

20th March 1941

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

Official Report

Volume II, 1941

THIRTEENTH SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

1941



NEW DELHI : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1941.

Legislative Assembly

President:

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

Deputy President:

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

Panel of Chairmen:

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

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

MR. L. C. BUSS, M.L.A.

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

Secretary:

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistants of the Secretary:

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

KHAN BAHADUR S. G. HASNAIN.

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.*

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

MR. L. C. BUSS, M.L.A.

SIR ABDUL HALIM GHUZNAVI, M.L.A.

SIR H. P. MODY, K.B.E., M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—18th March to 1st April, 1941.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
TUESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1941—		FRIDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1941—contd.	
Starred Questions and Answers	1579—85	The Dissolution of Muslim Marriages (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1753—54
The Protective Duties Continuation Bill—Introduced	1585	The Professions Tax Limitation Bill—Introduced	1754
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1585	The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1754
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1586—1632 1633—34	The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1754
THURSDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1941—		SATURDAY, 22ND MARCH, 1941—	
Starred Questions and Answers	1635—49	Starred Questions and Answers	1755—58
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1649—52	Statements laid on the Table	1768—69
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> —Interference by the Delhi Police in Khaksar Activities—		Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	1769
Allowed to stand over	1653	Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration	1769—70
Forcible Collection of War Fund—Disallowed	1653—54	Statement <i>re</i> one Krishna Gopal Garg, a convicted Prisoner in Ajmer	1770—71
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted	1654—79, 1680—1716	Election of a Member for the Committee on Public Accounts	1771
Reflection on the conduct of the Chair and Order of Withdrawal against Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury	1679—80	Election of Members for the Standing Committee of the Department of Commerce	1772
FRIDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1941—		Election of Members for the Central Advisory Board of Education	1772
Starred Questions and Answers	1717—30	The Indian Finance Bill—Passed	1773—1811
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1730—32	The Tyres (Excise Duty) Bill—Passed	1811—18
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> —Interference by the Delhi Police in Khaaskar Activities—Disallowed	1732—33	The Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1818—25
Treatment of Non-Violent Political Prisoners and Undertrials—Disallowed	1733—35	The Protective Duties Continuation Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1825—26
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1735—43	MONDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1941—	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	1743—44	Members Sworn	1827
The Hindu Marriage Disabilities Removal Bill—Circulated	1744—53	Starred Questions and Answers	1827—36
		Unstarred Questions and Answers	1836—50
		Statement of Business	1850
		The Protective Duties Continuation Bill—Passed	1850—98
		The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1898—99

PAGES.		PAGES.	
MONDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1941—<i>contd.</i>		FRIDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1941—<i>contd.</i>	
Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1940-41	1899—1902	Statement of Business	2037
TUESDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1941—		Election of a Member to the Committee on Public Accounts	2037
Member Sworn	1903	Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce	2037
Starred Questions and Answers	1903—17	Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1940-41	2038—92
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1917—24	SATURDAY, 29TH MARCH, 1941—	
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Labour	1924	Member Sworn	2093
Message from the Council of State	1924	Starred Questions and Answers	2093—2108
Resolution re—		Message from the Council of State	2108
Recognition of Unions of Government Employees—Negatived	1925—67	Statement laid on the Table re Net Earnings of recently constructed Railway Lines	2108
Low Prices of Indian Cotton—Withdrawn	1968—80	Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1940-41	2109—29
THURSDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1941—		The Insurance (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on consideration of clauses not concluded	2129—71
Starred Questions and Answers	1981—90	MONDAY, 31ST MARCH, 1941—	
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1990—94	Starred Questions and Answers	2173—83
Motion for Adjournment re discussion of the D'Souza Report—Disallowed	1994—95	Statements laid on the Table	2183
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Board of Education in India	1995	Motion for Adjournment re Arrest and Detention of Mr. Triloki Nath Singh of Lucknow—Disallowed	2184—85
Resolution re Reference of the Delhi Masjid Bill to a Joint Committee of the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly—Adopted as amended, and Nomination of Members on the Joint Committee	1996—2004	Message from the Council of State	2185—86
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	2004	The Insurance (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	2186—2243
The Delhi Muslim Wakfs Bill—Circulated	2004—07	The Delhi Restriction of uses of Land Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2243—44
The Professions Tax Limitation Bill—Circulated	2007—14	TUESDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1941—	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2014—22	Starred Questions and Answers	2245—51
The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	2022—23	Unstarred Question and Answer	2251—52
The Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2024	Short Notice Question and Answer	2252—53
FRIDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1941—		Statements laid on the Table	2253
Starred Questions and Answers	2025—34	Motion for Adjournment re Alleged misuse of the Defence of India Act—Disallowed	2253—54
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2034—38	The Railways (Local Authorities' Taxation) Bill—Introduced	2254
		The Delhi Restriction of Uses of Land Bill—Passed as amended	2255—92

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 20th March, 1941.

