry that if they do not agree to the terms which Government propose to offer to the United Kingdom, they will be left without protection for a period of a few months?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Honourable Member has no reason to assume that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the reason that Government will not give the industry some notice of their intention as to what they propose to do after two months in view of the vast interests involved?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have already answered that question. Before they come to any decision, Government must be in a position to determine the scope of the activities of the Tariff Board that will be set up.

SCHEMES FOR INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING.

51. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government have formulated any scheme for promoting:

(i) industrial research, and

(ii) industrial planning?

(b) What action has been taken to carry out that scheme?

(c) What amount of money has been spent by Government in 1937-38 for:

- (i) agricultural research, and
- (ii) industrial research?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). As regards industrial research, I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the existence of the Industrial Research Bureau, the functions of which were explained in an answer given to Mr. Mohan Lal Saxena's starred question No. 615 on the 3rd March, 1938. As regards planning, the Government of India's policy is that of discriminating protection, which was laid down in the Government of India, Commerce Department, Resolution No. 3748, dated the 10th July, 1923, under which several important industries have been successfully established in this country.

(c) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the statement laid on the table of the House in answer to part (a) of starred question No. 1018, dated the 14th September, 1938, by Babu Baijnath Bajoria. In addition to the grants mentioned therein a sum of Rs. 2,63,695 was spent on the scheme for the improvement of agricultural marketing during the year 1937-38.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the speech that the Honourable Member made in Bombay that the Government of India will co-operate with the Planning Committee of the Indian National Congress, may I know whether Government have since taken any steps to get into touch with that committee with regard to future industrial planning in this country?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have no recollection of having said anything of the kind that the Honourable Member attributes to me.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I apologise. May I know whether Government have any intention of co-operating with the Industrial Planning Committee of the Indian National Congress, and, if so, what are the lines on which they propose to co-operate?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There is a question down to that effect.

VESTING OF RECIPROCAL POWERS ON THE INDIAN MEDICAL COUNCIL WITH REGARD TO BRITISH MEDICAL QUALIFICATIONS AND INFLUX OF GERMAN AND JEW DOCTORS IN INDIA.

52. *Mr. Lalchand Navarai: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state if Government have received, by now, the report of the Indian Medical Council with a view to vesting in the Council the reciprocal powers with regard to British medical qualifications?

(b) If so, what conclusions have Government come to?

(c) Have Government received any representations from Indian medical practitioners that German and Jewish doctors are flooding this country all round, and what steps do Government propose to take in respect thereto?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). Government have received a copy of a Resolution passed by the Medical Council of India at its meeting on the 24th October, 1938, recommending that the Indian Medical Council

Act, 1938, should be amended so as to make provision of the nature set out in clauses (a) and (b) of section 120 (1) of the Government of India Act, 1935. The matter is under the consideration of Government.

(c) Government have received a copy of a resolution passed by the All-India Medical Conference in December, 1938, suggesting prohibition of the immigration of medical practitioners from countries which do not recognise Indian medical qualifications. That resolution will be examined.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: May I know when the amendment of the Act will be enforced?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The amendment will have to be made before it can be put into force and I cannot say when the amendment will be made.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: May I know when Government will examine the recommendations of the Medical Council and come to a conclusion?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Government will complete their examination as quickly as possible. I cannot assign any precise date as to when it will be completed.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Is it a fact that these Jewish doctors and German doctors are too many here?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The question as to what constitutes too many is a matter of opinion. I cannot say.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Will the Honourable Member give me an idea how many there are?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Well, Sir, if my Honourable friend will put down a precise question to that effect, I will try and get the answer for him.

Mr. J. D. Boyle: Sir, have Provincial Governments got the right to restrict the registration of foreign doctors?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I am speaking from memory but my recollection is that the registration of medical qualifications in the Provinces is primarily the concern of the Provincial Ministries.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is there any provision for requiring permits for German Jews landing in this country? This is something which the Central Government can do.

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

NEGOTIATIONS FOR INDO-BRITISH TRADE AGREEMENT.

53. *Mr. Lalchand Navarai: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commerce be pleased to state if any new Indo-British Trade Agreement has been arrived at? If so, what are its conditions and how far have the Indian interests been vouchsafed?

(b) Do Government propose to introduce any legislation to give effect to any new Indo-British Trade Agreement? If so, when?

(c) If no Indo-British Trade Agreement has been arrived at, will the Honourable Member be pleased to state how far the agreement has been reached?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a), (b) and (c). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply just given to Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar's question No. 35.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: With regard to the answer to clause (a), my question is more comprehensive and the reply does not answer all that I have asked. With regard to the first point, I want to know whether an agreement has been arrived at, what are the conditions, and how far have the Indian interests been vouchsafed?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have said that an agreement has not yet been arrived at; having said that, how can I answer the latter part of the question?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: When is it likely to be concluded?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That also I have answered in reply to other questions.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: That it is indefinite?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Honourable Member was not listening.

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

NEGOTIATIONS FOR INDO-BRITISH TRADE AGREEMENT.

†54. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government's attention has been drawn to the following statement recently made in the House of Commons by Mr. Oliver Stanley, President of the Board of Trade:

"The object of the British Government was to conclude the best trade agreement with India that could be negotiated in the general interest of United Kingdom trade?"

(b) Does that statement represent the intention and instruction of the Government of India also?

(c) If not, what steps have the Government of India taken, or propose to take, to safeguard the interests of Indian trade?

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

(b) and (c). Conversely, Sir, the object of the Government of India has been to conclude the best trade agreement with the United Kingdom that can be negotiated in the commercial and agricultural interests of this country.

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

REPATRIATION OF INDIANS FROM BRITISH GUIANA.

55. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether the British Guiana authorities contemplate returning another shipment of repatriated Indians to India from British Guiana at the nearest future;
- (b) whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made by Mr. Jacob at the recent centenary celebrations in British Guiana regarding Indians there; and
- (c) whether he has taken steps to ensure against further repatriation of Indians from British Guiana?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Not so far as Government are aware.

(b) Government have seen a press report of Mr. Jacob's speech during the Indian centenary celebrations in British Guiana.

(c) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to my reply to part (e) of his starred question No. 1148 on the 19th September, 1938.

Seth Govind Das: Have Government addressed any fresh communication to the Government of British Guiana?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I think on that occasion I told my Honourable friend that the question of the utilization of the emigration fund for purposes of settlement will be examined by the Government of India. And, as my Honourable friend is aware, Mr. Tyson is in British Guiana or will soon be there on behalf of the Government of India. All I can tell him at the moment is that he will look into this question.

Seth Govind Das: Has he been instructed to look into this question particularly?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: His primary duty is to present the case of Indians there before the Royal Commission and he will undoubtedly, in such time as he can spare, examine this question also with special attention.

Seth Govind Das: Will he examine the question of using the emigration fund for keeping the Indians in British Guiana and not repatriating them to India again?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I think he will examine the whole question of repatriation of Indians from British Guiana to India.

INFLUX OF JEWS IN KENYA AND SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTERESTS OF INDIANS.

56. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether Government are alive to the implications of the proposed Kenya Immigration Legislation now in the select committee stages;

- (b) whether Government realize that the immigration of Jewish refugees would create fresh rights for aliens, while Indian British subjects are deprived of them, as in the case of the Kenya Highlands;
- (c) whether Government realize that a large influx of Jews would drive the already settled Indian merchant, trader, professional man and Government servant out of the employment and preferment in Kenya;
- (d) whether he is aware that no Indian was appointed to the Kenya Immigration Advisory Board, which is regarded in Kenya, by Indians, as extremely invidious; and
- (e) what steps Government have taken, or propose to take, to safeguard Indian interests involved in this matter?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a)—(c) and (e). The Government of India have seen the text of the Kenya Immigration Restriction (Amendment No. 2) Ordinance, 1938, and have also received a representation on the subject from the East African Indian National Congress. They have already addressed His Majesty's Government in the matter.

(d) Yes. This matter is also under correspondence with His Majesty's Government.

Seth Govind Das: Is it now a settled fact that Jews are going to be given the highlands of Kenya?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I submit that that does not arise out of this question—as to whether they are to be given the rights of settlement in the Highlands or not.

Seth Govind Das: It arises out of this question because I am raising this question—the condition of Indians as far as the highlands are concerned.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is too general. The Honourable Member ought to put down a more specific question.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF JEWS IN CERTAIN COLONIES IN EAST AFRICA.

57. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether his attention has been drawn to the "Immigration Restriction Ordinance Amending Bill" after its second reading stages;
- (b) whether it is a fact that the East African Indian National Congress communicated with Government by telegram, expressing concern about the proposed settlement of Jews in Kenya, Tanganyika, Zanzibar and Uganda, and the pace at which the Kenya Government were rushing through the Legislative Council the Bill to amend the Immigration Restriction Ordinance; and
- (c) whether he has taken any steps, or proposes to do so, to represent the position to His Majesty's Government for redress, and with what result, if any?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (c). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me just now to his question No. 56.

(b) The East African Indian National Congress in a letter to the Government of India expressed their concern about the entry of Jews into Kenya and their apprehension regarding the Immigration Restriction Ordinance.

Seth Govind Das: Will Government take this occasion and again reopen the question of Indian settlement in the highlands?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I submit that question does not arise directly or indirectly out of this. This is concerned primarily with the Immigration Ordinance.

DUMPING OF BURMA RICE AT UNECONOMIC PRICES IN BENGAL.

58. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- (a) whether the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce approached Government and represented in December last for the termination of the India-Burma (Trade Regulation) Order, 1937, in order to end the menace of dumping of rice in India by Burma;
- (b) whether he has taken steps or proposes to give notice of the termination of the Order of 1937 at the earliest possible date;
- (c) whether he is aware that the dumping of Burmese rice is to a large extent responsible for the low level of prices in rice, specially in Bengal and East Coast markets; and
- (d) whether he proposes consulting this House, or the representatives of the commercial and consuming communities, in the conclusion of the fresh Trade Regulation Order on its various issues?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a), (b) and (c). The Honourable Member is referred to the answers given by me today to similar questions.

(d) Does not arise at present.

DUMPING OF BURMA RICE AT UNECONOMIC PRICES IN BENGAL.

59. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- (a) the total quantity of rice being imported into India from Burma since the enforcement of the "India-Burma (Trade Regulation) Order, 1937";
- (b) whether it is a fact that rice from Burma is imported into India free of import duty;
- (c) whether he is aware that foreign market for Burma rice is almost closed for export and the only resort for Burma rice is to be dumped in Indian markets;
- (d) whether he is aware that Burma has millions of tons of rice in stock to export to India at times of favourable prices; and

- (e) whether he is aware that Burma can compete with Indian rice in India at uneconomic rates for all times to come, when such rice from Burma is allowed entry into India without duty?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the statement laid on the table today in reply to part (b) of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum's starred question No. 46.

- (b) Yes.
 (c) No. It is not borne out by the export figures of Burma.
 (d) Government have no information.
 (e) Government are not so aware.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I know the percentage of exports of rice from Burma which comes to India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is, the percentage of the total export from Burma? I am afraid I will have to require notice.

SELECTION OF DR. DAVIES AS DIRECTOR OF DAIRY RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

60. *Mr. K. S. Gupta: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Dr. Davies of the Reading Institute has been selected by the High Commissioner for India for the office of the Director of Dairy Research Institute to be started in Delhi;
 (b) what are the qualifications of Dr. Davies;
 (c) whether it is a fact that Dr. Davies is an Assistant Chemist in the Reading Institute with no experience in dairying; and
 (d) what is his present salary in England; and what would be the salary of the Director of the Dairy Research Institute to be started in India?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) to (d). The post was advertised in India and England. The pay offered in the advertisement is Rs. 1,800—50—2,050 plus overseas pay of £30 if admissible. No appointment has yet been made.

APPLICATIONS INVITED FOR THE POST OF DIRECTOR OF DAIRY RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

61. *Mr. K. S. Gupta: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state if there was an advertisement calling for applications in India for the office of the Director of Dairy Research Institute? If so, how many persons applied and what are the qualifications of Indian applicants?

(b) Are the Animal Husbandry Expert and Dairy Expert of the Government of India the applicants for the job? If so, what is the result? If not, is there anything to prevent them for applying for the job?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). As stated in answer to the previous question, the post was advertised both in India and England. The Public Service Commission received six applications. The Dairy Expert

was one of the applicants; the Animal Husbandry Expert was not. I have already informed the House that no appointment has yet been made.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Why was the salary fixed so high?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Because Government came to the conclusion that they could not get a suitable man on a lower rate of pay.

REPORT ON THE CONDITIONS AND PROBLEM OF INDIAN CATTLE AND
LOCATION, ETC., OF THE DAIRY RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

62. *Mr. K. S. Gupta: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state whether there is any report of a preliminary study of the local conditions and the problem of Indian cattle? If so, will it be laid on the table of the House?

(b) Has the question of location, lay out and equipment of the Central Dairy Research Institute been decided? If so, by whom?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the Report of Dr. N. C. Wright on the Development of the Cattle and Dairy Industries of India, copies of which are available in the Library of the House.

(b) No. The second part, therefore, does not arise.

AMENDMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1935.

†63. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House please state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that it is contemplated to amend the Government of India Act, 1935, and that there has been correspondence between the Viceroy and the Secretary of State;
- (b) whether the proposals of the Secretary of State have been received and discussed in the cabinet meeting of the Viceroy;
- (c) the conclusion they have arrived at on the proposals received; and
- (d) whether he will lay on the table a copy of the proposals?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I regret that I am not in a position to give any reply to the questions put by the Honourable Member.

FRESH ANTI-ASIATIC AGITATION IN TRANSVAAL.

64. *Mr. K. Santhanam: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to an Associated Press news from New Delhi, published on page 8 of the *Hindu* dated the 20th December, 1938, relating to a fresh anti-Asiatic agitation in Transvaal;
- (b) whether the Government of India have obtained a copy of the memorandum signed by the Chairman and Secretary of the Federation of Rate-payers Association of Pretoria, mentioned in the report, and whether he will lay it on the table of the House;

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

- (c) whether any quarters have at present been reserved for Europeans in Pretoria or other places in Transvaal; and
- (d) whether any, and if so, what, steps are being taken by Government to prevent further discrimination against Indians?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) Government have not received a copy of the memorandum referred to in the Press report, but their Agent General in the Union has reported to them the activities of the Federated Ratepayers' Association of Pretoria.

(c) No.

(d) The Agent General in the Union has taken up the matter with the Minister concerned.

Seth Govind Das: Have the Government of India heard anything recently from the Agent General in this respect?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My answer has taken into account the latest information submitted by the Agent General in South Africa.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I know whether there are any proposals on the part of the Government of South Africa to impose discrimination in accordance with representations made by this Association?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: No, Sir, not so far as the Government of India are aware.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: Has the attention of the Government of India been drawn to the recent trouble in Rustenburg, and if so, are they prepared to say what the root cause is,—that is, in connection with the anti-Indian feeling recently displayed in the Transvaal referred to in the question?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I should be very happy to answer the question with regard to the Rustenburg incident if I am given notice. I have been confining my reply to the question of action or representations made by a certain Association in Pretoria.

Seth Govind Das: Are Government aware that the matter referred to by Sir Raza Ali is connected with this question because it is on account of the activities of this Association that that disturbance has arisen?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Well, Sir, at that rate the state of ill-feeling in South Africa towards Indians may have given rise to a series of incidents, and if I am expected to answer questions in detail with regard to all such incidents, I submit that cannot be reasonably expected.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: Are you in a position to answer it now, or you want notice of the question?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have already said that if my Honourable friend wants information with regard to the Rustenburg incident I should be happy to answer the question if I am given notice.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: With reference to the reply recently given by the Honourable Mr. Stradford, the Minister of the Interior in South Africa, to the deputation of European rate-payers that waited on him giving a sort of assurance about the addition to Indian disabilities in the matter of acquisition of land in the Transvaal, will Government be pleased to say if they have taken any action in the matter, and, if so, what?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My Honourable friend is doubtless referring to a report in the press that Mr. Stadford told the representatives of the Association that if 60 per cent. of the residents in a particular area wanted anti-Asiatic restriction clause to be introduced in leases, he would be prepared to make such a provision by law. My information from the Agent General is that Mr. Stadford did not make a statement to that effect. He might have had some such proposal in mind but he is open to argument and the Agent General is taking up the matter with him.

REVISED INSTRUMENT OF ACCESSION.

65. *Mr. K. Santhanam: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House please state :

- (a) whether the revised Instrument of Accession has been sent to the Rulers of Indian States;
- (b) what is the time limit fixed for the reply; and
- (c) whether a copy of the revised Instrument will be placed on the table of the Assembly, if it has already been issued, and if it has not yet been issued, as and when it is issued?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply which I gave a little while ago to Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar's starred question No. 34.

(b) It is not in the public interest to give information on this point.

(c) No, Sir.

Mr. K. Santhanam: When the original Instrument of Accession was formerly published by Government, may I know what is the objection to the publication of the revised Instrument of Accession so that we may be able to compare the two?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I submit, Sir, that under the rules of Parliamentary practice it is not open to my Honourable friend to cross-examine me as to why it is not in the public interest to give the information.

Mr. K. Santhanam: I am only asking whether Government have any special objection to the publication of the revised Instrument of Accession especially when they have already published the original Instrument of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have nothing to add to the answer. An objection is an objection whether it is a special objection or an ordinary objection.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I ask whether there is anything in the revised Instrument of Accession which is so radically different from the original one that it requires to be kept secret?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I ask at what stage do Government propose to take into their confidence the leaders of people in British India with regard to this matter?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I ask what is the time-limit fixed with reference to clause (b) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The answers which I have given cover that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask whether the Government of India propose to carry on only bilateral negotiations between themselves and the Princes, and keep the people of British India at arm's length throughout?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not admit that insinuation.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether there is any proposal in the mind of Government to take the people of British India into their confidence or this House into their confidence at any stage of the negotiations, with regard to the accession of Indian States to the Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I cannot answer that question because the explanation, if furnished, will involve a lot of discussion, and I am not prepared to discuss the matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask if the Government of India have any intention to consult the Provincial Governments of the eleven provinces who are also interested in the negotiations that are being carried on about the Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I answered this question in an earlier session and I repeat the same answer, namely, that I cannot give the information.

INDIA'S EXPORTS TO AND IMPORTS FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

66. *Mr. K. Santhanam: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce please state :

- (a) the figure of India's exports to and imports from Czechoslovakia for three months before and after the Munich agreement;
- (b) whether the reduction of India's exports to Czechoslovakia have been compensated by increased exports to Germany and to what extent;

(c) whether, as a result of the increasing German influence in Central Europe, India's trade with the countries therein is declining; and

(d) whether the Government of India have taken any steps in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I lay on the table a statement showing India's trade with Czechoslovakia for the quarters ending September, 1938, and December, 1938.

(b) No.

(c) There has been a decrease in India's trade with some of the Central European countries but it is not necessarily due to the reason ascribed by the Honourable Member.

(d) No.

Statement showing India's trade with Czechoslovakia during the quarters ending, September and December, 1938.