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

RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR JAIRAMPUR STATION, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

†423. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state if he is aware of a Railway accident that took place on the 5th August, 1940, near Jairampur Station on the Eastern Bengal Railway, in which many passengers travelling by the Dacca Mail had met with serious injuries and some with death?

(b) How many persons were injured and how many of them were sent to hospitals?

(c) How many of the injured persons admitted to hospitals were cured after proper treatment in hospital and how many succumbed to their injuries?

(d) How many of them demanded compensation for injuries and loss of property?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) Yes.

(b) I understand that the total number of the injured was 85 of whom 65 were treated in hospital.

(c) Information received in January showed that 51 had been discharged. Eleven persons died in hospital.

(d) I understand that about 50 claims were received.

RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR JAIRAMPUR STATION, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

†424. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Has the Honourable the Railway Member received any legal notice for compensations from persons who were injured in the railway accident which occurred on the Eastern Bengal Railway on the 5th August, 1940? If so, how many and from whom have such notices been received and for what amounts, respectively?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: Yes. All such notices received are sent on in original to the Railway Administration concerned and copies are not kept. I am, therefore, unable to supply the information asked for in the second part of the question, but the number of notices received was at least four.

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

RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR JAIRAMPUR STATION, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

†425. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chatteropadhyaya:** (a) Has the Honourable Member for Railways given consideration to the notices received from persons who were injured in the railway accident on the Eastern Bengal Railway on the 5th August, 1940? If so, whether any compensation has been decided to be given to such injured persons as have given notices for compensation? If so, what? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that on enquiry the Magistrate opined that there was no sabotage?

(c) Is it also a fact that the police report denies any sabotage?

(d) Is it a fact that the departmental enquiry declares that the incident took place on account of sabotage?

(e) Is it a fact that one gentleman amongst the victims, *viz.*, Jagdish Chandra Sen Gupta, had a wound on the head 4" deep and had ten other wounds on the body, for which he had to stay in the Campbell Hospital for about three months for recovery? Has he demanded compensation for injury and loss of property?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply just given to his starred question No. 424. No compensation was paid by the Railway Administration, which was in no way responsible for the accident.

(b) No magisterial enquiry was held.

(c) Government has not received any advice to this effect.

(d) I would refer the Honourable Member to the report of the Senior Government Inspector of Railways, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

(e) I understand that a gentleman of this name was admitted to hospital for injuries to head and legs. I have no information as to the length of his stay in hospital. I understand a claim for compensation was made on his behalf.

SCALE OF PAY OF CERTAIN RETRENCHED AND SUBSEQUENTLY RE-EMPLOYED EMPLOYEES IN THE LOCO. BRANCH OF MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

426. ***Nawab Siddique Ali Khan:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether an employee retrenched during economy campaign of 1931 and subsequently re-employed is eligible for old scale of pay applicable to him prior to his retrenchment?

(b) Is it a fact that under orders of the Railway Board all such retrenched employees who were borne on the waiting list and re-appointed before 1st April, 1935, are eligible for old scales of pay?

(c) Was the Agent, East Indian Railway, delegated the powers to amend the orders of the Railway Board, as per his Minute Sheet No. AE. 2581/2, dated the 4th September, 1935?

(d) Is it a fact that certain employees in the Loco. Branch of Moradabad Division were retrenched and later on re-employed before 1st April, 1935, and were allowed to get the old scale of pay which, after some years,

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

was substituted by new scale of 1934? If so, what were the circumstances under which old pay was offered to such men, which was subsequently changed?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: (a) Retrenched employees borne on a waiting list who were reappointed before the 1st April, 1936, are entitled to the old scales of pay, except those who were originally appointed after the 15th July, 1931, or had been appointed in a temporary capacity and had less than one year's service at the time of their retrenchment.

(b) Yes, except that the date is 1st April, 1936.