	Quarter ending September, 1938. (In lakhs of Rs.)	Quarter ending December, 1938. (In lakhs of Rs.)
Exports to Czechoslovakia	48	14
Imports from Czechoslovakia	32	26

ABOLITION OF ENTERTAINMENT TAX IN NEW DELHI AND GOVERNMENT'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPALITY.

67. *Mr. K. Santhanam: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state when the entertainment tax in New Delhi was abolished?

(b) What was the amount received from that tax?

(c) What is the contribution from the revenues of the Government of India for the upkeep of the New Delhi Municipality?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). No entertainment tax has hitherto been imposed in the New Delhi Municipality.

(c) The grant-in-aid to be paid during the current year to the New Delhi Municipal Committee is Rs. 3.34 lakhs.

REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING THE INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUMENT OF INSTRUCTIONS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

68. *Mr. K. Santhanam: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House please state :

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the press report published in the *Hindustan Times* of the 5th January, 1939, relating to certain representations by European commercial interests regarding the interpretation of the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General and the Secretary of State's reply thereon;

- (b) whether he will place the text of the representations and the reply on the table of the House;
- (c) whether the representations were made through the Government of India, or directly; and
- (d) whether the Secretary of State consulted the Government of India before he gave his reply?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) Yes.

(b) to (d). A joint memorial, dated the 24th May, 1937, was submitted direct to the Secretary of State by the Associated Chambers of Commerce and the European Association suggesting certain amendments to the draft Instrument of Instructions to be issued to the Governor General after the establishment of Federation. This memorial was considered by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Government of India. The Reforms Office letter No. F. 122/37-G., dated the 27th July, 1938, to the President, the Associated Chambers of Commerce, containing the substance of the proposals made and the views of the Secretary of State thereon is placed in the Library of the House.

ACTION ON CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY INDIANS IN FIJI.

69. *Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state if he has seen newspaper reports to the effect that Indians in Fiji, under the presidentship of the Honourable Pandit Hridayanath Kunzru, passed resolutions to the following effect :

- (1) that an enquiry into the economic condition of the Indians in the Colony is essential and in the proposed Commission there should be representatives of both Indians and the Government of India; and
- (2) that Indians be appointed to the Fiji Governor's Executive Council?

(b) Have these resolutions been received by the Government of India? If so, what action have they taken or propose to take in the matter?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: Are the Government of India in correspondence with the Colonial Office on this subject?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The resolution has only recently been received and I cannot say that the Government of India have already taken it up with the Colonial Office.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: Is it receiving the active consideration of the Government of India?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: That is so.

USE OF SWADESHI PAPER IN PUBLICATIONS SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE.

70. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state whether for the purpose of the supply and sale of Legislative Assembly and Council of State Manuals, debates, stationery and all publications issued by the Departments to the Members of the Indian Legislature, swadeshi paper is being used and if not why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: With the exception of a small quantity of superior letter paper and envelopes, Indian manufactured paper is used.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the "exception", is it because there is no such paper manufactured in India, or is it because it is too costly even after allowing the 10 per cent. price for the Swadeshi articles?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am not quite definite but I believe it is the former.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government take up the matter through the Departments concerned, with a view to finding out whether we can get that paper manufactured in this country?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That matter is being kept constantly under consideration.

Mr. K. Santhanam: Are Government considering the advisability of using only such paper as is produced in India? Is there any fixed rule that only a particular kind of paper should be used for certain purposes?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: This is a small quantity and the Honourable Member can judge for himself the extent to which this policy has been followed from the fact that the purchase of paper outside India since 1928-29 has fallen from Rs. 1,72,000 to Rs. 14,000 in 1935-36.

WORKING OF THE REFORMS OFFICE.

71. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House be pleased to state :

- (a) the present strength and personnel of the Reforms Office;
- (b) how long it has been in existence;
- (c) how much longer it is proposed to continue it in existence;
- (d) what are the main functions which are being discharged by the Reforms Office now; and
- (e) whether the Reforms Office works directly under any Member of Government or of the Governor General?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The staff of the Reforms Office consists now of a Reforms Commissioner and a Deputy Secretary assisted by a small ministerial establishment.

(b) The organisation was started in 1927 as a special branch of the Home Department, but has functioned as a separate, though temporary, Department of the Government of India since May, 1930.

(c) and (d). While the introduction of the constitutional scheme is still incomplete, it is considered necessary to retain a Reforms organization in some form, and the matter is under consideration.

(e) Since its creation in 1980 the Reforms Office has been in the personal portfolio of His Excellency the Governor General and that is the present position.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (d) of the question, I should like to know whether the Honourable Member can give the House some indication of the main functions which are now being discharged by the Reforms Office.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I can only answer it in a general way that they have got to deal with all questions arising in connection with the expected introduction of the Federation. What more can I say?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that the "astrologer" is in possession of the facts, may I ask what are the specific functions which this Department is now discharging, and whether the Government of India have satisfied themselves that the work now being discharged by them requires the existing staff of a highly paid Reforms Commissioner, a Deputy Secretary, and the ministerial staff?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If they had not been so satisfied they would not have maintained the staff.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are you so sure?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Absolutely.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if Government have any intention of absorbing this office as part of the Home Department at a very early stage?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have said that the matter is under consideration and I cannot reply to this question. I am not aware of any such existing intention.

WORKING OF THE NEW INDIAN LEGISLATIVE RULES IN RESPECT OF STARRED QUESTIONS FOR ORAL ANSWER.

72. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Law Member be pleased to state :

- (a) whether Government have examined the working of the new Indian Legislative Rules in respect of starred questions for oral answer in the Assembly;
- (b) whether Government have consulted the heads of departments concerned for the answering of questions; if so, what their opinions are; and
- (c) whether Government propose to consult Leaders of Parties in the House, and reconsider the whole question with a view to make the necessary changes in the Indian Legislative Rules?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). All Departments participated in an examination of the working of the new rule which was undertaken after the termination of the first Session during which the

rule was in operation and all Departments were agreed that the rule had worked satisfactorily.

(c) No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason why Government will not consult the leaders of Parties, while they have consulted their own Departments? After all, it is the non-official Members of the House who have to do bulk of the work. May I know why Government refuse to consult leaders of Parties?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: They would have had consultation if they had felt that there was any necessity for it, and if there was any inconvenience which had arisen.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government satisfied themselves that no inconvenience has been caused to non-official Members in this House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Yes, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On what grounds?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: By the absence of loud clamour to the contrary.

AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE FRANCHISE ORDINANCE OF CEYLON.

73. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state :

- (a) whether Government have definitely refused to accept the recent amendment to the Village Franchise Ordinance passed by the Ceylon Legislative Council;
- (b) whether Government have considered that the exclusion of Sinhalese estate labourers will not at all redress the grievances of the Indian estate labourers;
- (c) whether Government are aware that the Sinhalese labourers will get the franchise in some other form as they do not live on the estate;
- (d) whether Government have made representations to His Majesty's Government not to allow this Bill to become law;
- (e) whether Government are aware that the Governor of Ceylon has referred the amended Bill to His Majesty's Government for fresh consideration; and
- (f) whether Government propose to take adequate and prompt steps in this matter?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a), (d) and (f). The Government of India have already represented to His Majesty's Government that, in their opinion, the amended Ordinance does not meet the Indian point of view.

(b) Yes.

(c) Government understand that this may happen in many cases.

(e) The Bill has since received His Majesty's assent and has become law.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Since the Bill has become law, may I know whether the Government of India have made or propose to make any further representations in view of the obvious injustice done to the Indian estate labourers?

Sir Girdja Shankar Bajpai: As my Honourable friend is aware the position of the Government of India has been made perfectly clear both to the Government of Ceylon and to His Majesty's Government at every stage. My Honourable friend is also aware of the action which the Government of India took when it became apparent that the Ceylon Government were not responsive to their suggestion for the Ordinance to be amended on certain lines. At the present moment the Government of India do not think that any further representations or repetition of arguments is likely to be effective.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether my Honourable friend will press on the Commerce Department of the Government of India to take into consideration this question also, when trade negotiations between Ceylon and India are opened and conducted?

Sir Girdja Shankar Bajpai: The Honourable the Commerce Member has already indicated to my Honourable friend and the House that the intention is that these trade negotiations should not be limited to trade matters only and I think I can tell him that when other matters come up, this aspect of the Indian problem will be borne in mind.

DUTIES OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA IN LONDON.

74. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member be pleased to state :

(a) what are the main duties of the High Commissioner for India in London; and

(b) whether in any sense he is the political representative of India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to annexure E on pages 77-81 of the Account Code, First Edition (reprint) a copy of which is in the Library.

(b) The Honourable Member must draw his own conclusions from the reply I have given to part (a) of his question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I cannot draw my own conclusions. May I ask for some help from Government whose representative in London is the High Commissioner, whether according to their interpretation of these various functions, there is cast on him any duty which makes him wholly or partially, directly or indirectly, the political representative of India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am unable to give a legal opinion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government have considered his recent speeches speaking as a "plenipotentiary" or a "diplomatic representative" of India, and whether they have examined his duties from

the point of view of instructions laid down and drawn his attention to the fact that his duties as defined do not extend to those speeches?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: This point was canvassed at great length between the Honourable Member and myself during the last Session.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether the Government of India have come to any conclusion on this question, that if they do want a political representative for India, they must have other agencies and not allow the High Commissioner to discharge the duties of a political representative?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I do not think that question arises.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government have acquiesced in the position that the present High Commissioner has taken that he can speak of the political aspirations and ambitions of this country and pose in other countries as if he speaks the voice of the people of India in political matters?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The High Commissioner has done nothing to which the Government of India could take objection.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have the Government of India examined his speeches from this point of view, and have they satisfied themselves that his statements in Canada with regard to our ambition and political future is consistent with his duties as the High Commissioner for India?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Having regard to the purpose for which he visited Canada and the position he occupied there, no objection could be taken to his speeches.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I quite see the distinction which the Honourable Member draws, but it is neither here nor there, but *per se* his position as High Commissioner, is he free to make such speeches?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is an argument.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This has been fully canvassed before.

†75*.

MONOPOLY FOR THE SUPPLY OF MILK IN NEW DELHI.

76. ***Mr. K. S. Gupta:** (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands state whether it is a fact that the milk supply to the New Delhi residents is monopolised by a European firm, Messrs. Keventers and Company?

(b) Is the milk supplied pure and genuine?

† Cancelled.

(c) Is it daily examined by the authorities concerned before it is distributed?

(d) What is the sediment due to at the bottom of vessels, if the milk supplied is allowed to remain for some time?

(e) How many seers per rupee are sold by the above mentioned firm?

(f) Is the Honourable Member aware that pure and genuine cow's milk was sold by *gowalas* at eight seers per rupee before the monopoly?

(g) Are Government aware that inferior milk at a higher rate is a great hardship on the poor and the middle class people living in New Delhi?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) No.

(b) Yes, so far as is known.

(c) No, but analyses are carried out from time to time.

(d) Government have no information.

(e) The price charged by the firm is 2 as. 6 ps. a seer.

(f) Milk was, and still is, supplied by *gowalas*, but Government have no knowledge of the quality of the milk supplied nor of the price charged.

(g) No.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not one of the duties of the Local Government or the Central Government to see that no adulteration is carried on and the milk supplied by the *Keventers* or the *gowalas* is examined by scientific experts?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My Honourable friend is aware of the provisions of the Punjab Municipalities Act which prescribes the procedure to be followed for the prevention of sale of adulterated articles of food.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: With reference to part (f), why is it then the Honourable Member said that no examination has been made of the quality of milk supplied by the *gowalas*?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: What I said was this:

"Milk was, and still is, supplied by *gowalas*, but Government have no knowledge of the quality of the milk supplied nor of the price charged."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why is it that Government have not supplied themselves with information in regard to the quality of milk supplied by the *gowalas* if they have been carrying on any periodical examination of the milk that is supplied by the various agencies?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My Honourable friend will appreciate the fact that the question whether the milk supplied by *gowalas* is adulterated or not can be ascertained only if some consumer will make a report to the Health Officer. We do not know whether such reports have been made or not.

INSTITUTIONS FOR RESEARCH OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

77. ***Mr. K. S. Gupta:** (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state how many institutions of Research for Food and Drugs are established in India?

(b) What is the contribution by the Government of India to any of those institutions?

(c) What is the control of the Government of India over such institutions?

(d) Is there any contemplation on the part of the Government of India to extend the scope of such Research to find out the cheapest and the most wholesome food for the poorest in India?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) The Nutrition Research Laboratories, Coonoor, and the Biochemical Standardisation Laboratory, Calcutta, deal exclusively with Food and Drug research, respectively. In addition, there are a number of other institutions, where such research is a part-time activity and carried on with grants-in-aid by the Indian Research Fund Association and the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.

(b) The Nutrition Research Laboratories at Coonoor are financed by the Indian Research Fund Association which receive an annual grant of Rs. 1,50,000 from the Government of India. In addition, the pay of the Assistant Director of the Laboratories is met by the Central Government. The Biochemical Standardisation Laboratory, Calcutta, is financed in full by the Government of India.

(c) The Biochemical Standardisation Laboratory is a Government institution. The Nutrition Research Laboratories at Coonoor are controlled by the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association on which the Government of India are represented.

(d) The investigations already in progress cover the scope referred to.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government aware of the fact that the all India Village Industries Association popularly known as A. I. V. A. has been carrying on researches to find out the cheapest and the most wholesome food for the poorest in India without any assistance from the Government of India?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I do not have any information about the activities of the Association to which my Honourable friend refers.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government ascertain the nature of research that is being carried on by this Association and find out whether they can assist it either by way of fund or by way of additional scientific research through the various organisations under their control?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I would suggest that there is nothing to prevent the Association from approaching the Government or the Indian Research Fund Association as the case may be.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Gupta has exhausted his quota of five questions and so question No. 78 will not be answered orally.

INDIAN AGENT IN BURMA.

†78. ***Mr. K. S. Gupta:** (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state when the Burma Agent of the Government of India took charge of office in Burma?

(b) What is the staff he is provided with?

(c) What is the nature of work he is doing?

(d) Is he submitting any periodical reports about the situation and his work in Burma? Will the reports, if any, be placed on the table?

(e) Is he negotiating with the Government of Burma about the compensation to be awarded for the losses of property and life caused to the Indian nationals in Burma? What is the result?

(f) Is he taking any part in the criminal cases pending against the Burmans for the murders, loot and arson committed in the last Burma riots?

(g) What is the relief and protection given by the Agent to those nationals remaining in Burma after the riots?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) In September, 1938.

(b) One stenographer and two peons for the present.

(c), (f) and (g). The Agent keeps himself in touch with the situation in Burma and his primary duty is to look after the interests of Indians in Burma, particularly of Indian labour. He is not taking part in any criminal proceedings.

(d) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply to supplementary questions to Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar's starred question No. 1377 on the 22nd November, 1938.

(e) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me to Messrs. Abdul Qaiyum and Avinashilingam Chettiar's starred questions Nos. 1214 and 1228 on the 14th November, 1938.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIA AT THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT CONFERENCE.

79. ***Mr. Manu Subedar:** (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether India was represented at the meeting of the International Wheat Committee, which met in London in the first week of January? If so, by whom?

(b) Is there a proposal for an International Wheat Conference to be held and, if so, is it intended that India should participate?

(c) Can Government assure this House that no commitments would be made, which would prevent free export from India of wheat as and when the same becomes economically possible?

(d) Have Government got a copy of the agenda of the points which are proposed to be discussed at this conference?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes, by Sir David Meek, Indian Trade Commissioner in London.

(b) The reply to the first portion is in the affirmative. As regards the latter portion, no invitation has so far been received by the Government of India.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) No, Sir.

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

RATE WAR BETWEEN SHIPPING COMPANIES CARRYING HAJ PILGRIMS.

80. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government are aware that great hardship was experienced by numerous intending Haj pilgrims on account of the sudden rise in the price of tickets over the figures which, they were given to understand, would be charged when they left their country homes, as soon as one of the lines running pilgrim ships closed its season?

(b) Have Government enquired whether a large number of intending Hajis were stranded without the necessary passage and did not get the accommodation?

(c) Have Government received any representation on the subject?

(d) Have Government re-started the negotiations with regard to a settlement on the question of the rate war between the two companies with a view to stable conditions for the pilgrim traffic?

(e) What is the present position in this matter and what steps do Government intend to take to put an end to the difficulties of intending travellers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (c). Representations were received to this effect.

(b) On the matter being taken up with the steamship company concerned, the company, while not admitting the allegations made, agreed to provide accommodation for such pilgrims at rates not higher than those at which previous bookings had been made.

(d) and (e). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the statement made by me on the 8th December, 1938, in reply to questions Nos. 1973, 1974 and 1975 and to the answers to the supplementaries arising therefrom. There have been no further developments.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the interest taken by the Honourable Member in this subject, may I know whether the Honourable Member will use his good offices for negotiations being opened and a settlement arrived at as and when occasion arises?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid the occasion is not likely to arise for some months.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: The Honourable Member's reply, if I understood him aright, was that he was helpless in this matter owing to the fact that both the parties were going beyond the agreement which had been reached. May I know whether Government propose to take steps by which when an agreement is reached through the good offices of the Government, it may be made binding and compulsory on both parties.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There was a long list of supplementaries on the previous occasion in which I dealt
12 Noon. with all aspects of this matter.

(b) WRITTEN ANSWERS.

PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT OF NON-OFFICIAL ADVISERS OF THE
INDO-BRITISH TRADE AGREEMENT.

81. *Mr. Manu Sutedar: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state :

- (a) whether Government have seen an article by Mr. Platt, written on behalf of the Lancashire textile industry, giving a threat to India that, if the terms asked for by Lancashire are not given, Indian cotton would be boycotted;
- (b) whether Government have seen a statement in the papers by one of the non-official advisers refuting this article, saying that the facts were not correct and complaining that the said member was unable, until the ban of secrecy was lifted, to point out what the correct facts were;
- (c) whether Government have considered the question of publishing the reports of the non-official advisers in view of matters considered confidential at this end being freely discussed and disclosed in the United Kingdom; and
- (d) if the reply to part (c) be in the negative, will Government give reasons?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Government have seen press reports to this effect.

(c) and (d). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the answers given to Seth Govind Das's question No. 428, on the 24th August, 1938, and the supplementaries arising therefrom and also to the answers given on the 14th September, 1938, to parts (b) and (c) of Mr. K. Santhanam's question No. 1014 and the supplementaries.

FALL IN THE PRICES OF COPRA.

82. *Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce be pleased to state:

- (a) the price of copra in west coast (Malabar) in the years 1930 to 1938;
- (b) the main causes for the serious fall in prices;
- (c) whether the dumping of copra from Ceylon is not the real cause for the fall in prices;
- (d) whether the Honourable Member has read the address of the Honourable Mr. Yakub Hussain, Public Works Minister of the Government of Madras, at the Cocosnut Growers' Conference, published in the *Madras Mail* in its issue dated the 5th January, 1939, and its sub-leader thereon; and
- (e) whether Government are prepared to investigate the matter fully and impose protective duty on copra and cocoanut oil, imported from Ceylon and other places; if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) A statement showing the prices of copra at Cochin for the years 1931 to 1938 is laid on the table. Authentic information relating to other markets on the West coast of India is not available.

(b) and (c). The price of copra is affected by various factors and these are being investigated by Government.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answers given on the 22nd November, 1938, to Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar's starred question No. 1378 and its supplementaries.

Statement showing the prices of Copra in rupees per candy of 654 lbs. at Cochin.

Year.	Price.	
	Rs.	₹.
1931	59	5
1932	73	5
1933	51	12
1934	38	0
1935	53	7
1936	68	1
1937	66	13

1938

January	51	0
February	44	0
March	43	0
April 2	40	0
April 9	38	0
May	42	0
June	40	0
July	41	0
August	43	0
September	42	8
October	45	0
November	45	0
December	47	0

PROPOSAL TO HOLD THE FEDERAL COURT IN OOTACAMUND.

83. *Mr. M. Thirumala Rao: (a) Will the Honourable the Law Member please state whether it is a fact that the Judges of the Federal Court propose holding their Court in Ootacamund this summer?

(b) If so, is it necessitated by the volume of work from Madras Province?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Chief Justice of India informs me that no such proposal has been considered by the Court.

(b) Does not arise.

PROTECTION TO COCOANUT INDUSTRY AGAINST COMPETITION FROM CEYLON.

84. *Mr. M. Thirumala Rao: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether his attention is drawn to the proceedings of the All-Kerala Coconut Growers' Conference held at Narakal and published in the issue of the *Hindu* of the 6th January, 1939?

(b) Is the Honourable Member aware that dumping of Ceylon produce at low prices has seriously hit the Indian producer?

(c) If so, do Government propose to afford due protection against unfair competition from Ceylon?

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

(b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given by me today to parts (b), (c) and (e) of Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hedge's starred question No. 82.

QUESTIONNAIRE ISSUED BY THE ALL-INDIA NATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE.

85. *Mr. M. Thirumala Rao: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government have received a copy of the questionnaire issued by the All-India National Planning Committee organised by the Congress?

(b) If so, have they replied to relevant questions that can be answered by the Government of India?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government lay on the table of the House a copy of the reply sent by them?

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

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

SIR THOMAS AINSCOUGH'S REMARKS REGARDING INDIA'S INDUSTRIAL POLICY.

86. *Mr. M. Thirumala Rao: (a) Has the attention of the Honourable the Commerce Member been drawn to Reuters summary of the report of Sir Thomas Ainscough, Senior Trade Commissioner in India, published in the *Hindu* dated the 13th January, 1939?

(b) If so, have Government considered the remarks made in that report that India's attempt to become industrially developed will result in serious clash of interest with agricultural interests and a crisis in India's finances?

(c) Do Government propose to align their industrial policy on the basis of these remarks?

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

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT CONFERENCE.

87. *Mr. M. Thirumala Rao: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state whether Government have received a report of the World Wheat Conference which was recently held in London?

(b) Was there any proposal to control crop production by fixing export quotas, which should be binding on those assembled?

(c) Has India been represented at this Conference?

(d) Is India's position at the Conference independent of British lead?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The Honourable Member is apparently referring to the International Wheat Advisory Committee which met in London last month. If so, the reply is in the affirmative.

(b) No such question was discussed at the meeting of the Committee.

(c) and (d). Yes, Sir.

INDIANS IN TANGANYIKA.

37A. *Mr. Manu Subedar: Will the Education Secretary please state whether Government have any information as to:

(i) the number of Indians who have gone to Tanganyika during the last five years; and

(ii) the amount of Indian capital sunk there?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (i) A statement showing the number of Indians and Goans who entered the Tanganyika territory during the years 1933-1937 is placed on the table of the House. Separate figures for Indians are not available.

(ii) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me on the 17th November, 1938, to part (b) of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetty's starred question No. 1306B.

Statement showing the number of Indians and Goans entering the Tanganyika Territory during the years 1933-1937.

Year.	Number.
1933	654
1934	763
1935	885
1936	1183
1937	1405

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ANTI-INDIAN RIOTS IN BURMA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has received a notice of a motion of adjournment from Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi who wants to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, recrudescence of anti-Indian riots in Burma, looting Indian shops and burning Indian cotton mill at Monywa, and the failure of the Government of India in securing the safety of the life and property of the Indians in Burma. Is there any objection to this motion?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion will be taken up at 4 O'Clock this afternoon.

RESOLUTION RE WITHDRAWAL OF INDIA FROM THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that immediate steps be taken under Article 1 (3) of the Covenant of the League of Nations to give notice of India's intention to withdraw from the League, among others, for the reason that the League has failed to implement the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant against covenant-breaking members of the League."

The history of the League of Nations is indeed a sorrowful tale. No institution was begun with such great hopes as the League of Nations. It was after the great war, when millions of people had died and millions of others had been maimed that President Wilson gave the hope, in his idealism, that war can be stopped and stopped for all time. It is with that intent that this League of Nations was founded. It begins with these grandiloquent words: "The High Contracting Parties in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security", etc. The purpose and the object of the League of Nations was to stop all war and to guarantee collective security in this world. But there has been no greater failure of its purpose than it has been attended within recent years. Even in the year following the establishment of the League of Nations we find that the guarantee of collective security was no easy thing. In 1920 itself there was the matter of deciding the Polish-Lithuanian frontier, and just as a Commission was getting busy about it General Zeligowski of Poland marched into Vilna and seized it. In 1922, another thing happened and that was that Gabriel D'Annunzio made a raid with a private army in defiance of the League and seized Fiume on the Dalmatian coast. In 1923, when the League Assembly was in session there came word that Mussolini, now the leader of Italy, was bombarding Corfu as a reprisal for the killing of two Italian officers by Greeks when they were examining the proposed line of the Greco-Albanian frontier. Even before the League was finally established we find there were States who did not care a bit for the guarantee of collective security but were taking the law into their own hands. The main purpose of the League was collective security and if the members of the League who signed the Covenant of the League of Nations had any sincerity in their professions, the acid test of that sincerity was to be found in their pledge to establish general disarmament on a low scale for national defence. There are people who deny that this pledge of disarmament was ever made, but I would like to read from the Covenant these lines which cover this matter. The words are clear in the Covenant:

"The members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety. The Council shall formulate for such restrictions."

It was also stated formally at the Peace Conference that the "conditions as to German armaments are not solely intended to incapacitate Germany from a renewal of her policy of military aggression. They also constitute the first step towards the reduction and general limitation of armaments as being one of the most effective preventives of war, and one of the first tasks which the League of Nations must strive to perform."

Then, there were these disarmament conferences. They dragged on for three or four or five years. I have seen in this Library the volumes of the proceedings of the disarmament conferences: they are great only in one respect and that is in their bulk. The result was nil. Germany was in the meantime admitted to the League of Nations and she walked out of the League for the reason that all the disarmament that was required was with reference to Germany alone and as regards the other powers that had come out victorious in the war, they were not for any kind of disarmament; and the result was that Germany left the League of Nations in a huff on the plea that they were not sincere in their efforts. The statement which the German delegate made on that occasion is worth reading:

"In the light of the course which recent discussions of the powers concerned have taken in the matter of disarmament, it is now clear that the Disarmament Conference will not fulfil what is its sole object, namely, general disarmament. It is also clear that the failure of the Conference is due solely to the unwillingness on the part of the highly armed states to carry out their contractual obligations to disarm. This renders impossible the satisfaction of Germany's recognised claim to equality of rights and the condition on which the German government agreed at the beginning of this year to take part in the work of the Conference thus no longer exists."

The German delegates left and then Germany started on a rearmament which created new forces in Europe and led step by step to the terrific rearmament programme of Great Britain and of all other nations in Europe today. Today Europe is an armed camp, each country trying to arm itself to the utmost, to the breaking point; and the notions of collective security were in no greater danger than today. I do not wish to refer to the invasion of Abyssinia by Italy because it is recent history and need not be retold, but I would like to read one passage about the effects of this war:

"The poor Negus was all the time pleading with the League of Nations for protection and even while he was pleading the League of Nations allowed Mussolini to transfer all his troops into Abyssinia so that he could fight better the helpless Negus and the Abyssinians. The effect of the war, it is not too much to say, was the complete shattering of all the prestige of the League."

The failure of sanctions against Italy has been the greatest defeat to British diplomacy in current times and has made the League of Nations impotent in the eyes of all aggressive nations.

I shall not refer to what Japan did in Manchuria before this happened in Abyssinia. Next comes the story of Czechoslovakia which is quite fresh in our minds. The League of Nations had guaranteed many things and among them was the security to the smaller states; and when the matter of Czechoslovakia came up we know how well Great Britain and France guaranteed the security of a small State like Czechoslovakia which had depended on them for security and upon the League of Nations; Czechoslovakia had no other support on which to depend against an aggressive State like Germany. I do not wish to repeat here what happened only a few months ago. I would only remark that collective security today is nowhere present in Europe or elsewhere. In my opinion the guarantee of collective security by the League of Nations could never be true for the reason that it never had sanction by which it could have enforced its claim for collective security. It allowed all the member States to arm themselves to the teeth, and when they were so armed the League of Nations had no sanction or strength behind it by which it could maintain collective security. I should

[Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

like to read one passage from one of the latest books published on the League of Nations—"Co-operation or Coercion" by L. P. Jacks. He says:

"Collective security in the well-ordered state implies that the citizen renounces his quarrels to the jurisdiction of public law. He must leave the government to do the fighting, if fighting there is to be done. He is not at liberty to destroy his enemy if he can, nor to threaten him with lethal weapons. Except in cases of emergency, when the arm of the law is not available to protect him, the taking of the law into his own hands is sternly forbidden, and necessarily so if the collective system is to work. The principle of collective resistance by the state is here combined with that of non-resistance by the individual, except in so far as he resists his opponent by handing him over to the law."

No approach to these conditions is visible among the sovereign states now constituting the League of Nations. The tendency is in the opposite direction. While pledged under the terms of the Covenant to combine their forces for mutual protection, they show not the slightest disposition to renounce the right of independent belligerency, but continue to arm themselves without limit, the left hand thus destroying the value of the pledges given by the right. Nothing could be more inconsistent with the conditions under which the rule of law is maintained in the political state. Until the right of independent belligerency in their own defence, with the attendant right of arming at discretion for the purpose is surrendered, the structure of the league will fail to reproduce the structure of any of them."

So, in the absence of any sanction by which the League can enforce its decisions, it is not surprising that it has failed in its purpose. It requires no great intelligence to see that the League has failed today in its main purpose, and it does not require any argument to show that the League does not serve any more the main purpose for which it was founded. It is not, therefore, surprising that we have come forward to move this Resolution. Arguments have been advanced that the League has served other purposes than political. It has been pointed out of the 32 million odd Swiss francs, barely two million francs is spent on purely political work and that nearly 93.2 per cent. of the League finances are expended on non-political and constructive work beneficial for the whole world, including India. It is said that for this reason India should continue to maintain its connection with the League. I would like to put before you another view of the case. If the money spent in the League is spent on non-political matters, it is up to us to know how much of the money that we pay to the League we get the benefit of. It is pointed out that the amount of contribution paid by India to the League has been reduced of late because of the separation of Burma. Today we pay nearly Rs. 10 lakhs to the League annually. May I ask what return we get for this amount? I think a few thousand rupees is paid for an office of the League in India. A few people get employment in the Secretariat of the League in Geneva; over and above that I would like to know whether any effort is being made so that India might get more benefit from the League. As far as I can see India is being tied to the chariot wheels of England and votes for her in the League. Unless India becomes independent she stands to get no benefit from being in the League today, except paying ten lakhs of rupees every year and giving a vote to England. In the present circumstances I do not see any reason why India should be made to pay out of her exchequer a big sum of ten lakhs: in this connection I would like to quote a passage from the speech of the Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar in the League of Nations when he had been there in the last year along with the Indian delegation. It is indeed not surprising that one like him could have given support to the Resolution that we are moving here today. I will read to the House a few extracts from what he said to

show how he has lent support to this Resolution. He laid on the table of the House a passage from his speech on the 17th November, 1938, and that passage reads as follows :

"A certain section of opinion in India was opposed not merely to Article 16, but to all the other Articles of the Covenant, and that section was gaining ground owing to the rapidly decreasing prestige of the League. The League had been described as a body which could neither punish its enemies nor help its friends. The matter was further complicated by another consideration, not strictly relevant to the interpretation of Article 16. There was in India a strong feeling of grievance about the representation of its nationals in the administration of the League; that factor also has a bearing on India's attitude."

Then, I read his opinion, which is more relevant to the matter under issue before the House :

"If the League could not justify its existence by constructive work towards the end for which it was established, India might lose all interest in Article 16 and every other Article of the Covenant. Personally he was opposed to the secession of India from the League, but he desired to direct attention to the fact that such a measure was a possibility, even a probability, in view of the changes in the constitution of India which were expected to come into effect at no distant date."

I would repeat again, Sir, that "he desired to direct attention to the fact at the secession of India from the League was a possibility, even a probability, in view of the changes in the Constitution of India which were expected to come into effect at no distant date".

Sir, the only difference there will be in the Constitution that is coming, over the present constitution is that the coming constitution may be responsible, while the present one is irresponsible, and the implication is, the moment there is a responsible constitution, limited as it is, India will give notice to secede from the League. That is the meaning of what my friend has said in his speech. Today we have an irresponsible executive; they may not secede from the League, but the moment the future Constitution is ushered in, and the moment the people of this country get responsibility even to the extent to which the Federation under the Government of India Act, 1935, gives it, then to quote the words of my Honourable friend,— 'such a measure would be a possibility, even a probability'. From that speech it is clear that the Government are well aware that the overwhelming public opinion in India is to secede from the League of Nations for no other reason than that the League no more counts in the politics of Europe and world today, and that the money spent on the League today is money wasted, and for this reason we have brought forward this Resolution. Sir, I move.

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

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that immediate steps be taken under Article 1 (3) of the Covenant of the League of Nations to give notice of India's intention to withdraw from the League, among others, for the reason that the League has failed to implement the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant against covenant-breaking members of the League."

Notice has been given of three amendments to this Resolution. The first stands in the name of Mr. Joshi. Will Honourable Members only move their amendments first, and then there will be a discussion on the Resolution and the amendments. Honourable Members have only to move their amendments formally, and then there will be a discussion.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-official): I move, Sir:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to convey to the League of Nations India's dissatisfaction that in major political issues it has so far failed to achieve its purpose of bringing about international peace and protecting the interests of smaller nations, to put forward before the League proposals for making it a better and more effective instrument for accomplishing its aims and objects by strengthening the Covenant of the League and otherwise and for India's more effective participation in its work and also recommends to the Government of India to take such steps, as are necessary to secure the acceptance of its proposals by the League'."

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

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to convey to the League of Nations India's dissatisfaction that in major political issues it has so far failed to achieve its purpose of bringing about international peace and protecting the interests of smaller nations, to put forward before the League proposals for making it a better and more effective instrument for accomplishing its aims and objects by strengthening the Covenant of the League and otherwise and for India's more effective participation in its work and also recommends to the Government of India to take such steps, as are necessary to secure the acceptance of its proposals by the League'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The next amendment in the list is by Sir Syed Raza Ali. He has given notice of it only yesterday. The Standing Orders require two days notice. This, it appears, has been circulated to all the Honourable Members.

Secretary of the Assembly: It was circulated last evening.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Under the circumstances, the Chair is prepared to waive the Standing Order.

Sir Syed Raza Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I move:

"(a) That after the words 'Governor General in Council that' the words 'unless the League of Nations agrees to reduce India's contribution to 2,00,000 francs with effect from 1941' be inserted;

(b) that the word 'immediate' occurring in the first line be omitted; and

(c) that all the words occurring after the words 'to withdraw from the League' be omitted."

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

"(a) That after the words 'Governor General in Council that' the words 'unless the League of Nations agrees to reduce India's contribution to 2,00,000 francs with effect from 1941' be inserted;

(b) that the word 'immediate' occurring in the first line be omitted; and

(c) that all the words occurring after the words 'to withdraw from the League' be omitted."

Then, there is a third amendment in the name of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: General): Sir, I move:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added:

'and also for the reason that Great Britain has persisted in following an utterly wrong policy with regard to Palestine, in contravention of Article 22 of the Covenant, and in open disregard of the feelings of the Indian Nation in this matter'."

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

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added:

'and also for the reason that Great Britain has persisted in following an utterly wrong policy with regard to Palestine, in contravention of Article 22 of the Covenant, and in open disregard of the feelings of the Indian Nation in this matter'."

Now, there will be a discussion on the Resolution as well as on the amendments.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I share the dissatisfaction which my friend Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar, has expressed with the constitution of the League of Nations and with the work done by that organization. But, Sir, because I am dissatisfied with the work of the League of Nations, I am not prepared to ask the country to leave that organization. I feel, Sir, the remedy to secure the removal of dissatisfaction is not to walk away, but I feel that there are other remedies for securing the removal of our dissatisfaction. It is with that intention that I move my amendment.

There are two points of view from which this subject can be discussed and should be discussed. The first is the general utility of the League, its constitution, and the work done by it in order to achieve its object of establishing international co-operation and international peace. Secondly, we must also consider India's position and India's relation with the League of Nations and India's participation in the work of that organisation. Taking the first point, I would deal very briefly with the constitution of the League of Nations and then I shall deal with the work done by the League of Nations. I agree again with my Honourable friend, Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar, that the constitution of the League of Nations is defective. In the first place, the constitution of the League of Nations is unnecessarily connected with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. There should have been really no connection between the two, and I am glad to find that this question has been taken up by the League itself. Proposals are being framed in order that the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations may be separated altogether. I also agree with the view which was read by my Honourable friend, Mr. Chettiar, that the League does not provide effective sanctions. If the decisions of the League are to be enforced, it is necessary for the League to be provided with an armed force, especially an armed air force in order that it should have the power to coerce recalcitrant members. I have no doubt that in course of time the League will be given that power. I admit that there are other defects in the constitution of the League. The members of the League do not bind themselves to accept arbitration in political issues. This question has been discussed also in the League of Nations. It was Mr. Arthur Henderson, on behalf of the Labour Party in Great Britain, who tried his very best to get the members of the League to bind themselves to accept arbitration in all political issues. Sir, the nations of the world are not still willing to part with even a little of their sovereignty, that is the stumbling block in the way of the success of the League. I feel that a time will come when the nations of the world will be willing to part with at least some of their sovereignty in order that international co-operation can be established and there may be universal peace in the world. As the constitution of the League is defective it is our duty to make efforts to change that constitution.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City : Non-Muhammadan Urban): Who are you?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, says, who are you? I say, who are you to withdraw from the League of Nations? Unfortunately, the efforts that are made at present to secure changes in the constitution are in the contrary direction. Great Britain and several other countries are trying to weaken the League of Nations by taking away from that organisation some of the sanctions which that organisation possesses. I again share the views of my Honourable friend, Mr. Chettiar, that the record of the League of Nations in big political issues is very poor. We must admit that in spite of the League Japan has been able to swallow Manchuria, Italy has swallowed Abyssinia and the League only made half-hearted attempts to prevent that being done. Austria has been swallowed and part of Czecho-Slovakia has been swallowed. The League has not been able to help Spain, it could not render much help to China. I admit that these are great failures of the League. We naturally mark the failures of the League, but even in political sphere, in small matters may be, it has rendered great service to the world. The League, I have no doubt, in solving those smaller matters, has avoided at least smaller wars and our thanks are due to that organisation for that work. I again admit that the League of Nations has failed to secure disarmament in the world.