(c) No; the orders issued by the General Manager, East Indian Railway, referred to by the Honourable Member did not make any amendments to the orders issued by the Railway Board.

(d) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the men were given the old scales of pay through a mistake.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member whether the employees were given to understand that those who were on the waiting list would be given the old scales, and that those who were temporary would be given the new scales? Were they informed?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: I cannot cite the orders at the moment, but orders were issued.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Was any understanding given to them?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: The men to whom this question refers were apparently given the old scales of pay initially.

DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN THE LOCO. BRANCH OF MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

427. *Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether it is a fact that in the Loco. Branch of Moradabad Division of the East Indian Railway about seven persons have been discharged during the end of last year?

(b) Is it a fact that they were not given protection under Disciplinary Rules to defend themselves against allegations, which were investigated without their knowledge?

(c) What was the method of enquiry or investigation adopted by the Superintendent, Power, and who was deputed for such enquiry? What was the designation of the person deputed for these confidential enquiries and what was his length of service?

(d) What was the length of service of each of the discharged employees and what bad entries (if any) were to be found in their service records or personal files?

(e) Were the Divisional authorities of Moradabad not competent to investigate the alleged crime through their own officers, and for what definite reasons were the discharged hands not allowed to face an open trial, whether departmental or judicial?

(f) How many persons were reduced, discharged, fined, dismissed and given various other punishments during the time Mr. Lambe was the Superintendent, Power, in Moradabad Division?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes, as they were removed from service by the Chief Operating Superintendent under the proviso to rule 1708 of the State Railway Establishment Code, Volume I.

(c) Confidential enquiries were made with the assistance of the police.

(d) The seven employees had approximately the following length of service, 19, 14, 9, 13, 19, 15 and 12 years. All except one of them had several punishments recorded in their service sheets.

(e) The case was of a nature which did not lend itself to investigation by the officers and in the manner suggested.

(f) Government have no information and I regret I cannot undertake to collect it.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know whether the rules were the same on all the railways, or is it only on the East Indian Railway?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: In what respect?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In respect of these waiting list people and temporary people.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: This question does not relate to that.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: With reference to the answer to part (f), has the Honourable Member made an investigation?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: I have said that I have no information on these particulars, and I cannot accept the implication in the question that a particular officer is responsible for abnormal action in this respect.

UNCONFIRMED EMPLOYEES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

428. *Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to enquire and state whether it is a fact that there are lot of employees on the East Indian Railway who have been for over five years in continuous employment and are not yet confirmed?

(b) What is the strength of such staff?

(c) What action do Government propose to take to provide such staff in some permanent vacancies? If none, why not?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) and (b). It is not practicable to ascertain the periods of service of all unconfirmed men, but if the Honourable Member has any particular lot of employees in view and will furnish details of their grade and the place where they are employed, I shall endeavour to secure the information.

(c) None; the confirmation of temporary non-gazetted staff is a matter within the discretion of General Managers.

FIREMEN PUNISHED ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY FOR STOPPING TRAINS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

429. *Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether it is an offence for a fireman to stop a train at some station when he is ordered to do so by the driver on account of the latter feeling indisposed all of a sudden?

(b) If stopping of a train under circumstances mentioned in part (a) above constitutes an offence, then should the fireman allow the train to run against signals and cause serious damages?

(c) How many firemen have been punished on the East Indian Railway during the last one year for stopping trains under circumstances mentioned in part (a) above and what punishments have been awarded in their cases?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No such case has come to the notice of Government.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: The matter happened at Hardwar. The driver fell ill when the train reached the station, and he asked his subordinate to stop the engine. Steps have been taken against the subordinate for having stopped the engine, though the driver filed a certificate to the effect that he was ill and he gave the order.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I have no knowledge of this circumstance, but I would suggest to the Honourable Member that, if, as is apparently the case, he founds a general question of this kind on one particular case, it would be of great assistance if he gave details of the particular cases he had in view.

PASSES FALSELY OBTAINED BY CERTAIN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IN MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

430. *Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether obtaining a privilege pass for a dependent alleged widowed daughter when her husband is alive or a pass for a son when the employee has no son, constitutes an offence?

(b) What punishments are usually inflicted for such offences?

(c) Is it a fact that some years back a clerk of Moradabad Divisional office was dismissed for obtaining a pass for his son, when it was proved that he had no son?

(d) Is it a fact that a Gateman of Moradabad Division has lately been dismissed for a similar offence?