When we speak of the work of the League of Nations, it is not the political work alone which we should consider. Mr. Chettiar has admitted that besides political work the League does work in both economic and social sphere. The League has as a subsidiary body the International Labour Office. There is also an organisation for intellectual co-operation, they have a big organisation which has done very good work so far as regards public health. The League has done something to bring about better international communications. They have done some work for ameliorating the conditions of women and children. They have done great work in relieving the sufferings of refugees. Besides these, the League of Nations has done very useful work in collecting information on economic, social and even political matters. The mere collection of this information is of great use. Besides that, the existence of the League of Nations for a fairly long period has brought into existence a body of international public servants. It is not an easy thing for individuals to feel internationally and to act internationally. The League of Nations and the bodies working with it, like the International Labour Organisation, the Intellectual Co-operation and other organisations, have brought into existence a body of persons who feel internationally and who act internationally. I feel that this is a very useful thing which the League of Nations has done. If the League of Nations has failed in political matters—and I do not admit that it has failed in all political matters, but still it is admitted on all hands that it has done very useful work in both the economic and social sphere. Why should we withdraw from the League of Nations? Do we not want that Indian labour should benefit from the International Labour Organisation? Do we not want that the public health organisation of our country should benefit from the experience of the League of Nations? If we want economic benefits from the League, if we want social benefits from the League, why should we not co-operate with the League of Nations, why should we withdraw from the League of Nations? My Honourable friend Mr. Chettiar has pointed out several objections for our remaining in the League of Nations. It is true

that Abyssinia has suffered. It is true that China has not been helped. It is true that Spain has not been helped. But has Spain withdrawn from the League of Nations, or has China withdrawn from the League of Nations? China and Spain still cling to the League of Nations and try to get out of it whatever little help it could render. And why should we leave the League of Nations? Moreover, if the League of Nations is not successful, is it the fault of that organisation, or is it the fault of the members of that organisation? We, as a member of the League of Nations, are equally responsible for the failure of the League of Nations.

An Honourable Member: Not at all.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I shall come to that point. It is not, therefore, that the organisation is a bad organisation. There are some members of the League who are apathetic to its work, who are not sufficiently sympathetic and the failure of the League of Nations is due to that fact and not to the idea underlying that organisation. If, therefore, the League of Nations is to be successful, it can be made successful by all the members of the League trying towards its success including India. What have we done? India is a member of the League of Nations. My friend, Mr. Chettiar, and the great Party which he represents have been in this Legislature for more than three years. May I ask what they have done to improve the League of Nations? I could have understood my Honourable friend and his Party if they had brought forward a Resolution pointing out to the Government of India what changes should be made in the constitution of the League of Nations. (Interruptions.) If these gentlemen will obstruct me and not allow me to speak, that only shows that their arguments are weak and the course they are following is wrong. I ask again what have they done? Instead of pointing out to the Government of India what should be done to make the League successful, they bring forward a Resolution saying that we must walk away from the League. It may be said that these gentlemen are engaged in the national struggle and therefore they are apathetic to the League, except to say that we should walk out of the League. Our very membership of the League is a recognition of the fact that India is a self-governing nation. If at any time India ceases to be a self-governing nation, that question will be a question of international interest. Moreover, our membership of the League of Nations enables us to discuss foreign questions. Why don't the members of the Congress Party insist upon the Government of India placing the report of its delegation before the House for open and free discussion? May I ask if the League of Nations is unsatisfactory, are there not other organisations which are unsatisfactory and which we are still using? May I ask the Congress Party whether they consider the constitution of the Legislative Assembly to be satisfactory and if it is not, why do they work in this organisation?

An Honourable Member: Wait and see.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I have waited and seen for a long time. So, if we are not leaving the Legislative Assembly, why should we leave the League of Nations. The Government of India can do many things in order to see that its participation in the League of Nations is more effective. It can place the report of the delegation before the Legislature for discussion. Then, the Secretary of State must cease to interfere in the relationship between India and the League. Whatever relations we may have to maintain should be through the High Commissioner for India. Then the Government of

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

India are themselves lowering the status of India by refusing to allow the Commerce Member to sign treaties with other countries of the world. The delegation of the Government of India headed by Sir Muhammad Habibullah had made certain recommendations. The first recommendation was that the Government of India should set up a committee of the Legislature to consider the attitude of India towards the work of the League of Nations. The Government of India should immediately set up a committee and allow that committee to consider what India's attitude should be towards the questions included in the agenda of the League and the brief given to the delegates should be the brief prepared by this committee. Then, Sir, India must secure membership of the Council of the League. Then again I agree with my Honourable friend that there are very few Indians on the staff of the League—hardly any one in a high position. The Government of India should insist that there should be a sufficient number of Indians on the staff of the League of Nations and some of them in high positions. It is our right to insist that the whole of the Indian delegation to the League should consist of Indians and there should not be even one Britisher in the delegation. India's position in the international world is misunderstood on account of the fact that several Britishers find a place in the Indian delegation.

There is only one point more which I wish to mention before I sit down. The Government of India, in order to secure changes in the constitution of the League and to secure that its work is successful should take immediate steps to set up a committee and that committee should make a report as to what changes should be made in the constitution of the League and the proposal made by that committee should be sent to the League of Nations. Then there is the amendment put forward by Sir Syed Raza Ali that the contribution should be reduced. If the League of Nations does not accept our proposals, let us then make the proposal that in the eyes of the Indian nation the usefulness of the League of Nations is much reduced and, therefore, the contribution made by India should also be reduced. The Congress Party is no doubt very fortunate in bringing forward this motion at this moment when the League is in a very bad way. Those of us who believe in the brotherhood of man and the citizenship of the world expected and thought that with the establishment of the League of Nations a new era would begin. But, unfortunately, disappointments have come to us. But simply because there are disappointments we must not get into despair. If we have faith that universal brotherhood can be achieved and that citizenship of the world can be established, then in spite of disappointment, we must redouble our efforts to bring about international co-operation with the help of the League of Nations. I hope the House will not accept the Resolution moved by the Congress Party but will accept the amendment moved by me.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: Sir, the Resolution as sought to be amended by me would read as follows :

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that unless the League of Nations agrees to reduce India's contribution to 2,00,000 francs with effect from 1941, steps be taken under Article 1 (3) of the Covenant of the League of Nations to give notice of India's intention to withdraw from the League."

The difference between the Resolution moved by Mr. Chettiar and me seems to me to be more than one of mere outlook. It seems to be, if

I may be excused the use of the word, somewhat fundamental. The Congress School of thought, if I understand the position correctly, does not care for the international position of India.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : You are utterly wrong.

Sir Syed Raza Ali : I am very glad to hear that. If it was seriously meant, nobody would be better pleased than myself, but I seriously doubt it.

Sir, the position really is this. Let me assure my Honourable friends, if any assurance was necessary, that I quite appreciate their position. Today is not the first time I have met my Congress friends. I have been in close association with them for a very long time, may I say almost a lifetime. Their point of view is this. Today we are powerless in our own country. India is not the mistress of her own destinies. Therefore, there is no use taking part in activities of bodies where India's voice does not count and where India's mind is made up by others for herself. Their viewpoint seems to be, on this question, this: "let us go out of the League. If and when we come into our own, if and when India becomes the mistress of her own destiny, it would be time for us then to re-join the League." I believe that is their position. So I do not think my friends were quite right in expressing strong dissent from me.

Now, my position, on the other hand, is this,—that, no doubt, it is most sad, it is most unfortunate that we are not masters of our own destiny in our own country. Every section of Indian population is doing all it can to hasten the day when the control of our policy will be in our own hands. But then, along with that, there is what I call the international position of India, big or small. Sir, till the day comes when we are in full control of our destiny, I for one would be for co-operating with those bodies outside India. This would enable us to be in touch with the viewpoint of other countries of the world. India's position no doubt suffers very greatly from the fact that our voice is not heard on important and essential matters very often. But I assure my friends that it would be a mistake to go out of the League, not really because the League is such a useless body as it was painted to be by the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution, but because we have not that measure of power in our own country which we ought to have. Sir, the sentiment is one which I entirely appreciate and which I quite admire but I do not think it is the right attitude to adopt. One cannot afford to cut one's nose to spite one's face if I may say so. This, according to me, would be very much the position if this Resolution was adopted by this House and brought into force ultimately.

May I very briefly say that I happen to know a little about the activities of the League of Nations. It is true that the position that the representatives of India occupy at Geneva is, unfortunately, a subordinate position; it is a position with which no self-respecting Indian can be happy. It is a position which is a source of not only inconvenience but of unhappiness to those Indians who represent the Government of India at the League of Nations. But I was entirely unable to follow the logic of the Honourable Mr. Chettiar. He gave a number of instances and dwelt on the policy recently followed by Germany, Japan and Italy. Sir, it is quite true that Germany, Japan and Italy are no longer members of the League of Nations but what is the cause? Has the Honourable the Mover ever put that question to himself? Germany went out of the League because

[Sir Syed Raza Ali.]

Germany wanted to embark upon a course of what in the eye of the civilized world is aggression.

An Honourable Member: No.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I am surprised to know that that is not aggression, that it is something else, and it seems that that attitude commends itself to some of our Honourable friends. Be that as it may, Italy went out of the League in order to attack Abyssinia; in fact she did so after she had attacked Abyssinia. Then Japan went out of the League because it had aggressive intentions against China which intentions she has since carried into effect. I ask my Honourable friends on the Congress Benches what aggressive action they propose to take, and against which country?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): We want to stop aggression by Great Britain against India.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: And, therefore, we want to go out of the League?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Undoubtedly.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, my Honourable friend should not be interrupted, as he is making his maiden speech.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I assure my friend that I am quite capable of taking care of myself. Sir, the logic that has been just interjected is a most strange logic, but we are not surprised. We often see that kind of logic used from some of our friends over there. I will not say more. Now, if really India's idea is not to embark on any course of aggression, which power India simply cannot exercise even if she wanted to, I entirely fail to see why India should give notice of withdrawal because the League has failed to maintain the cause of peace in the world. If I remember correctly, today at least as many as 58 States are members of the League of Nations.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I am afraid you are wrong. It used to be 58; there are only 49 left now.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I will accept my Honourable friend's figure. Let it be forty-nine, but in what way is India differently situated from the remaining forty-eight countries which are members of the League which would justify her going out? It seems to me that the position of India is on a par with the position occupied by the remaining forty-eight countries according to the figure given to me by my learned friend.

An Honourable Member: We are a poor country.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I am very thankful for this interjection. I come to my point. We are a poor country, there is no doubt. Now the position today is this. From the official list I find that India is the fourth largest contributor to the finances of the League. First comes, according to the figures I have got, Great Britain, then Soviet Russia, then France, immediately followed by India which makes a contribution of over a million of francs per year to the League. Sir, we are a poor country—there is no doubt about that. Further, though we have participated in the benefits arising from the activities of the League, there is no doubt in my mind

that owing to the peculiar political condition of India we have not been able to take the fullest advantage from the League's activities. I should not be understood to attach any undue importance to being elected by the Assembly or the Council to certain important positions which count in the eyes of the civilized world. Still, take the case of the Council of the League. There are a number of non-permanent members of the League. In spite of our huge population, in spite of the large contribution that we make to the League, never has a non-permanent seat been assigned to India.

Again, take the International Court of Justice. Judges from other countries have been elected as members of this Court but never has an Indian been honoured by being elected as a Judge of that Court. Then again, take the Secretariat office or the International Labour Bureau. There are very few Indians who occupy any positions of trust and responsibility there. I must admit that the matter is not of very great importance but at the same time it is a matter of which due cognizance should be taken. So, in all these matters India's grievances are real and just. What really surprises one is that there is a very large disparity between the huge contribution made by India and the advantages secured by her by being a member of the League. Lately India's contribution has been slightly reduced. That, however, does not matter much. India's contribution yet amounts to a very large sum. I would, therefore, suggest that we should make it quite clear to the League that it is impossible for us to pay a sum of over a million francs every year and that our contribution should not stand at a higher figure than 200,000 francs. If the League is agreeable to this suggestion, I, for one, would be strongly for India continuing to be a member of the League till such time as India becomes a fully self-governing country. But if the League has any hesitation in accepting our proposal or it objects to entertaining this proposal, I would have no hesitation in giving notice of India ceasing to be a member of the League. After all, the advantages that we receive from the League of Nations, some of which have been described by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, are of some value. Let it be quite clear that I do not attach undue importance to the advantages that we are receiving from the League of Nations today. Still, those advantages are of some value. That being so, there is no reason why we should sever our connection with the League. As was interjected by my friend, Mr. Manu Subedar, the question is a financial question and I entirely agree with that view. If we were to turn into money the value of the advantages rendered to us by the League, I think 200,000 francs would not be an unduly large contribution for India to make. Therefore, I submit that it is of the highest importance that India's connection with the International organisations of the world should continue. Sir, I have represented my country in South Africa. I was there for three years. I know what value is attached by other countries to India being a member of such organisations. I have a suspicion at the back of my mind that the Congress people do not attach much importance to India being represented on these International bodies. There, I must say, I differ from them. I think it is of very great importance, having regard especially to the political changes that are going to take place in India, that we should not be, what is known in our language, a 'frog of the well'. We should put ourselves in touch with world-wide activities of all enlightened nations.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: What happened to Abyssinia and China?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not take notice of these interruptions.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I will allow myself only to reply to the last interjection and then, Sir, I shall have finished. I am asked what has happened to China and Abyssinia? I entirely fail to see what this has got to do with India's presence in the League of Nations. But I can tell my friend what has happened to China and Abyssinia. They became the victims of aggression and they suffered the greatest suffering in the world. If India pursues the dreams that some of my friends are dreaming, she might also become a similar victim in course of time. Her fate might be no better than the fate of China and Abyssinia. But as long as we continue to be in the British Commonwealth of Nations as I prefer to call it instead of the British Empire, there is no reason why we should fear that the fate of Abyssinia or China is going to overtake us. Sir, I move.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Sir, I have listened carefully to the speech of the Honourable Member, Sir Syed Raza Ali, and he said that the Congress Party did not attach sufficient importance to the League. We are very anxious to be represented at international gatherings, but by men of our own choice and not by men who go there in the capacity of bondsmen or henchmen of an alien nation who prefer to do the bidding of their masters. So far we have been denied the privilege of sending our own men

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to move his amendment.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: I have already done so. I am now speaking both on the original motion and the amendment.

We have been denied the privilege which is enjoyed by other States which happen to be Members of the League of Nations, namely, of being represented by nationals of their own choice. That privilege has been denied to India which is also a Member of the League. Therefore, it is not a matter for surprise that we are not very anxious to be represented at such gatherings in an inferior capacity. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, admitted in the course of his speech that the League was a very defective organisation and that it was thoroughly rotten.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: This Assembly is a defective organisation and still we are Members.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: We are not here by nomination. We do represent certain people here.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The worse thing is that you are by election to misrepresent the country and the people.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: The Honourable Mr. Joshi has admitted that the League is thoroughly rotten and still he wants us to continue and improve it. This is an argument which does not need any refutation. I respectfully submit to the House that this is not a question of francs or roubles as has been attempted to be made out by my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali. There are questions of national principles involved. There are

questions of national self-respect involved in this. Are we to continue to be Members of a League in an inferior capacity, to do what Great Britain wants us to do? I must remind my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, that Abyssinia was an independent State and that Haile Saliessie was the Emperor of an independent State. He put his faith in the League of Nations only to be disillusioned, only to be torn to pieces by the vultures of Rome, and to be reduced to the position of a subject State. How can this League of Nations be of any earthly use to India which is not even a free nation. If free nations can meet with the fate of China, with the fate of Abyssinia, with the fate of Czecho-Slovakia and with the fate of Manchuko, what earthly good can this League of Nations do to a subject nation like India?

Now, Sir, I come to the subject of my amendment which is thoroughly in consonance with the principles embodied in the original Resolution. Here I would like to read a short extract from Article 22 of the Covenant which shows how the great principles enunciated at the time when the Covenant of the League was brought into existence, have been flouted by Great Britain in their application to Palestine. Now, Sir, Article 22 of the Covenant reads :

"To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late War have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them. . . . there should be applied the principle that the well being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this covenant."

Then, the system of mandates was brought into existence. Then, sub-clause (4) of Article 22 reads :

"Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can continue his speech after Lunch. The House stands adjourned till Half Past Two.

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

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

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Sir, I was trying to make out that all the principles laid down in Article 22 of the Covenant have been violated time and again by Great Britain, the mandatory on behalf of the League of Nations. If we turn to the history of Palestine we find that for about 90 to 100 years in the 12th and 13th centuries the Crusaders waged a series of wars against the local inhabitants. They were fired with religious zeal which is an understandable thing, and even the Crusaders in those dark Middle Ages never attempted to do what is being attempted by Great Britain at the present day, namely, annihilation of the Arab race. Great Britain went there ostensibly to set them on their feet, to turn them into an independent nation, but what has happened is the reverse. A number of Commissions have been appointed to report and to suggest solutions for this vexed problem of Palestine. After every rising a Commission has been appointed

[Mr. Abdul Qaiyum.]

by Great Britain. There was the well-known Peel Commission which has been followed by another Commission, and they have all suggested that Palestine should be partitioned into three States, a purely Arab State of the south-east, the Jewish State of the north-west, and an area around Jerusalem which will remain permanently under Great Britain as a mandated territory. Now all these schemes of partition have been very rightly and very stubbornly resisted by the Arabs, because this is an attempt at vivisection of a nation which is alive. When the war was on, Great Britain sent a number of emissaries to these people. The high-sounding principles of self-determination were trumpeted in front of the Arabs. Lawrence of Arabia, followed by a number of gentlemen similarly qualified, were sent to that country with the result that they brought about a rising of the Arabs and weaned them from their allegiance to the Turkish State. But when the war was over those promises were all forgotten, and instead it was openly declared that Palestine would henceforward become a national home for the Jews, and a Jewish State for all intents and purposes. In this there is a warning for all of us who believe in the promises of Great Britain. What happened in the case of the Arabs who put their faith in these promises? They have been disillusioned, and that is a lesson for people similarly inclined in other parts of the world who may care to put their faith in British promises. Now what is it that has induced Great Britain to change its policy? Surely it is not love for the Jews. Great Britain wants the passage to India to be safe in her hands. She realises that powerful totalitarian States, like Italy and Germany, have sprung up. She realises that her means of communications in the Mediterranean are in danger. Therefore she wants a safe naval base in the eastern Mediterranean. It is for these purposes that Palestine is being converted into a Jewish State, so that the pro-British element whose very presence and existence will depend on the British bayonets, and who will for ever be faithful to the British connection, should be introduced into that country. Palestine has got great possibilities; it is the terminus of the oil pipe line from Iraq to Haifa. It is a country through which all the eastern air routes traverse, and it has assumed tremendous importance since the rise of Italy. It is not love of the Jews, but with a view to perpetually keeping this country mainly for their own interest that Great Britain is prepared to try an experiment which is unprecedented in the history of the world, namely, the utter ruin and annihilation of the Arab race. This is what the British policy in Palestine means.

Now turn to Article 22 of the Covenant, and you will realise that the practice is absolutely at variance with the professions and high-sounding principles which were laid down in the Covenant of the League of Nations. What is the present position? We are told that the League of Nations in spite of so many difficulties is worth keeping. The nation which really brought the League of Nations into existence is outside the League,—I refer to the democracy of the United States of America. It was the initiative of President Wilson that brought the League of Nations into existence, and, when he realised that the League of Nations was merely a continuation of the Supreme Allied War Council, when he realised that it was being based on the principle of self-determination and not on the principles of equality and liberty, that it was being based on the blood and iron of the treaty of Versailles which brought a number of iniquities into this already harassed world and aimed at perpetuating those iniquities by

this League of Nations, that President Wilson withdrew from the League. Not only that; a number of other powerful States have seceded from the League. Italy is out of the League, and so are Brazil, Japan and Germany. It may be that there are different reasons, but still what is the use of having this League which is utterly powerless to prevent an attack from Japan on the great country called China which contains about a third of the human race? What is the use of being members of a society of nations which was absolutely powerless to protect Abyssinia from the onslaughts of the hosts of Rome? What did the League do? They have accepted in the case of Manchuko the Japanese thesis that it was not even a war but was merely a punitive measure; and in the case of Italy they kept on fiddling while Abyssinia was burning. They waited for two years and when Italy had accomplished its conquest they had the audacity to call off the half-hearted measures, namely, the sanctions which they had imposed against Italy. Then, more recently, we have seen the annihilation of Austria and also the dismemberment of Czecho-Slovakia—which was the creation of the League of Nations. The League was absolutely powerless to prevent its disruption at the hands of Germany. Now we are told that there are a number of good things which the League has done, namely, it has stopped drug traffic, prevented the spread of mosquitoes, and so on. But what are these things? Are these any major issues?

An Honourable Member: They have saved human life.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: But what did it do in the case of Abyssinia and Palestine? Sir, coming to Palestine, what have the British Government done? The request of Mr. Jinnah, the Leader of the Muslim League Party, that India should be represented at the World Palestine Conference now going on in England, and to which delegates from all parts of the world have been invited, has not even evoked a response from the British Prime Minister. This is the way in which a very reasonable request made by a responsible statesman, has been treated by the British Prime Minister. Great Britain must know that she cannot play with fire as she has been doing so long. I want to warn the British Government through their agents who are sitting here that their policy in Palestine has created a deep wound in the Muslim world which is not likely to heal. And I for one am convinced that the end of the British Empire will result from this very policy which is being pursued in Palestine by Great Britain. I think any civilised nation should be ashamed of the policy which Britain is pursuing,—shooting down innocent people, wiping out houses and bombing from the air.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got one minute more.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Last but not least, I turn to the question of my own province and the neighbouring tribal areas. The League of Nations has been talking of stopping bombing by international action. What have the representatives of India done in the League of Nations throughout these long years, to stop bombing on the frontier? Even the other day it appeared in the papers that bombing was going on. On the 26th December I was in Kohat and I listened to a tale of woe from a number of people who had been to Waziristan and they told me that a number of villages had been wiped out by bombing which had been recently resorted

[Mr. Abdul Qaiyum.]

to. I had no reason to doubt or disbelieve what I was told. All questions and resolutions about bombing are being disallowed in this House, and it is sought to be proved to the rest of the world that nothing is wrong with the tribal areas in the North-West Frontier Province

Mr. N. M. Joshi: You are still a Member of the Assembly.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: I will remain for some time. I am here at the sufferance of my electorate. My submission is that the League of Nations is a thoroughly unsatisfactory body. It has proved to be absolutely powerless time and again when there were occasions for the exercise of its powers to bring the transgressors to justice. What is the use of being a member of this League? I, therefore, warmly support the resolution and the amendment and I request the House to vote in such a way that this Government should be forced immediately to send a notice to the League of Nations severing our connection with that body which is absolutely useless.

Mr. G. H. Spence (Secretary: Legislative Department): Sir, I hope that it may be of some slight convenience to Honourable Members if I endeavour at this early stage in the debate to indicate very briefly the attitude of the Government on some of the issues before the House. I will take first the amendment moved by the Honourable Sir Syed Raza Ali. I do not propose to weary the House by taking it through the whole history of the question of India's contribution; but for an appreciation of this amendment it is necessary to bear in mind what exactly the present position is. The existing scale is in force for the years 1937, 1938 and 1939. The League has appointed a new allocation committee which will shortly meet and which will present its report to the Assembly of the League of 1939, and a new scale will then be brought into force from 1940. The reference, therefore, in the amendment to a reduction with effect from 1941 is not particularly apposite. What will happen will be that the allocation committee will consider the whole question on its merits and will deal with all representations submitted on behalf of any particular member of the League. I may interpolate here that the Government of India, in redemption of their pledge to take such steps as lie in their power to secure a further substantial reduction of the contribution, have already prepared a memorandum for submission to the allocation committee, and I think the House will be interested to hear that India is one of the twelve members of the League represented on that committee. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that India will get anything but a fair deal and Government hope that India may secure a reasonably substantial further reduction. But turning to the more important aspect of Sir Syed Raza Ali's amendment, I must point out that a reduction to the figure named by him—200,000 francs—is simply not within the sphere of practical politics at all. I should explain that the League does not determine the contributions of members in terms of francs. The contributions are determined in terms of units and the amount in francs is arrived at by calculating the appropriate fraction of the total budget for a particular year. Thus, with India assessed as she now is at 49 units out of a total of 917, she pays in terms of francs $49/917$ ths of the amount of the total budget for the year.

For the current year the result of this calculation is that India pays 1,218,000 odd gold francs, equivalent to 1,542,500 odd Swiss francs . . .

An Honourable Member: What is it in Indian money?

Mr. G. H. Spence: That has been stated dozens of times—it is a little under Rs. 10 lakhs. In terms of the current year's budget the unit is equivalent to 24,858 gold francs and to 81,479 Swiss francs. Thus a reduction of the franc value of India's contribution to 200,000 francs would mean a reduction in terms of units, if the Honourable Member has gold francs in view, to eight, and if he has Swiss francs in view, to something under seven. . . .

An Honourable Member: What about rupees?

Mr. G. H. Spence: I am speaking in terms of francs because the amendment is expressed in terms of francs. A reduction to seven or eight units of the assessment of a country which is now assessed at 49 units, and which was assessed as recently as 1936 at 56 units, is manifestly not within the sphere of practical politics. . . .

Mr. Sri Prakasa: The League itself is not practical politics.

Mr. G. H. Spence: And a recommendation to Government to give notice of termination of membership unless the League agrees to the reduction mentioned in the amendment does not differ in substantial effect from the unqualified recommendation for immediate withdrawal embodied in the original Resolution.

Turning to the original Resolution, the view of the Government is that the House will make a great mistake if it carries it. Government of course admit that more particularly in recent years the League has not proved an effective instrument for the achievement of international peace and security; but at the same time they maintain that to make this a ground for leaving the League is to ignore vital considerations. In the first place, even as things stand today, League membership is emphatically worthwhile if only by reason of the League's technical and humanitarian work in which India has actively participated and from which India and the world at large have derived great benefit. In the second place, the ineffectiveness of the League for the time being on the political side is not due to any inherent defect in the conception of the League but to existing world conditions, and, in particular, to the fact that Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States are outside the League. Conditions in these respects may change and the League may once more attain a nearer approach to universality and therewith the capacity more effectively to achieve its primary object. Should this consummation be realised it will manifestly be of the utmost advantage to have in being an organisation with the widest possible membership, and if only for this reason a member State which believes in the League ideal, as I am sure India does, should not lend the weight of her example to a policy of withdrawal but should retain her membership unimpaired and thus ensure that she will be in a position to play her part in the more effective activities of a resuscitated League. Apart from that I do venture to submit in all earnestness to Honourable Members opposite that from the point of view of the individual advantage of India, there is absolutely no doubt whatever that her membership of the League has given India an international status. . . .

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. G. H. Spence: Which she would not otherwise have secured and which she should be loath to abandon.

That brings me, Sir, to the argument used by more than one previous speaker to the effect that India gets no material return commensurate with the cost of her membership of the League. Well, Sir, on that I would submit that the argument proceeds on an entirely faulty conception of what India or any other country is in the League for; you are not in the League in the hope of getting something material out of it. You are in the League to play your part in a great international organization. In the nature of things, an international organization has got to be financed, in the nature of things it must be financed by contributions from members, and in the nature of things the material benefits measurable in money which accrue to an individual member cannot be equivalent to the money contribution made by that member. . . .

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Is it in the nature of things that small nations should be sold like that?

Mr. G. H. Spence: Then, Sir, there was another point mentioned though no very great stress was laid on it, and I don't propose to lay much stress on it. References were made to the paucity of Indian representation in the League Secretariat. That is a matter which Government have always borne in mind, and they are exceedingly anxious to secure greater representation, more particularly to secure some representation in the really high appointments in the League Secretariat. But at the same time the existing position is not so bad as is commonly represented. India at the present moment has in the League Secretariat, apart from two temporary collaborators, four permanent employees, and four permanent employees in the International Labour Office. Of the eight permanent employees, six are in the higher ranks, that is to say, ranks which receive a salary of above 12,000 francs. Ranks drawing salaries below that figure are to a large extent recruited locally in Switzerland. If you want to see what India's comparative position is, you have got to ignore the lower ranks in the League and look to the higher ranks, and if you do that, you will find that India's position does not really compare by any means unfavourably with that of most other countries, and if Honourable Members are curious to pursue the point, they can refer to detailed figures compiled in 1936, which still give a more or less correct picture of the general position. The figures were laid on the table in reply to a question asked by Mr. Satyamurti in 1936. Apart from the representation of India in the Secretariats at Geneva, we have got to remember that India is one of the very few countries in which the League maintains a branch office both of the League Secretariat itself and of the International Labour Office. However, I do not think this is a very vital element in the questions under consideration.

Well, Sir, with the amendment of Mr. Joshi, in principle, Government find themselves in, at all events, very much closer agreement than with the original Resolution. . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No wonder.

Mr. G. H. Spence: But in honesty they are bound to admit that they think that the Governor General in Council would have a very heavy task placed upon him if the amended Resolution were carried. None the less, it would, in the view of Government, be. . .

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got only one minute more.

Mr. G. H. Spence: Well, Sir, as my time limit is up, I will say no more, but if any Member who desires to know in greater detail what my views on this matter are, I would ask them to study the speech which I made in 1936 in the Council of State, where I was not subject to the 15 minutes time limit..

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I am as much an internationalist as a nationalist. It is, therefore, with a very heavy heart that I rise to support the original Resolution, and I do so on three grounds.

In the first place, in my opinion the League has failed to attain most of the objects for which it was established. I do frankly admit that, on the economic side, the League has done very good work; but it is really a semi-independent organization of the League, namely, the International Labour Office, which has done this work. A great deal of labour legislation has been promoted in this country to ameliorate the conditions of labourers, and for this we all ought to feel grateful. But it does not follow that while we participate in the benefits of the International Labour Conference and the International Labour Office, we should continue to be a member of the League of Nations. The United States of America participates in the International Labour Conferences and takes advantage of the existence of the International Labour Office, but it is not a member of the League of Nations. My friend, Mr. Joshi, is afraid that if we cut ourselves adrift from the League of Nations, the interests of labour will suffer. He need not have any apprehensions on that score. . . .

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I know the constitution.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: You know the constitution, but from your speech I understood that you were afraid that India would suffer. However, the League has also done a considerable amount of useful work in regard to questions relating to education, sanitation, and public health. Its activities in these various respects have greatly helped India. The League of Nations has also served as a clearing house of information on many important subjects like currency, finance, and banking.

But on the political side the League has failed, and failed very miserably, and this was the main object of this League. Only in connection with a few unimportant disputes have the efforts of the League succeeded, but they have failed in regard to all the major issues which have appeared during the last 20 years. Therefore, Sir, it is clear that the League has failed to fulfil most of the important objects for which it was established. This has been due to various causes. I need not go into the discussion of those causes, but I will briefly mention a few of them. The first cause was the defective constitution of the League. The British Empire was very largely represented on the League in proportion to the other countries, and

[Dr. P. N. Banerjee.]

this was perhaps the reason why the United States kept itself aloof from the League of Nations, although President Wilson was the originator of the whole idea. The second reason, perhaps, was the association of the League with the Versailles Treaty, which was an unjust measure. The third reason was that there was no international army under the control of the League, nor even an international police force, which could control the recalcitrant countries. But the most important cause of the failure of the League was the fact that small and weak countries existed side by side with big countries following an Imperialist policy. But whatever the causes, the fact remains that the League has failed.

My second reason for supporting this Resolution is that India contributes a very large sum towards its expenses and she does not get any direct return. Sir, India is a poor country, and if this large sum of money were utilised for more beneficent purposes in this country, a great deal of good would result to India.

These are important reasons but the third reason is even more important. That reason is the anomalous position which India occupies in the League of Nations. What is this anomalous position? It is this. So far as the League of Nations is concerned, India occupies an independent position, being an original member of the League. But so far as Britain is concerned, what is India's position? Is India independent *vis-a-vis* Great Britain? No. It cannot be said that India has that position. Then why maintain this pretence? What is the necessity for maintaining this pretence for such a long time? When the League was established in 1919 the hope was held out to India that once she secured an independent status in regard to her outside relations, it would not take much time for her to secure an independent status so far as her internal position was concerned. But during these twenty years India has not obtained any freedom in regard to internal affairs. She is still a subject country, she is still subject to Great Britain. And how are the representatives to the League of Nations selected? They are appointed by the Government of India which is a subordinate Government. Therefore, those who go as delegates to the League of Nations Conferences are not independent persons. They cannot voice the feelings and the ideas of the people of the country. They voice the feelings and the ideas of the British Government. Some time ago I asked a question whether the Government would consider the desirability of the delegates to the League being elected by the Indian Legislature. To that the reply was—"No". It was pointed out that the League delegates were representatives of their respective Governments. But it was forgotten that in all free countries the Governments themselves are the representatives of the people. Here the situation is entirely different. Here the Government of India is not in any sense representative of the people of India. Therefore, what we wanted was that the views of the people should be represented at the League's Conferences through the elected representatives, but even this small concession was not granted. This is a very vital matter. My Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, said that, although India occupies a very uncomfortable position in this League, she should continue to occupy it in order that in course of time she might get a better status. But is that position consistent with India's self-respect? I say "No". And this is the principal ground on which I support the Resolution.

Sir, the League of Nations is practically dead, but this is not a matter of satisfaction to me. I hope and trust that a new League of Nations will arise out of the ashes of the present League, and that at no distant date. But this can happen only when India becomes independent and all the weak nations become strong and also free. It will be then, and not till then, that there will be a real parliament of man and a true federation of the world.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Mr. Deputy President, in discussing the question of the League of Nations, there are three general aspects to which we must pay due attention. There is, first of all, the general ideal of the League—the ideal of international co-operation for the purposes of peace. I take it that no Honourable Member in this House will have any quarrel whatever with that ideal. Then there is the constitution of the League itself by which its organisation is bound. There is no doubt that there is considerable criticism of the position which the League occupies both by reason of its peculiar constitution and by reason of the fact that the Covenant of the League is so closely attached to the Treaty of Versailles, and I think that probably most Members of the House would agree with the criticisms that have been offered from time to time by various countries who are members of the League in those directions. Then the third aspect in connection with the League which has to be considered is the record of the League itself. I think—and it is but natural—that too great an emphasis has been placed upon the purely political activities of the League. I do not feel that it is fair or reasonable for Honourable Members to deride the argument which was used by Mr. Joshi when he pointed out that, quite apart from the political aspect, there were other aspects of the League's work which were undoubtedly important. I think, therefore, that it is unwise for the House to concentrate upon the political aspect to the entire exclusion of the other aspects of the League's work. Having said that, I must admit, as every honest person must admit, that when the League was first begun it was the political aspect which most held men's minds and they expected by reason of the organisation of the League that war would ultimately give place to negotiation and peaceful settlement. Member after Member of the House has explained in what way the League has failed to fulfil the hope which was held up for it. But very few Members have paused a while to consider the reasons for those failures. Of course, I suppose we may moralise and say that the nation members of the League are not yet ready to take those measures which are necessary for international collaboration in the direction of peace. But to my mind there are two fundamental reasons which have contributed to the failure of the League on the political side.

First of all has been the refusal of the members of the League to consider for one moment the surrender of any portion of their sovereignty for the common good. Suggestions are now being made in connection with the reconstitution of the League which will endeavour to meet that point either, on the one hand, by insisting that members of the League shall surrender some portion of their sovereignty in connection with armaments, or, on the other, by suggesting that the League itself, while it is constituted of sovereign States, should not attempt any element of international coercion or compulsion. That is one reason.

The other reason that makes it extremely difficult for the League, as it is now constituted, to deal with what I may describe as the major political

[Mr. F. E. James.]

issues of the day, is the unanimity rule in connection with the revision of treaties. As Honourable Members are aware, it requires now a unanimous vote of the Assembly of the League to alter any of the provisions of the treaties which emanated from the last war. So long as that rule exists, any treaty revision is almost impossible as far as the League is concerned. I am merely explaining for the benefit of Honourable Members, who are undoubtedly fully aware of most of these matters, that there are certain fundamental reasons in the League itself which have contributed to the failure of the League to deal with some of the more important political problems of the day. As far as this debate is concerned, dissatisfaction with the League has been voiced from various points of view. There is first of all the dissatisfaction which is voiced in the Resolution itself which refers to the failure of the League to implement the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant against the Covenant-breaking members of the League. That Article, as the House is aware, deals with sanctions and contains the element of compulsion and coercion against members who are declared to be breakers of the Covenant. No one will disagree for a moment with the interpretation of the position which has been put forward by various Members of the House in regard to the lack of force or sanction behind this particular Article in the Covenant. Then other Members have put forward the argument that it is unfair that India should be expected to contribute to so great an extent to a League which in any case is in an extremely weak condition.

Sir Raza Ali, on whose presence in the House I congratulate him and also the Muslim League Party, argued that there should be no reason to withdraw but that India being a poor country her contributions were out of all proportion to her resources. Mr. Spence has explained that already contributions from India have been reduced and that there is every probability, in view of the hopes of revision of the budget of the League, of a further reduction of India's contribution. I agree with Sir Raza Ali in suggesting that if India is to remain a member of the League her contribution should be radically reduced.

Then, we have another amendment proposed by the Honourable Member from the North-West Frontier Province which refers to what he alleges to be the wrong policy followed by Great Britain with regard to Palestine. That seems to me to be slightly irrelevant when the House is talking about the League. That is an issue entirely between him and the British Government and it is not an issue in which the League is involved except in so far as Great Britain holds Palestine under mandate and is responsible for its administration to the League of Nations. Here again, I would remind my Honourable friend that surely whatever may have happened in the past, at the moment when Great Britain, following her policy of appeasement, is now engaged in conference with the various parties concerned in order to bring about a settlement of the Palestine problem, satisfactory both to the Jews and the Arabs,—surely it is an unfortunate moment to choose that as an argument for leaving the League of Nations. Then there is the argument advanced by my Honourable friend, Professor Banerjee, that it is no use staying in the League of Nations as long as India is in a subordinate position *vis-à-vis* Great Britain. That is an argument I can well understand and I think that if India had not been an original member of the League that would have been a very valuable argument against India joining the League now as a member, being as she is in regard to her foreign policy in a subordinate position.