(e) Is it a fact that a senior Station Master of Moradabad Division obtained a pass for an alleged widowed daughter when her husband was alive and also for a son when he had no son and immediately after this offence he was promoted to the next higher grade and the case filed? What are full particulars of cases mentioned in parts (c), (d) and (e)?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) Yes.

(b), (c), (d) and (e). I have called for the information and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

UNSATISFACTORY RUNNING OF THE GRAND TRUNK EXPRESS.

431. *Sir F. E. James: Will the Honourable the Communications Member be pleased to state:

- (a) what improvements, if any, have been made in the timing, accommodation and service on the Grand Trunk Express since the cut motion of the subject was carried against Government by the Legislative Assembly on the 24th February, 1940;
- (b) whether he is aware that this train still holds the record for unpunctuality and is sometimes between two and eight hours late;
- (c) whether he is aware that the quality of the rolling stock used on this train is still inferior; and
- (d) whether he is aware that the arrangements for the supply of food to passengers still continue to be unsatisfactory for the greater part of the journey?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) The running time between Madras and Delhi has been reduced by 40 minutes, and an earlier arrival at Delhi has permitted a more punctual and early delivery of mails from the South in Delhi. A more frequent examination of stock is made and the period between overhauls of stock is reduced by one-third. Return tickets at reduced fares have been introduced.

(b) I believe this train has arrived over two hours late at Delhi on three occasions and over eight hours late on one occasion between the 1st January and the 8th March, 1941.

(c) I believe that the rolling stock is not as modern as on a number of other trains, but I understand that it is generally adequate.

(d) I understand the arrangements for the supply of food for lower class passengers are generally satisfactory. There are not sufficient through upper class passengers to justify the running of a dining car, but arrangements have been made for the supply of meals to upper class passengers from the Indian Refreshment Car.

Sir F. E. James: With regard to the answer to part (c) of the question, is the Honourable Member aware that his description of the quality of the rolling stock is, to put it very mildly, very inaccurate?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: No. I believe, what I said, that it was not as modern as on a number of other trains. If the Honourable Member wishes to contest that statement, of course, I will take it from him.

Sir F. E. James: I will put it in another way. That is a very loose description of the gross inferiority of the rolling stock on that particular train. With regard to the answer to part (d) of the question, would it not be possible for the Railway Board to examine the time table of the train with a view to arranging the starting of this train from Madras and from Delhi in the reverse direction at more convenient times, for on the present timings it is extremely inconvenient for upper class passengers from the point of view of food?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: One trouble with this train is that it runs through three railway systems, and, as the Honourable Member is aware, you cannot adjust the timings of the train without a tremendous number of readjustments in other trains. I sympathise with the difficulty that upper class passengers may feel as regards meals, but I cannot regard their claims as having primary consideration.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Very often I see three, four or five first class passengers in the train, and yet there are no facilities provided for a restaurant car or any other means of getting food.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I can assure the Honourable Member that it does not pay to put on a full restaurant car for five first class passengers.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether Government are aware that sometimes there are not more than two or three passengers and still a restaurant car runs for the benefit of those passengers?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I have noticed that, and we have been taking steps to reduce those facilities.

Sir H. P. Mody: Are Government aware that there are millions of ticketless travellers?

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I ask whether the reduction of time between Delhi and Madras by 40 minutes means a reduction in the time between Delhi and Nagpur also?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I have not got the time of arrival at the Nagpur station.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: With regard to the answer to part (d) of the question, is the Honourable Member aware that a very large number of Muslims travel over this train, and no facilities are provided for food for Mussalmans?

Mr. M. S. Aney: And also for prayers.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: They are all middle class men.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: The train does not travel through predominantly Muslim areas, but I am quite willing to believe that there are a number of Muslims travelling by that train. There is an Indian refreshment car which provides good food.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: There is a refreshment car, but the needs of the Muslims are not catered for.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I was not aware that a Muslim could not take food that was prepared by a member of another community.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: I have travelled on that train twice and my personal experience is that the food was not of the right type.

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

Mr. H. A. Sathar H. Essak Sait: May I ask the Honourable Member . .

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

PROMOTION OF GUARDS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†432. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) With reference to the reply to part (a) of starred question No. 193, dated the 20th November, 1940, will the Honourable the Railway Member kindly state when the information promised therein in regard to the strength of guards grade III and IV on each division of the North Western Railway and the number of men actually working on each division, will be laid on the table of the House?