The problem we have to consider is not the question of India's joining the League *de novo*, but of India leaving the League after an association with the League from 1920. Nobody I think who has had the responsible task of representing India at the League has yet come forward with the proposition that India should leave the League. I have not even heard my Honourable friend, Sir Nripendra Sircar, say that. I should be very interested to hear what his contribution to the discussion will be. I know that some of those who have represented the Government of India at the League of Nations have been less enthusiastic about the League than others. But I have yet to hear any representative of India, who has had experience of attending its meetings and of the international contacts that are enjoyed there, advocate leaving the League. I am bound to say at the same time that for the last 18 or 20 years the Government of India has been blowing hot and cold in regard to representation at the League of Nations. I am at one with those who suggest that it is wrong that India should be represented at the League of Nations by delegates who are no longer resident in this country or who are not likely to have any intimate connection with the people of this country. I think that a great deal of the dissatisfaction of India and of Indian opinion with the League of Nations is due to the fact that after all these years the Government of India has scarcely on any occasion, or on very few occasions, treated India's representation at the League seriously or the work of our delegates as worthy of consideration in this House. To my mind there are two questions which arise in this connection. First of all, what does India gain by leaving the League? She probably gains for her budget about eight to ten lakhs a year. She loses a certain amount of influence which she has in international circles, not necessarily on the political side but on other sides of the League's international work. Her defection from the League will have no effect on League policy. It will have no effect upon the declared policy of Great Britain and the Dominions in favour of League collaboration. Its only effect, possibly, will be to give a certain measure of encouragement to Japan, Germany and Italy who, having withdrawn from the League on precisely these grounds, will claim India as a supporter of their policy.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Not a bad idea.

Mr. F. E. James: I suppose Mr. Asaf Ali is qualifying to be a member of the High Command!

What does India lose? I claim that she will lose opportunities of international co-operation. I claim she will lose definitely her status in international affairs which she enjoys by reason of the membership of the League of Nations. I claim that if she leaves the League now, when the time comes, as it will come in my view fairly soon and much sooner than many people expect,—if she leaves the League now, where will her influence be in those days of reconstruction which will be so important not only for the League but for the peace of the world? As a member of the League, she will have her proper place when that time comes; as a country outside the League, she will have no place, and will be able to make no contribution to perhaps one of the most important epochs in international affairs since the days of the Great War.

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

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is:

"That the question be now put."

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir, my Party has not spoken; and that was made clear to the Whip and he had agreed that it will not be put unless one Member from our Party has spoken.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Whether, as the Mover of the amendment or, in any other capacity, a member of that Party has spoken. The question is:

"That the question be now put."

The motion was negatived.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Sir, I must thank the Congress Party for not having pressed their motion for closure, and I am glad that you have allowed me to speak. I must make the position of my Party quite clear before the House, as regards the main proposition and the different amendments before the House. Apart from the amendment moved by Sir Syed Raza Ali, a member of our Party, I have to make the position of my Party clear in respect of other amendments and the original motion before the House. As far as Mr. Joshi's amendment is concerned, my Party does not think it advisable to support it. They think that there is nothing in that amendment, and I do not want to dilate upon this question. As far as the main Resolution is concerned, my Party would not have supported that Resolution on the grounds which have been advanced by the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution, and we want to make it clear that we do not think that the League of Nations is an entirely useless body or will remain a useless body in future. We say that there is something which can be gained from the League of Nations. But we have got our grievances against the League of Nations,—in so far as the League of Nations has failed to perform the many duties for which it was really and originally created. I do not want to reiterate the arguments put forward by other Honourable speakers against the League of Nations's doings. They have been so many times put before the country and before this House that everyone is in full possession of those facts. Our grievance as far as our representation on the League of Nations is concerned is against the Government, and that is that the Government have not chosen so far to send the real representatives of India to the League of Nations. The people who have been sent to the League of Nations to represent India cannot be said to represent India or India's point of view. They may be the representatives of the Government of India, but the Government of India are an irresponsible Government and, therefore, the people who go there to represent India are really bound to represent the views of the Government of India or the British Government. But the real voice of India should be placed before the League of Nations through the proper representatives of India on the League of Nations. That is our grievance against the Government,—that in choosing the delegates they never paid full consideration to this fact as to what kind of delegation should be sent to the League of Nations, and my Party, the Muslim League, have seen that up till now, in spite of their great agitation and the different resolutions passed in the country, their view-point has never been placed before the League of Nations as far as the Palestine question is concerned. No delegate sent by the Indian Government has ever spoken in the League of Nations about the feelings which are prevailing in this country as far

as the other countries' freedom is concerned. My Party, though they are not against the League of Nations and would not be in favour of the main Resolution, want fully to support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. Our Party also represents the Muslim League outside this House, and we would be failing in our duty towards the Muslim League if we did not place the views of the Muslim League before this House.

It was said by my friend, Mr. James, that this question has got nothing to do with the question of Palestine and that it should not be mixed up with the League of Nations, but he has admitted that it is really the League of Nations which has given the mandate to the British Government to interfere with the administration of Palestine. The British Government had thought of giving up the mandate, but it was the League of Nations which forced them to keep it up. We do not know why the British Government should have anything to do with Palestine. What the Muslim League wants is that the British Government should sever their connection from Palestine. If they want a mandate then the only mandate to be given to the British Government should be that no other country should interfere with the administration of Palestine and they themselves should also not be allowed to interfere with the administration or affairs of Palestine or force the Jews to make their homes there and thus incite a quarrel between the Jews and the Arabs. It is the League of Nations which has entrusted this mandate to the British Government. The Muslim League does not like this policy of the League of Nations, and it has expressed it on many occasions on the platform. Our Party is now voicing the views of the Muslim League through this House, and that is the reason why we are supporting the amendment of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum that India should stop its contributions to the League. If our voice is not put before the League of Nations by our representatives, at least this view will be placed before them through this House that we do not agree with the action taken by the League of Nations in imposing the mandate on the British Government to handle the affairs of Palestine. We feel that the British Government has not kept the promises which it had made to the Arabs, and it has bungled the whole affair. They have unnecessarily, on account of a small affair, created a good deal of mischief in the whole world, and they have unnecessarily created a feeling of criticism and hostility in the minds of those people who would have been otherwise the greatest supporters of the British Empire. This is the policy which has been pursued by the British Government which is totally wrong in the eyes of the Muslim League and the Muslim League Party in this House. We, therefore, support the amendment of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum, but as it cannot be supported without supporting the main Resolution, we are bound to support the Resolution as well. That is the position of our Party.

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I claim the kind indulgence of the House on the ground that I am one of those who very rarely bother the House with their speeches. I hope, therefore, the House will kindly bear with me when I offer a few remarks on the subject under discussion. I have listened very carefully to the various speeches that have been delivered on this occasion and I gather that the indictment against the League is based on the following grounds. Firstly, the League has failed to fulfil the objects which it was designed

[Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid.]

to serve. Secondly, India's contribution is out of all proportion to the benefits which it derives by its membership. Thirdly, India is represented very inadequately on the administration of the League of Nations. Of course, there seems to be another deeper ground and that is that because India is not a free country, it should walk out of the League of Nations. Well, Sir, there seems to be unanimity on one point, namely, that the League has certainly not been very successful in handling some of the major crises that have arisen in its chequered history. Now, we must examine the causes of this failure. There are two very important reasons. One is that the League of Nations lost the support of the United States of America and, secondly, the League of Nations was unable to legislate against the emergence of what I may call the totalitarian ideology. At the time of its inception, nobody could foresee this factor which has upset the calculations of the statesmen who were the founders of the League. These seem to me to be the chief contributory causes of the failure of the League in handling successfully questions of great political importance. But, I feel that by seceding from the League no particular object would be served except that we shall be losing our international status. If we have to go to the League again when we achieve our freedom, why should we leave it now and cut ourselves adrift from an organization which we hope to rejoin again.

As I said, the League has not been very successful in many of its functions. But apart from the political side of the League there are some other activities which have been eminently successful. Take, for instance, the abolition of slavery. Then, there is the question of drug traffic, intellectual co-operation and technical organisations. Further, there is the International Labour Office. The League has done a great deal for improving the labour conditions in the world, for which we ought to be thankful and appreciate its efforts in that behalf. There are many other things. The abolition of slavery is not an unimportant matter. I am prepared to believe that slavery has certainly been wiped out of existence in the world, except perhaps in certain remote and inaccessible parts of the world. I think the results of the efforts of the League organisation entitle it to our appreciation. By cutting ourselves adrift from the League and seceding from it, we shall be losing touch with an organisation which has rendered immense humanitarian and social service to the world. I feel that the contribution of India is certainly heavy. I know from personal experience that Indian delegates have time and again made every endeavour to persuade the League to reduce that contribution. I think their efforts have met with a certain amount of success. I am glad to hear from the Honourable Mr. Spence today that a further definite effort is going to be made to achieve a substantial reduction of India's contribution and I hope that will materialise. Thirdly, there is the inadequate representation of Indians on the League organisation. I feel rather strongly myself on this point and hope that the League authorities will appreciate the fact that India has been a very large contributor to its finances and in recognition of that fact India's representation on the League should be much larger than it has been. We have this Resolution before us which seeks to end our connection with the League organisation and there is Mr. Joshi's amended Resolution which seeks to improve the usefulness of the League. I am not for ending things. I am for mending

things and I am in favour of the amendment which Mr. Joshi has moved in the House today.

As regards the Palestine question, there is no doubt that Muslim opinion is unanimous in wishing the Palestine Arabs all happiness and relief from their present troubles. I doubt very much whether this Resolution is the proper means for ventilating grievances on the Palestine question, that is to say by means of a Resolution which seeks to sever our connection with the League of Nations. I cannot, therefore, support the amendment of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. I would beg of the House again to realise that in a matter like this we should exhibit a larger outlook and sympathy. I am afraid that if we pass this Resolution the outside world would regret that India for inadequate reasons has severed her connection with a beneficent organisation. India or the world would not be a gainer. If by India's severance from the League of Nations, the League could be made more useful and be made a more steady factor in the political situation in the world, well by all means let her do so. But I am afraid the reverse would be the case. India would lose the opportunity of exerting her influence in world affairs in accordance with her past traditions. With these words, I support the amended Resolution moved by Mr. Joshi.

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

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

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

"That the question be now put."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—57.

Abdul Ghani, Maulvi Muhammad.
Abdul Qaiyum, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
Basu, Mr. R. N.
Chaudhury, Mr. Brojendra Narayan.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Das, Mr. B.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Mr. Govind V.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Ghiasuddin Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. K. S.
Hans Raj, Raizada.
Hegde, Sri K. B. Jinaraja.
Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury
Muhammad.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.

Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Manu Subedar, Mr.
Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Syed.
Pande, Mr. Badri Dutt.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Rao, Mr. M. Thirumala.
Raza Ali, Sir Syed.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Santhanam, Mr. K.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shahban, Mian Ghulam Kadir
Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Sikandar Ali Choudhury, Maulvi.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Subbarayan, Shrimati K. Radha Bai.
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr. Sir.

NOES—43.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aikman, Mr. A.
 Ayyar, Mr. N. M.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Boyle, Mr. J. D.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Chambers, Mr. S. P.
 Chanda, Mr. A. K.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Dalpat Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Gorwala, Mr. A. D.
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Hardman, Mr. J. S.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kamaluddin Ahmed, Shams-ul-Ulema.
 Lillie, Mr. C. J. W.

Mackeown, Mr. J. A.
 Maxwell, The Honourable Mr. R. M.
 Menon, Mr. P. A.
 Menon, Mr. P. M.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Miller, Mr. C. C.
 Mukherji, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Nur Muhammad, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.
 Ogilvie, Mr. C. M. G.
 Rahman, Lieut.-Col. M. A.
 Roughton, Mr. N. J.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar Sir.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripen-dra.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Staig, Mr. B. M.
 Stewart, The Honourable Sir Thomas.
 Sukthankar, Mr. Y. N.
 Sundaram, Mr. V. S.
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

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

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to convey to the League of Nations India's dissatisfaction that in major political issues it has so far failed to achieve its purpose of bringing about international peace and protecting the interests of smaller nations, to put forward before the League proposals for making it a better and more effective instrument for accomplishing its aims and objects by strengthening the Covenant of the League and otherwise and for India's more effective participation in its work and also recommends to the Government of India to take such steps, as are necessary to secure the acceptance of its proposals by the League."

4 P.M.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—43.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.

Ahmed, Mr. K.
Aikman, Mr. A.
Ayyar, Mr. N. M.
Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
Boyle, Mr. J. D.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chambers, Mr. S. P.
Chanda, Mr. A. K.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
Dalpat Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.

Gorwala, Mr. A. D.
Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Hardman, Mr. J. S.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kamaluddin Ahmed, Shams-ul-Ulema.
Lillie, Mr. C. J. W.

Mackeown, Mr. J. A.
Maxwell, The Honourable Mr. R. M.
Menon, Mr. P. A.
Menon, Mr. P. M.
Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
Miller, Mr. C. C.
Mukherji, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Nur Muhammad, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.
Ogilvie, Mr. C. M. G.
Rahman, Lieut.-Col. M. A.
Roughton, Mr. N. J.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar Sir.

Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripen dra.
Spence, Mr. G. H.
Staig, Mr. B. M.
Stewart, The Honourable Sir Thomas.
Sukthankar, Mr. Y. N.
Sundaram, Mr. V. S.
Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

NOES—57.

Abdul Ghani, Maulvi Muhammad.
Abdul Qaiyum, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
Basu, Mr. R. N.
Chaudhury, Mr. Brojendra Narayan.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Das, Mr. B.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Mr. Govind V.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Ghiasuddin Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. K. S.
Hans Raj, Raizada.
Hegde, Sri K. B. Jinaraja.
Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhury Muhammad.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Laksimi Kanta.

Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mann Subedar, Mr.
Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Pande, Mr. Badri Dutt.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Rao, Mr. M. Thirumala.
Raza Ali, Sir Syed.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Santhanam, Mr. K.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shahtan, Mian Ghulam Kadir Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Sikandar Ali Choudhury, Maulvi.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Som, Mr. Surya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Subbarayan, Shrimati K. Radha Bai.
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr. Sir.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is now seven minutes past Four of the Clock. The question has arisen whether the Chair can put the amendment and the Resolution to vote. There is no precedent that the Chair can find and the Chair does not know whether any question like this has arisen before; but if it is the general desire of the House the Chair will, on this occasion, put the amendment and the Resolution to the vote without creating a precedent

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member): As regards general desire, Sir, it is not the desire of this side.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, the Chair would take up the adjournment motion.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: May I raise a point of order, and that is this: I quite concede that there is no precedent. The rule which has always been observed is that when voting on a particular motion is in progress, that particular matter must be finished.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Can the Honourable Member show any ruling like that?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: That has been the case always

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When there is an adjournment motion?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Once voting is in progress. The point is really this. You now put Mr. Joshi's amendment, which is in substitution of the original Resolution, to the vote already: this motion is being voted upon. When a question of time is raised, the point has to be considered. The voting is not complete. Either there is some logic in this or we are going to apply sense to it. Applying logic, it is already past Four, and, therefore,

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Because the voting was going on.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Therefore, I say that voting is continuing on this motion

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The point of order has been raised. The Chair would say that it has got to stop now. The voting on the amendment of Mr. Joshi was actually in progress when the Clock struck Four, but as that amendment has been disposed of, the Chair does not think, under the Standing Order, it should be justified in proceeding further with the Resolution before the House. But the Chair is prepared to consider the question again on a later occasion and give its considered ruling, but a ruling has already been given so far as the present occasion is concerned.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ANTI-INDIAN RIOTS IN BURMA.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi (Dacca cum Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

Sir, yesterday morning, I received this telegram from the Southern India Chamber of Commerce, Burma

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhuri (Bengal: Landholders): On a point of order, Sir. As we have already started about 12 minutes late, can we get extra time after six o'clock?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): On that, the Standing Order is quite clear.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi:

"Alarmed at recrudescence anti-Indian riots looting incendiarism Burma. Madras Premier informed Assembly twenty seventh January that on eighteenth January at Mohnya one Indian cotton mill burnt twelve Indian shops looted nine Indians injured stop since then situation worsening."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not read all that.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: I have to acquaint the House with the contents of the telegram:

"As evidenced by reports Indians assaulted several Indian shops looted in Myingyan District headquarters on thirtieth January stop request move adjournment motion and urge Government take immediate steps protect Indian life property in Burma. . . . South Indian Chamber."

Sir, at the Round Table Conference which was held in England in 1930 the question of the separation of Burma from India was considered. I was one of the delegates who served on the Committee, and I opposed the separation tooth and nail, for the main reason that a large number of Indians had settled down in Burma, they have sunk capital to the tune of millions of rupees and they had been doing business there for some generations. Most of them, at least a majority of them, were Mussalmans, and their position would be very difficult if the separation took place. Secondly, Sir, another point which was prominently in our mind was that the European community in Burma wanted to exploit Burma and not to give even a small portion of the business to the Indians who had been trading there for generations. They wanted to keep the whole loaf to themselves and oust the Indians from Burma so that they might exploit the whole country for themselves. That was the idea in their mind

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): It is quite untrue.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: I may be quite untrue as far as my friend is concerned, but it is quite true so far as I am concerned.

Mr. F. E. James: May I rise to a point of explanation? I challenge my friend to point to any statement made at the Round Table Conference by any European representative, or to any statement made in Burma by any European political party even advocating the separation of Burma?

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: I never said that the European delegates at the Round Table Conference made any remark of that kind, nor did I say that the Europeans publicly declared at public meetings their desire to exploit Burma. That was the intention in their mind

Mr. F. E. James: No. no.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: We could gather it from the manner in which they were manipulating the separation of Burma from India. I hope I shall not be interrupted again because I have got only 15 minutes. Sir, when it was settled that Burma would be separated from India, a definite assurance was given by His Majesty's Government to the effect that they would see to the protection of life and property of the Indians who had settled in Burma. I ask, Sir, where is that assurance today? What has been done to that assurance which was given to us when we were in England? What happened to it? Don't we know what happened only last year? In July, there was a tremendous loss of life, and an enormous amount of property was looted, and nothing was done either by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State to prevent murder, arson and looting that was going on there

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Go to Burma and see the next.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: If one European in that country had been murdered, thousands of military men and armed forces, aeroplanes, in fact, all the British regiments would have been drafted to that place to protect the life and property of the Europeans living there. But, in the case of Indians, nothing has been done, because, it is the Indians who are suffering, and not Europeans.

Sir, the Honourable the Member for Education, speaking on the 5th of September last, made a very long speech on this subject, and that speech is now before me. I ask him to say what since then has been done to protect the life and property of Indians in that country? As far as we know, nothing has been done.

Now, Sir, Burma was separated as long ago as the 1st of February, 1937, and even an Agent of the Governor General was not appointed there till the 5th of September. The Agent had not reached there even on the 5th September, but six weeks later. Now, Sir, it is really a very serious matter. This House is quite helpless. We will shortly see my friend, the Education Secretary, shedding crocodile tears and expressing lip sympathy for all that has been happening in that country, and, with that, everything will end. I ask him, instead of shedding crocodile tears and making sweet speeches, please, for Heaven's sake, take action and tell us what action you have taken to prevent this looting, murder, arson and all the rest of it which is continuing from day to day. What steps are you going to take, what specific steps are you going to take to stop all these things? You must make a statement on the floor of the House today here and now to prevent

Mr. F. E. James: What steps can he take?

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: Let him say that he cannot take any steps.

Mr. F. E. James: Tell him what to do.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: I would send all the military there to protect the Indians. Let him be frank and tell us that he cannot do anything, that we should help ourselves. We will know then what to do. Do not give us an assurance which you cannot carry out. Do not say things which you know you may not be able to carry out. If it is not in your power, say so, and we would know our position and we shall advise our Indian friends there as to what to do, and what not to do. Sir, I move.

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

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I rise to support the motion. I had also a motion in my own name, but my Honourable friend's motion had priority. I heartily support the motion that has been moved by him. This is the second of the adjournment motions on this matter within less than six months. I will immediately answer my Honourable friends of the European Group as to what the Government of India could have done and ought to have done. Then, I shall go to the other atrocities and the state of terror in which our Indian brethren in Burma are from day to day.

It is not at our instance that Burma was separated. It was against the unanimous protest of India that Burma was separated. We did not long for bringing Burma within India as part of India, nor were we responsible for the separation of Burma. At the time Burma was separated no special steps were taken to see that Indian life and property were safeguarded. Assuming that Burma is an independent State, the ultimate thing that could be done is waging war with Burma and sending troops. I do not ask that the final step should be taken now. The self-same question was put by the Honourable Member in charge of the portfolio and his able Secretary when the previous adjournment motion was being discussed on the floor of the House. It was suggested but the Honourable Member himself said that that ought to be done as the last resort. I do say that that ought not to be taken in the earlier stages, but there are other things that could be done. Firstly, what I say is, that an Agent must have been asked to go to the spot and make enquiries as to what had occurred. The Agent ought to have been appointed in 1937 itself as soon as Burma was separated. It took nearly one and a half or two years for the appointment of the Agent, and after he went there, I ask the Honourable Member in charge of the portfolio, did he go to the scene of occurrence, did he go to the spot and make enquiries? After he was appointed did he take any steps to get into touch with the Indians there? I shall presently show that this is not a sporadic incident, but that this is by design to turn out all Indians from Burma. It is not only one section of Burmans who are interested in it, all sections which have voice in the administration of Burma with the people in addition and it is unfortunate that I have to make reference to the Government of Burma—it is absolutely indifferent

[Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangur.]

in this matter. Whatever may be said on behalf of the Burman Government I can read between the lines, and it seems to me to be in consonance with the policy of the Government of Burma, though I am not prepared to say emphatically to that extent.

The phongyis who shape the course of action in Burma, the press who shape public opinion in Burma, the Youth League in Burma—all of them have combined to suppress the Indian element, to exterminate the Indian section from Burma altogether. The Indians have a lot of interests there. They are nearly a million there. They have sunk a good deal of money, and Lower Burma is what it is today, an industrial country, only on account of the Indian capital invested and the Indian labour that has been sent out to Burma. Lots of Indians have migrated to that country from 1869 onwards. They went there by invitation, not at their own instance. People were induced to go there; the zemindars were asked to send their farm servants and labourers so that Burma might improve industrially. Today the fate of Indians there is very pitiable; they are afraid of what will happen to their lives and their property. That is the position in which they are. I ask, was the Government of India really alive to their responsibility when they did not care to appoint an Agent immediately after the separation of Burma? This is not a new incident. So early as 1930 the Koringis were attacked—that was when the Government of India Act was on the anvil, and negotiations for separation started as early as 1930. The Burmese wanted to make out that they would not tolerate Indians any longer there. That was the first step that they took to give effective evidence that Burma wanted separation. That is how they started these riots.

Then, after the Act was passed in 1935, just a short time after separation, there was again a riot in 1937, then in 1938, and there is a third riot today. All these have a common origin. It is not a book that was written that has given rise to these riots. It is only an excuse as the Committee has reported. The Government of India has been sleeping over these. They were not alive to their responsibility nor did they discharge their responsibility properly. The Agent there ought to have been an Indian—an Indian who can easily get into touch with the Indians there. But an European has been appointed and I am afraid that he is sleeping over his duties there. Then there is the question of trade relations between India and Burma. Today the export from India to Burma comes to the tune of 11 crores and exports from Burma to India comes to the tune of 26 crores. Burma, therefore, has got a favourable trade balance and it is in the interests of Burma and the Burma Government to see that they maintain proper relations and good relations with India. At any time we can see that none of these exports come from Burma to this country. Is it not a weapon which could be resorted to? What steps have been taken in that direction? Is it not the duty of the Government of India to write to the Burma Government and ask them to suppress or prevent all those papers which are trying to foment communal hatred there? What steps have been taken in that direction? What steps have been taken to round up those goondas who call themselves phongyis or monks? That is a thing which is done and could be done by any Government which is honestly anxious to discharge its duties in maintaining law and order and prevent sacrifice of life and property of

minority communities there? Has that been done? What has been done in respect of the Youth League there? I shall read to the House the last portion of the Committee's report. The full report of the Committee is not available but there are some extracts from it in the *Statesman*:

"The Committee consider that it is not on account of the writing of a particular book that all these incidents have taken place. There is a design behind."

It is really curious that one Burman offends another Burman and then it is the Indian's head that is cut off and it is the Indian's property that is looted. It is a riddle which I will set to any man, but however long he may think over it he will not be able to come to any conclusion or solution. When two Burmans fight, why should Indians die? I ask the Honourable Member in charge of this department to solve this riddle. The other day when the last adjournment motion was being discussed in September in Simla, my Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, said that some Buddhist Muslim wrote a book and on account of certain passages in it accusing the Buddhist religion the riot broke out. I ask him to disabuse his mind and not to give this kind of special pleading for the Burma Government. Let him not entertain that idea and delude himself into not taking proper action.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): On a point of personal explanation. All that I said in September was that this was at the time understood to be the immediate cause of the riot.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: That was the excuse for the riot. The Committee cannot be said to be interested in the Indian people there, and even that Committee had to report that the cause of these riots is something much deeper. That is the Burmans want to have Burma for themselves that is the cry there. The last portion of the report is worth reading:

"While these are the problems in the background, against which the riots have to be studied, they would not have become the disturbing factors they did but for the activities of the Burmese Press."

In an earlier portion, the Committee say:

"On the other hand, the speed with which the disturbances spread and the obstinacy with which the feelings that caused them remain together with the crescendo of political propaganda all contribute to the belief that the real cause of the riots was not merely Maung Shwe Hpi's book. There had been at work in Burma for some time a number of dangerous influences or causes which to some extent lay at the root of the passions which the book served to release. They are economic, political and social in character."

In conclusion, the committee say:

"There is plenty of evidence, that once started the riot found a great many of its recruits among the young men belonging to the Thakin organisations. That on the whole the Thakin movement has for some time been doing mischievous work admits of little doubt. Though the leaders did not themselves cause the rioting in any direct sense, the readiness with which their disciples took part in it has amply proved that they made a great contribution towards it. The movement unless checked or unless public opinion is strong enough to stop it, which the Committee doubt, will remain a dangerous source of unrest."

The committee have honest doubts that the public in Burma may not take any step to stop this agitation. So far as this adjournment motion is concerned, I want to know what the Government of India have done? Have they written to the Government of Burma in a tone

[Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.]

which the occasion requires? Have they warned the Government of Burma that unless prompt steps are taken they will have to enter into warfare with them. Then, economic steps ought to be taken to stop Burman goods from coming into this country. Steps should also be taken to prevent Burmans entering this country. May I ask what steps have been taken in that direction. The goondas who foment the strife should be rounded up and the youth movement should be checked. The phongyis and other persons should be asked to give security not to indulge in this propaganda. These are the steps which can be easily taken. I ask if the Agent in Burma has been able to collect statistics of the number of persons who have suffered in the last riots and those who have suffered in the recent riots. Even statistics we do not have. Last time when the adjournment motion was moved, it was said that an enquiry should be set on foot for the purpose of ascertaining compensation or adequate relief to the sufferers. Mere compensation is not enough after death has taken away a number of Indians. Sufficient steps ought to be taken to see that in future at least such riots do not occur. There are two things which the Government of India have to do. One is to see that proper steps are taken that such riots do not recur and that those persons who have suffered do get proper compensation. Lastly, a committee consisting of responsible Indians may be sent immediately to make an investigation into the causes of the riots, to advise the Government of Burma, as a friendly and good will commission, to take strong steps to suppress riots in future, if they occur and if the Burma Government does not take proper or adequate steps it is for us to enforce the economic sanctions. Whatever the League of Nations might have been able to do, let us do it here. Failing that, the army, which has been allowed to be used by the Government of Burma, should be used against Burma, in the interests of India. This is the least that we expect the Government to do to protect the lives of Indians settled there. The lot of Indians in Burma is hopeless. They went to Transvaal and Kenya of their own accord. To some extent they are responsible for their own lot there. Here the people were invited to go and settle there and they have been cut away from their mother country in circumstances beyond their control. In these circumstances the Government of India cannot sit with folded hands and say that nothing could be done. If there is a will, I believe that Government can do something and I am really sorry to note that the Government are not prepared to do what they can do. I whole-heartedly support this adjournment motion.

Mr. F. E. James: Last Tuesday, I had an opportunity of a conference with two distinguished Burman gentlemen in Colombo, U Ba Win, who is at present the Mayor of Rangoon, and U Ba Lwin, a Member of the House of Representatives. This conference and a very large number of letters I have had from Indian friends in Burma have led me to draw certain conclusions from the present situation. In the first place the latest recrudescence of rioting and disorder does not appear to have in its origin any definitely anti-Indian bias. Of course, Indians have been affected. Every one knows that.

My Honourable friend, Sir A. H. Ghuznavi, has read out some incidents where Indian life and property were severely damaged; but my in-

formation goes to show that the present disorder is largely of a general economic and political character and is widespread throughout the province of Burma. The other observation I should like to make is that it is quite clear that the Government in Burma today is by no means a strong Government. It is uncertain of its tenure. It is uncertain of the support it can get from its followers. It is still more uncertain as to its own policy. Let me refer to a speech recently delivered by Mr. W. C. Richards who was at one time a member of this House and who now leads the European Group in the Burma Assembly. He criticised the Ministry on the ground that it had displayed weakness in dealing with disorder and he went on to show that the Government of the day did not fulfil its primary obligation not only to the minorities in Burma but to the population generally. The Prime Minister of Burma in a statement which he made only last week was at great pains to point out that he and his Government were being coerced by agitators. He went on to say that their methods were aimed not only against the present constitution but against any constitution and that the new constitutional theory, "seems to be that everybody has a right to govern the country except the Government and that the legislature appointed by a country-wide vote does not represent the country but mass meetings held at some place or other always do." Mr. Richards went on to assert that the sooner the Government of the day definitely asserted itself against these chaotic tendencies the better it would be for Burma. Well, Sir, it is obviously difficult for us in this House to suggest to the Burma Government precisely what they should do to meet these forces of disorder. I think the Provincial Governments in this country have, since the inauguration of provincial autonomy, a far better record in dealing with these matters than the Government of Burma. And yet that does not mean that even our Provincial Governments, firm as they have been in the maintenance of law and order, have been able to suppress altogether certain disorderly elements and their effects on policy. It is obviously a very difficult matter. One thing that my Burmese friends impressed upon me was that not only the Burma Government but the whole of the Burmese people were extremely sensitive of criticism coming from this country. Now that does not mean that we should not criticize when the citizens of this country are in danger; and I think we are perfectly right in raising our voices as unitedly as possible in condemning any weakness in the Government where it affects deleteriously the people of this country who are the inhabitants of that place. It is difficult to make precise recommendations. Some have been made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. Some of them are not quite practicable; some are; but it is clear that, in the last analysis, as I said on a motion of adjournment on the 15th of September last year, in the last analysis, if the Governments in Burma are not able to discharge their responsibilities, those responsibilities then must rest on the representative of the British Government itself.

Now, first of all, I consider that the functions of the Agent of the Government of India in Burma should be greatly widened. At present he deals almost exclusively with immigrant labour. His functions should include the representation of the Government of India on all matters affecting Indians in Burma. I do not agree with the criticism advanced by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, that the difficulty of the present situation is partly due to the fact that the present

[Mr. F. E. James.]

officer is a European, for, as he doubtless knows, that officer was appointed by the Government of India on the express recommendation of the Government of Madras. Secondly, I am not very much in favour of goodwill missions at the present time. I did discuss the advisability of some such organization going over to Burma, with my Burmese friends and they said, that unless the goodwill mission was one representing the authority of the Government of India it would be of little value. My second suggestion would be that the Member in charge of this Department himself or his Secretary should go to Burma with the whole authority of the Government of India behind them

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member): Preferably the Secretary?

Mr. F. E. James: Both if you like, both if they can be spared from office at the same time. My point is that I see no particular value in sending a casual unofficial deputation of goodwill at the present time. That would not have the slightest effect in Burma and I do not think that it would be particularly welcomed in Burma. But I do believe that a visit by a Member of the Government of India would have some effect. Thirdly, I should like to ask—and I asked this on a previous occasion—as to whether the Government of India themselves are satisfied that everything has been done, so far as lies in the power of the Governor of Burma, in the discharge of his special responsibilities. If the Government of Burma is not able to deal with the matter with authority and with fairness, then they should give way to some other Government that can. But it is very doubtful whether there exist in Burma today even among the Opposition the elements which can contribute to a stable government. If, therefore, there is very little prospect for some time of a stable and strong Government in Burma, then surely the case is greatly strengthened for the use of the Governor's special powers. I know that that is not a policy widely supported in this country, yet I am perfectly sure (interruption) that those who say "no" will be very glad to see the Governor of Burma's powers exercised in regard to the protection of the minorities to which they belong.

An Honourable Member: That is the Englishman's policy of "divide and rule".

Mr. F. E. James: That is a highly irrelevant remark. I am trying to make a serious contribution to the discussion and I hope the House will take my suggestions in the spirit in which they are offered. Sir, the position is a difficult one. These particular riots are not only anti-Indian; they are not anti-Indian in their origin; they are a very different proposition altogether. They are riots arising from political and economic discontent, which from time to time evidences itself in savage attacks upon the Indian population. What we do feel essentially is that the Indian population in Burma should be better protected; and if the Government of Burma cannot protect them, then other powers should be used and, if necessary, the intervention of the British Government itself should be called into being.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Mr. President, five months ago, almost to a day, this very question of Indians in Burma was raised and discussed on an adjournment motion. That it has been raised again, only on the second day of the present Session, is proof of the keen and continued interest which Honourable Members take in this question, and also a reminder that the causes of anxiety still persist. We have a reminder of the justification, shall we say, for that anxiety in that incident at Moynwa to which my Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, referred in his opening speech on this adjournment motion. And it is not merely that. Of an Indian population of roughly a million and a quarter people, a considerable number are undoubtedly concentrated in Rangoon, but others are scattered all over the country, some in very minute groups and, therefore, by reason of their dispersion they are exposed to danger unless the requisite element of protection from the Government and of goodwill from the people are forthcoming. Those being the circumstances, it is not unnatural nor unexpected that there should be this anxiety for the situation of the Indian community in Burma. That is common ground between us. Now the question that arises is: What is it that the Government of India could have done since this matter was last discussed, and what is it that they can do now to provide a permanent and a final solution of the difficulties that have arisen—permanent and ever-lasting protection, if you like, for Indians in every part of Burma? Now I submit that that particular problem has two aspects of it. One is that of the immediate precautions to be taken for the protection of Indian life and property. The second is that of the remedy to be applied for the eradication of those more deep-seated and permanent causes which make the adoption of these special precautions necessary.

Before I go on to deal with either of these two points which I have mentioned, I should like to dispose of the actual position with regard to this disturbance at Moynwa which occurred on the 18th of January. Inquiries made from the Government of Burma and our Agent in Burma both prove that those riots arose out of a fracas between certain students who wanted to have a hartal observed for something entirely unconnected with the Indians,—as a matter of fact as part of the drive against the ministry in Burma by the Opposition, and the refusal of the Indian shopkeepers to fall in line with the wishes of these people. The phongyis, the ubiquitous priests in Burma, came into the picture, and there was this trouble resulting in the burning down of an Indian mill, the looting of 12 Indian shops and injuries to 9 Indian persons. I can assure my Honourable friends that, if the situation in Rangoon itself had permitted of the Agent proceeding immediately to these places, he would have done so. I shall explain in a moment what the tension in Rangoon is. It was because of this tension in Rangoon that he did not proceed there immediately, but he has satisfied himself that, immediately after these occurrences, not merely the local civil police but the military police were reinforced and that the situation there is completely under control.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: But the mill has been burnt.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: It was not a large size mill. Of course, I am not justifying its being burnt, but I am simply trying to say that whatever disturbance arose on this occasion was promptly suppressed and the police there have been reinforced. Now, Sir, the point I was going to make was that when the House last discussed this question in September there had

[Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai.]

been a series of continuous riots. In November I had occasion to answer a question by my Honourable friend, Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar, in which I explained that, apart from some boycotting of shops in Mandalay early in October, there had been no trouble up to the time when I answered this question, namely, about the middle of November. The point for the consideration of the House there is that from about the middle of October, when this boycott took place, until the 18th of January when this recrudescence of trouble at Moynwa occurred, the Indian position, as regards the immunity of life and property from menace, was comparatively peaceful. I would not make a higher claim than that for the position as it stood. Now, I think it will be appreciated by the House that this does represent some improvement. And, I would also explain, how this improvement has been effected because it has been urged in the course of the debate that the Government of Burma have proved absolutely supine or indifferent to the position.

When the discussion took place in September, I was at pains to point out that we ourselves were not satisfied with the manner in which the Government of Burma had acted on that occasion. But, Sir, you have to take into consideration two things. First, that in Rangoon itself, ever since the middle of December, a very tense situation has developed, not directed against the Indian community as such, but as a part of the interplay, if you like, of local politics, involving marches of cultivators from outside Rangoon to Rangoon, of strikers from the oil fields marching also to Rangoon, of students' strikes and other similar situations. Here, again, I think one may say that it does represent an improvement on the old situation that, although there has been this tension in Rangoon, on the whole the Indian position has been safe.

Now, for a statement of the action which the Government of Burma have taken. Let me say at once that it was due to some extent, at any rate, to the representations made by us with the support in this House as a result of the discussion which took place in September, 1928. Sir, the position is that in Rangoon under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code all processions and meetings have been stopped. The police has been reinforced. Not only has the civil police been augmented in strength but the military police also. The press has, unfortunately, functioned in the last few months as an instrument of incitement, particularly incitement against the Indians. There, again, under the special Press Emergency Powers Act, copies of newspaper issues and books in which this incitement has been indulged have been forfeited, security has been demanded from certain editors who are offenders in this respect and two editors have also been prosecuted and imprisoned. I think the House will agree that here again there is something in the way of an improvement to record on the old position.