(b) With reference to the reply to part (b) of the question referred to above, stating that it is not practicable rigidly to demarcate the duties of various grades of guards above the lowest, is the Honourable Member aware that in the rules printed in 1929 for the appointment of guards, it is laid down that:

Guards grade II will work goods trains;

Guards grade III will work express goods and passenger trains; and

Guards grade IV will work passenger express and mail trains?

(c) If so, how does the Honourable Member justify his previous reply, and the disallowance of officiating allowance to guards grade II officiating in higher grades?

(d) If there is no difference in duties, what is the need for having different grades of guards?

(e) With reference to the reply to part (c) of question No. 193, will the Honourable Member please state the number of annual promotions of guards during the three years before 1929 and from 1929 to 1939 and the number promoted on transfer to other posts?

(f) If there is a marked decrease in the number of promotions after 1929, are Government prepared now to take suitable steps for removing the blockade in promotions by increasing the number of posts in grade III, or by giving suitable compensation?

(g) Is it not a fact that even the few promotions made in June 1940 were the result of continuous representations from the persons affected?

(h) Are Government aware of the discontent prevailing among the staff, and what steps do they propose to take to remove the same?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: (a) The information was laid on the table on the 15th March.

(b) I am informed that the rules the Honourable Member refers to stated that guards in the various grades would *usually* work the trains specified.

(c) I can see no contradiction between my reply and the rules quoted by the Honourable Member, and since it is not practicable rigidly to demarcate the duties, officiating allowance is not permissible.

(d) The different grades are justified by the necessity of having a more qualified type of employee to handle under normal conditions trains now worked by higher grade guards.

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

(e) Information available with Government shows that 13 guards, grade II, were promoted to grade III in 1928; there were no promotions from grade II to grade III between 1929 and 1939. Information concerning guards transferred to other posts is not readily available and cannot be secured without extensive research, which I regret I cannot authorise.

(f) The absence of promotions to grade III between 1929 and 1939 was the result of the abolition of grade IV, the reduction in the number of posts in grade III and the existence of surplus guards who had to be absorbed. Government do not consider any action is necessary as they understand that the position has become normal and promotions to grade III have been resumed, nor can Government admit that staff have any claims to compensation under such circumstances.

(g) No, promotions are only made when vacancies have to be filled up.

(h) I am prepared to believe that some are not contented, but Government propose to take no action as they consider that there is no solid ground for grievance.

PROMOTION OF GUARDS, GRADE II TO GRADE III, ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†433. *Bhai Parma Nand: (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 194 of the 20th November, 1940, will the Honourable the Railway Member state why direct recruitment of guards grade III was resorted to on the North Western Railway during 1929 to 1939?

(b) Why were suitable employees in lower grades not promoted?

(c) How is it that the old employees in grade II were suddenly thought suitable for promotion in 1940?

(d) What were the "special circumstances" on the North Western Railway as compared to East Indian and Great Indian Peninsula Railways which led to the reduction in the number of higher grade appointments of guards on the North Western Railway?

(e) Is it a fact that the minimum qualification for grade III was Intermediate Examination? Were there no grade II guards on the North Western Railway possessing that qualification? If there were, why were they not promoted instead of having direct raw recruits?

(f) Why is direct recruitment "limited to a maximum percentage"? What is that percentage, and has it been done in order to satisfy communal requirements?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) No direct recruitment was made to grade III of guards between 1929 and 1939 except in two individual cases.

(b) Because there were no vacancies to be filled.

(c) The opportunity for making promotions occurred only in 1940, and employees in lower grades were considered for such promotion.

(d) The North Western Railway undertook investigations which resulted in the action referred to.

(e) I understand the qualification prescribed is that of a degree. Government have no information regarding the second part; but the object

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

of direct recruitment is not merely to secure men of particular educational qualifications; it is to ensure that they are recruited to a higher grade at the start of their service.

(f) Ordinarily, direct recruitment to an intermediate grade is restricted to 20 per cent. of the vacancies in any year. This has been prescribed to keep the balance between the claims to promotion of staff already in service and the necessity for recruiting staff with better qualifications.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN POSTS FOR GUARDS WITH DEFECTIVE VISION ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†434. *Bhai Parma Nand: (a) With reference to the reply to part (b) of starred question No. 194 of the 20th November, 1940, will the Honourable the Railway Member state if he has consulted the medical authorities that the disabilities of guards as enumerated therein do not affect their vision?