To get back to this episode of Moynwa. We, on this side of the House, deplore it as much as Honourable Members in any section of the House. But, Sir, we have to bear in mind what the writers of the interim report of the Riot Inquiry Committee, a Committee on which there are two Indian members, have to say with regard to the actual position or the actual causes of the differences and the tension between the Indian and the Burman communities. They say that this thing has been growing since 1922, that is, for 17 years, and although this religious pamphlet—I am afraid I cannot correctly or even adequately pronounce the name of the author—might have

been the immediate cause of the trouble in 1938, there are more fundamental causes, such as the question of Indian immigration into Burma, the question of the holding of land by Indians in Burma, the question of marriages between Indians and Burmans. I must not be understood as either adopting the emphasis which the authors of this report have laid on these causes, or as endorsing all the remedies which they have suggested for doing away with these causes. All that I wish the House to appreciate is that you cannot summarily dismiss the arguments which they have put forward for treating the problem as, in a way, a long range problem which will take a certain amount of time and tact to settle. That being the position, we have to reconcile ourselves to the possibility that now and again a flare-up may occur. My Honourable friend, Mr. James, it will be remembered, in the debate of September, 1938, asked whether the Government of India had offered to His Majesty's Secretary of State to reinforce the police and the military in Burma for the purpose of protecting the Indian interests there. I said to him then that it was a matter which the Government of India would take up immediately with the Secretary of State. I can inform him and I can inform the House that it was taken up then. The Government of India offered to lend military or police reinforcements to meet the situation. That offer was made then and that offer stands now.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi: What did the Government of Burma say?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: The Government of Burma said that they had brought the trouble under control.—I am referring to the position when the riots had practically come to an end—and that at the moment they did not see any reason why they should look to any quarter outside Burma for the discharge of their primary responsibility for the maintenance of law and order. Now, Sir, that being the position, I submit that, in so far as immediate measures for the protection of the Indian life and property are concerned we have done all that we could. And I maintain that on the whole the record of the Government of Burma during the last few months in this respect has improved. In so far as the causes of the trouble are concerned, I regret to say that it is not possible in the twinkling of the eye, as it were, to find a solution which would meet the requirements of the case. It has been suggested in certain quarters that we might send troops to Burma for the purpose of protecting the lives of Indians there. I had occasion early in the course of my remarks to draw attention to the scattered nature of the Indian population in Burma. I think a moment's reflection will show that if we were to rely on the protection of each individual Indian in Burma by the police or the military to be sent from here, we shall have to enrol millions of people for this purpose. The solution of this problem can be found only, as I said, by the Government of Burma discharging their responsibility impartially and effectively and, even more, by the Indian community in Burma and the Burman community in Burma coming together once more in the friendly spirit which, before 1922, characterised their relations.

Sir, let me say to the House that we have given them a full and frank account of what we have done. We seek, and I venture to suggest we deserve, their co-operation. These periodic votes of censure, as far as I can make out, do not make a practical contribution to the solution of this extremely difficult problem. It may be that what we have done is not enough. There are difficulties inherent in the problem which make it impossible for

[Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai.]

any one to claim complete effectiveness for measures that may be applied. If we have failed, if our resourcefulness has not been equal to the occasion, surely, the least that we can ask Honourable Members is to put forward concrete suggestions and we will be prepared to consider them with the attention and the care it deserves. Apart from that, I do not think really any case has been so far made out for censuring the Government of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr.

5 P.M. President, I must confess to a feeling of disappointment at the concluding sentences of my Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai's speech. I do hope that after the recrudescence of these riots in Burma the Government of India would take this House into their confidence fully and say: we have on the whole failed to guarantee protection to life and property in Burma, and, therefore, we propose to do something else and something more effective. On the other hand, he patted his own back and said "we have done all that we can, the Burma Government has done all that it can do, and we can do no more, unless you make some concrete suggestions which do not occur to us." I suggest that such bankruptcy is not worthy of a Government which claims the power and the prestige of the Government of India. I want to put it to the Government, this question: one murder at Serajevo inflamed the whole of Europe into an armagaddon, the kidnapping of one European woman set aflame the whole of the Punjab, the murder of one British Resident in one of the Orissa States brought forth a large body of troops into Orissa, and I want to ask my two Indian friends who are sitting so forlornly on the Treasury Benches, deserted by their European colleagues because Indian lives alone are involved, to ask their European colleagues and ask them this frank question: supposing a few European lives had been lost by murder in Burma, would they have kept quiet and pretend that they have done everything and that the Burma Government have done everything and that they can do nothing more and that they are helpless and would they have asked us to suggest some remedy? We will suggest, but first vacate your place. Let us take your place. We will deal with this. It seems to me unworthy of the Government to stick to their Benches, and say we can do no more and, therefore, you must suggest something else to us. Our demand is simply this: Burma was part of India till the other day and you chose to separate Burma from us. There are more than a million Indians there and they have been there for a very long time past and they have rendered distinguished and meritorious services for the development of Burma in every direction. We only want that their lives and property ought to be adequately protected. The position as disclosed by the riots is only significant. I want to inform the Government from knowledge which I have in my possession that the lives and property of Indians are not safe even in Rangoon today. Every Indian in Burma has got to walk in constant dread of what will happen next.

It seems to me that Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai was on surer ground when he talked of the immediate as against the ultimate solution. On the question of the ultimate solution, I agree that it lies in the Indian people inhabiting Burma earning the goodwill and the affection of the people of Burma and both communities, the majority and the minority living together as brothers and sisters. We have the minority problem in this country also,

and I want to say nothing which will make our problem uglier or more difficult than it is today. That is the ultimate solution. Nor can I entirely agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. James, when he descanted on the special responsibility of the Governor for the protection of the minorities and he said that that protection ought to be invoked. I will not walk into his parlour. I have a holy horror of these Governor's safeguards. No minority can long rely or ultimately rely on the safeguards of the Governors alone. The minorities ought to learn to depend upon themselves, and to get, secure, and retain the affection and goodwill of majorities, and majorities must treat minorities not only justly but generously. That is the only way in which we can solve this problem ultimately. This idea of pathetic faith in the Governor's safeguards, in spite of the provocation to us by these continual attacks on Indian life and property, we are not going to agree to. My Honourable friend asked,—what shall we do? I make him a concrete suggestion. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ayyangar, also referred to it already. The trade agreement between India and Burma terminates sometime next year. I think they have got to give notice of termination sometime this year. If the Government of India are united and strong, let them give notice to the Burma Government that this agreement will be terminated when it falls due. Since Burma has a very favourable trade balance as against us, we can conduct these trade negotiations in such a manner that India and Burma can trade together as friendly neighbours, only if the life and property of our nationals are going to be protected. I want to know why my Honourable friend did not give this House that assurance. I am sure all sections of the House will be highly gratified if the Honourable Member, who I see is present here in the House now, can give us that assurance that they shall give notice of termination of this trade agreement, and will not renew a fresh trade agreement, unless ample and adequate safeguards and guarantees are forthcoming for the protection of Indian life and property in Burma.

I am glad that my Honourable friend, Mr. James, paid a tribute to the Provincial Governments in the maintenance of law and order. But we feel that in this matter the Government of Burma ought to be told by the Government of India that their duty to maintain law and order includes their duty to protect Indian nationals in that country. Since there is a common Secretary of State for India and for Burma, I should like to know what Lord Zetland is doing. Whenever we ask any question, a veil of secrecy is being drawn over all of them. "Have you addressed the Secretary of State"? Yes, is the answer. "Will you tell us what you have said"? No, is the answer. "Will you tell us what he has said"? "It is not in the public interest", is the answer. I want to know whether the Government of India have addressed Lord Zetland, who happens to be the Secretary of State for India and for Burma simultaneously, and what is his reply to this demand of the House for proper and fair treatment to Indians there. My Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, said in answer to a suggestion made by Mr. James, at the last Session, when this question came up before us that the offer of the Government of India to send troops down to Burma or extra police to Burma still remains and is still open. I want to know what has been the reaction of the Secretary of State for Burma to this. Has he accepted the offer? Is it the case of the Burma Government that they have proper powers but will not exercise them or is it the case of their not having enough troops or enough police to deal with this?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: If I might interrupt my Honourable friend for a minute, I had given an answer to that question on a point which was made I think by my Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi. I stated that we had been informed that the Burma Government felt that they had adequate forces at their disposal.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India accept that position when these riots take place months after the assurances were given and when Indian life and property are not secure even in Rangoon? It does seem to me that their acquiescence in that position shows a callousness—I am sorry to use that word—although they profess a great sympathy, I take them at their professions, but it does seem to me that they ought to have been more sensitive to the grievances and the wrongs of our people in Burma and taken definite and active steps. My Honourable friend asked a question as to what has not been done between the last debate and this debate on this matter. We put them forward in this House and my Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, dealt with those demands in his speech. The Honourable Sir Jagdish Prashad said on the last occasion:

"I may tell the House at once that the objective which Honourable Members opposite have and which Honourable Members on this side have is much the same, namely, that we want that the life and property and the honour of our nationals in Burma should be safe, that those who have hitherto lived in peace and harmony and have done so much for the economic development of that country should be allowed to make their own contribution to the further development of Burma."

Then, after giving that assurance, he also said:

"I may inform the House that we intend to take up with the Secretary of State and with the Government of Burma the question of compensation."

I should like to know where the matter stands. I should like to know whether an investigation has been made and any figures arrived at as to the amount of loss by way of property of Indians during the last riots, whether any attempt has been made to assess the compensation, and whether the compensation will be paid to Indian sufferers in the last riots.

The last point made was with regard to the Agent in Burma. My Honourable friend, Mr. James, answered Mr. Ayyangar's question about the European Agent by saying that after all the Government of Madras made this recommendation of European Agent. On that matter, I want to introduce no racial bias at all, but I do suggest that we must have an Agent with a bigger and higher status; and I suggest very earnestly to the Government of India to send a distinguished high Indian non-official who will command the respect and the confidence of all communities and will be able to represent the Government of India not only on paper, not only in theory but in fact; and the entire authority of the Government of India must be behind him. I also endorse the suggestion of Mr. James that either the Member or his able Secretary should go and try his persuasive powers with the Government and the people of Burma and not waste them on this desert House all the time. We are not convinced at all by your argument, try it elsewhere; go to Burma, talk to the people and the Government there, and see that they respect the honour, the property, and the lives of Indians there. It is no pleasure to us, as Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai said, to move and pass these votes of censure again and again. But what else can we do? Will my Honourable friend suggest something? Are we to tell them, "You have done well, you can do no more; who dares do more is none" and, therefore, let Indian lives and property be

sacrificed". I suggest, Sir, that any self-respecting party or Member of this House has no option but to bring up this matter again and again, and force it on the attention of the Government of India, in order that they may in their turn bring it to the notice of their master in Whitehall, the Secretary of State, so that we may at least feel that we have done and are doing everything in our power to see that the interests, the honour, and the safety of our nationals in Burma are amply secured.

The Honourable Kunwar Sir Jagdish Prasad (Member for Education, Health and Lands): Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, expressed some disappointment at the concluding portion of the speech of my Honourable friend the Education Secretary. With some hesitation and without meaning any offence to my Honourable friend I may express also a little disappointment not only at the commencement of his speech but at its middle part and also at its concluding portion. My Honourable friend in ending his speech told the House and the public outside that whatever men on the Government Benches may say here carries no weight with those on the other side but perhaps if they cross the seas the Burmans may be more easily taken in than are members of the Opposition here.

Sir, I acknowledge that this question which arouses,—and very naturally so,—such anxieties in this House and outside has been dealt with on the whole with moderation and restraint. The speeches that have been made express the anxiety not only of this House but an anxiety which is shared by a large section of Indians in Burma not only with regard to the present, whether their life and property will be safe, but deep anxiety as to the future. They feel that there is a school of political thought in Burma which may adopt as its programme the eviction of Indians from Burma by violent means. They wish to know whether this large body of Indians, which in the times when Burma was undeveloped did so much by its capital, labour and enterprise to develop it will be allowed to make further contributions to its prosperity or whether they would find conditions of living made intolerable for them. That I think, Sir, is a very natural alarm. There is no doubt that, as the report of the Burma Inquiry Committee shows, there is a section which under the guise of nationalism is preaching a crusade against the Indians, that they are using all the well-known devices of creating mass discontent and mass violence,—the youth leagues, violent newspaper articles, utilising religious and social prejudices, etc., in order to create a feeling of hostility to the Indians. I take it that it is the position of Honourable Members opposite, as it would be of all reasonable men, that what the Indians desire is that while legitimate grievances should be removed they should not be used as a pretext for expropriation, that in giving relief where relief is necessary it should be accompanied with justice. Nobody desires that the Burman should not have the right of utilising to the full the resources of his own country, but what the Indians ask for is that they should be allowed to continue as a peaceful minority and should have all the protection which a minority which conducts its business and makes its contribution to the material and also to the intellectual welfare of the country deserves.

Now, Sir, I come to one or two particular questions that my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and other speakers in this House have asked. As regards the question of compensation, if my Honourable friends will turn to the interim report of the Inquiry Committee, one of the terms of

[Kunwar Sir Jagdish Prasad.]

reference of the Inquiry Committee is the loss of property caused and the damage done; and I am sure that when this inquiry is complete this question will be further examined. I can also assure my Honourable friends that we have already brought this matter to the notice of the Secretary of State for Burma. Then as regards the question of the Agent, I quite recognise that in the altered conditions of Burma now and with a situation so delicate, the position of our Agent is one of extreme importance and of great responsibility, and the person who goes there as our Agent can make a large contribution in promoting good will between the Indians in Burma and Government, and naturally his status and personality are of the greatest importance. That is a point of view which is constantly before us.

I should like to make an appeal now to the good sense of all the people in Burma. I think they must realise that with the growth of nationalism in this country and with increased political power the welfare of our nationals abroad, whether in Burma or in Ceylon or in Malaya or elsewhere, is a source of constant concern to the people of this country and that Governments here cannot allow the unredressed and legitimate grievances of our nationals abroad to go unchallenged. I hope that the common sense and the spirit of compromise of the two peoples there will bring about a state of feeling when it may never be necessary to use weapons to which reference has been made by certain speakers in this House today. But I am not concealing from myself circumstances arising if the situation does not improve, if national antagonism and racial bitterness continue and if a feeling grows both in India and in Burma that no justice can be obtained by peaceful methods, the time may come when there may be an insistent demand on the Indian Government to take stronger measures, and that embittered racial feelings between Burmans and Indians may lead to serious reactions on the very important trade relations between this country and Burma. That would indeed be a misfortune. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, said that in spite of our professions we were callous. I can assure him in all sincerity that there is no trace of callousness in us. We fully recognise our responsibilities. I should now like to inform the House that I have just had a telegram from our Agent in Burma. He tells us that the information that appeared in some papers that some Indians were killed at Monywa is incorrect, that there were only five or six Indians seriously injured, that the situation is absolutely quiet since the 22nd of January and that additional police were despatched there immediately. This is what he says: "All possible protection given to Indians. All quiet since the 22nd of January." In Rangoon too there has been an improvement in the strike situation. As regards the action taken against newspapers, three newspapers had their securities forfeited—I need not read out their names. An editor was arrested under the Emergency Act: so that the Government of Burma are using the weapons which governments use when they are faced with grave disorders—orders under section 144, drafting of additional police, action against the press and so on. I have every reason to believe and hope that the Government of Burma will continue to watch the situation carefully and wherever disorder arises they will deal with it promptly and effectively. I have taken this censure motion as an expression of the anxious desire of this House that the situation in Burma should settle down as quickly as possible; but as its terms imply a motion of censure against

the Government of India I must oppose it. I hope I have been able to convince the House that far from meriting censure we deserve some slight marks of approbation from Honourable Members opposite.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I was greatly disappointed at the speech of the Education Secretary. This is an occasion when feelings are more important than rhetoric. No doubt he spoke in flashing language but he did not give the impression that he was feeling for the Indians in Burma. This happened on the 18th January according to his own statement and the Government did not issue any bulletin for the public on what happened and steps they have taken or propose to take. He only came forward with an explanation when an adjournment motion is brought forward here. We should remind the Government of Burma that we have been very generous to the Burmese people. When the question of financial separation was considered Burma got a very large amount which they ought not to have got. I was myself a member of the sub-committee which dealt with the matter and I can say that Burma was very generously treated. In addition there is a trade agreement which is undoubtedly to the advantage of Burma; and further, we have undertaken to protect Burma from foreign attacks without their having to maintain an army: they are relieved from army expenditure and we are maintaining an army for their protection. These advantages we have given to them. May I ask whether the Government have ever discussed this question in the Executive Council or with the Secretary of State, that they would put the screw on the Burmese Government if they do not properly protect the lives and property of Indians in Burma? On the last occasion also the Government of India did not move at all till a motion of adjournment was brought up in this House. It was after that motion and after repeated questions that an Agent was appointed there and, as pointed out by my Honourable friend, his status is not sufficiently high to induce the Burmese Government to look after the interests of Indians there. Another point is, that whatever the causes may be, as pointed out by my friend, Mr. Ayyangar, in all these incidents it is only the Indians who are killed and never the Burmans. When these facts are pointed out, I think the Members in charge in the Government of India who are the custodians of the lives and property of the Indians in foreign countries ought to rise to the occasion and feel their responsibility and act. If they are incapable of doing it, they should plainly tell us that they cannot do anything; and then we will see what we can do to help them. We know how to act and we will deal with the matter. On the last occasion when we discussed this adjournment motion I appealed to the European Group and asked them what they would have done if an Englishman had been killed in any other country. Mr. James on that occasion stood up, spoke feelingly and said that he was quite prepared to support this motion and do the same thing for us that he would do in the case of an Englishman. I wish that our representatives in the Government of India realised this difficulty. They should rise to the occasion and not get entangled in official files but see that the lives of Indians abroad are valuable lives and should be properly protected. Let them come forward and say that we did all that we could do but we could not achieve our object. At present I should like to know whether they discussed this question of renewing the trade agreement and whether India should take the responsibility of protecting Burma as at present and what other steps they have taken. As far as we know, nothing

[Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad.]

has been done yet. When we come here and raise this question on the floor of the House, then and then alone our representatives on the Treasury Benches come forward with sweet speeches, and crocodile tears. They really don't show that they feel in this matter to the same extent as they ought to feel.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands the Mover of this motion wants to reply.

Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi: Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, had put a pointed question to the Honourable the Member for Education. My friend asked him: 'Are you prepared to make a statement on the floor of the House today that you would give notice to the Burma Government to conclude the agreement and that you would not continue that agreement till you are satisfied that the lives and property of Indians settled there are safe in Burma', but to this question the Honourable the Education Member gave no reply. His reply contained all sweet words and nothing else. Mr. President, we heard two speeches today from the Treasury Benches, those speeches were full of sympathy, but they carried us no further. Under the circumstances, we must press this motion to a division.

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

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 6th February, 1939.