(b) Do the Hours of Employment Regulations apply to Guards? If not, is the Honourable Member aware that advantage is taken of its non-applicability to put guards on duty for longer and odd hours?

(c) Is the Honourable Member prepared to take steps to see that those guards who have defective vision and "who are suitable" are considered for the posts mentioned in part (c) of question No. 194?

(d) Are Government aware that guards generally by the very nature of their duties get defective eye-sight, and are on this account relegated to the benefit of their young juniors? Why do Government not compensate them like the Army personnel who are invalided out for diseases contracted in the execution of duty?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) The Honourable Member is apparently referring to starred question No. 195 and not No. 194 asked on the 20th November, 1940. If so, the answer is in the negative.

(b) No, but I am informed that endeavours are made to limit the hours of work of guards to those prescribed in the Regulations. The answer to the second part is in the negative.

(c) I have no reason to believe that staff who are suitable are not considered for the posts referred to.

(d) No. As regards the second part, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply to part (b) of starred question No. 195 asked on the 20th November, 1940.

PROMOTION OF RAILWAY GUARDS FROM GRADE II TO GRADE III.

†435. *Bhai Parma Nand: (a) With reference to his reply to starred question No. 239 of the 25th November, 1940, stating that promotion of guards from grade II to grade III is by selection, will the Honourable the Railway Member kindly state what criteria are laid down for such selections, particularly in view of his reply to starred question No. 193, of the 20th November, 1940, wherein he said that it is not practicable to demarcate the duties of guards?

(b) What does the Honourable Member propose to do to see that his policy of "promotions by fair field and no favour" is actually acted upon?

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

(c) In view of the Honourable Member's admission that accusations are made by all the communities of manipulation of promotions by selection on communal basis, is he prepared to lay down that promotions from grade II to grade III will be made by seniority only provided the record of service of the employee is satisfactory?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: (a) No specific criteria are laid down, but both the staff and the members of the Selection Boards are well aware of the qualifications required. Because the duties of the different grades cannot be rigidly demarcated, it does not follow that the selection of the best men from a batch of candidates for promotion cannot be made.

(b) I have no reason to believe that promotions are now made on any other basis.

(c) The existence of complaints on the part of all communities suggests that no favour is being shown to any of them and I see no reason to interfere in those circumstances.

PROMOTION OF RAILWAY GUARDS FROM GRADE II TO GRADE III.

†436. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) With reference to his reply to supplementary question to starred question No. 239, dated the 25th November, 1940, stating that the maximum permissible percentage of 20 is laid down for direct recruitment to grade III on the North Western Railway, will the Honourable the Railway Member kindly state whether eight direct recruits were engaged in 1940? If not, what was the number?

(b) If the reply to the first part of part (a) be in the affirmative, will the Honourable Member kindly state how many promotions were made as against the eight direct recruits in 1940? Was it 32? If not, why not?

(c) Do Government now propose to see that the proper percentage for promotion, i.e., 80 per cent. of vacancies should be filled by promotion? If not, why not?

(d) If this was not done in 1940 or the previous years, are Government prepared to stop direct recruitment till such time as the deficit in regard to past promotions is made up? If not, why not?

(e) Who was responsible for not acting on the rules in regard to these percentages, and what action is being taken against the person or persons concerned? If no action is being taken, or is proposed to be taken, why not?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: (a) I understand that eight were recruited, but would observe that while the rules permit direct recruitment up to 20 per cent. a General Manager has the power of making modifications.

(b) I have called for information and a further reply will be laid on the table of the House.

(c), (d) and (e). The Honourable Member is referred to the observation made in reply to part (a); but the question of the proper percentage for future promotion will be considered when further information is available.

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

UNRECOMMENDED EMPLOYEES ALLOWED TO APPEAR AS RECRUITS FOR APPOINTMENT AS GUARDS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†437. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state when the reply to starred question No. 241, dated the 25th November, 1940, regarding unrecommended employees allowed to appear for recruitment as guards on the North Western Railway, may be expected?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: Information was laid on the table of the House on the 11th February, 1941.

CONVENIENCES FOR PROMOTING THE ORANGE TRADE AT KOHOLI RAILWAY STATION, NAGPUR DISTRICT.

438. ***Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh**: Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) whether he is aware that an orange market was opened at *mouza* Koholi in Saoner tahsil, Nagpur district, by Mr. D. V. Deshmukh, President, Market Committee of the District Council, Nagpur, in November, 1940;
- (b) whether there is any raised platform and shade for storing oranges at this railway station;
- (c) whether he is aware that transactions of sales of oranges to the extent of Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 5,000 take place every day at this place, when the orange season is in full swing and that there is a traffic of at least sixty passengers a day;
- (d) whether the railway makes an income of about Rs. 2,500 per day;
- (e) if he is aware of the inconvenience, loss of time, and extra trouble involved in filling up the orange wagons for want of proper siding arrangement and whether he proposes to take any steps to remove it;
- (f) whether the Up and Down Grand Trunk Express is proposed to be stopped at this station to despatch orange fruits by it; and
- (g) whether he is prepared to take steps to see that a change in the timing of the evening passenger train leaving Koholi station and reaching Nagpur at 9.15 P.M. is made to enable fruit merchants to send orange by the express train the same night to Calcutta?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) I have no particulars of the value in rupees of the trade or of the passenger traffic.

(d) No.

(e) I recognize that a raised platform normally adds to convenience, but have no reason for supposing that a great loss of time is involved owing to its absence and have no steps in contemplation.

(f) No.

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

(g) No. The timing of individual trains is a matter for the Railway Administration and I do not propose to interfere in the matter.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know whether the Government is aware that the Railway makes an income of Rs. 2,500 per day.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I said that was not the case.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: I want to know what the income is.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I must ask for notice.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know whether the Government is aware that the orange market is on the side of the village and the siding is on the other side, so that persons who want to take *pitaries* from the market side to the siding have to cross the rails and they have to cross the high ground also?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I am not aware of the detailed arrangements in a small station like this. I would suggest to the Honourable Member that it would be far better if he can bring these matters to the notice of the Railway Advisory Committee and the General Manager.

OPENING OF A POST OFFICE AT KOHOLI, NAGPUR DISTRICT.

439. *Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Will the Honourable Member for Communications please state:

- (a) whether the District Council, Nagpur, had made a representation to the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur Division, about the opening of a post office at Koholi, Saoner Tahsil, Nagpur district;
- (b) if the request so made was granted; if not, why not;
- (c) if he is aware of the growing orange trade of this place to the extent of Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 5,000 every day;
- (d) whether he is prepared to open a post office for the convenience of the orange fruit merchants and the public of this place; if not, why not; and
- (e) whether he is prepared to open the post office subject to any conditions with the District Council; if so, what are the conditions?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: (a) Yes.

(b), (d) and (e). The matter has been under correspondence between the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur Division, and the District Council, Nagpur, whose reply accepting the condition was received only recently and steps are now being taken to open the office. The condition is the payment of a non-returnable contribution of Rs. 133-11-0 which is the estimated loss on the working of the proposed office during the first year.

(c) I understand that there is a trade in oranges but have no information as to the exact extent of the trade.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know whether the post office will be opened?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: Yes.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: When will it be opened?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: It will be opened shortly.

CASE OF NEGLIGENCE FOR NOT CLEARING BALANCE SHEET OUTSTANDINGS IN THE TRAFFIC ACCOUNTS BRANCH OF NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

440. *Mr. H. M. Abdullah: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state whether it is a fact that a charge of negligence for not clearing Balance Sheet outstanding was brought against three Muslims and three Hindus of the Traffic Accounts Branch of the North Western Railway in 1938?

(b) Is it a fact that the decision in this case had been pronounced in 1941?

(c) Is it a fact that amounts involved were trifling in the case of Muslims as compared with Hindus?

(d) Is it a fact that the Hindu Accounts Officer has held the three Muslim clerks responsible for carelessness and for failure to take adequate action for the clearance of old outstanding items, and remarks to this effect were recorded in their character rolls, and whether one of the Muslims affected had stood first in Appendix C Examination?

(e) Is it a fact that the Hindu Accounts Officer has declared the work of the three Hindus clerks involved in the above case, as satisfactory, and remarks recorded in their character rolls were that they should have tried to clear the outstandings?

(f) If the reply to parts (a) to (e) be in the affirmative, will the Honourable Member please state what action he proposes to take to get the Muslim clerks justice and to stop recurrence of such instances?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) No. Eleven members of the office of the Deputy Chief Accounts Officer, T. A. Branch, North Western Railway, Lahore (including subordinate supervisory staff) were asked to explain delay in clearing outstandings in 1939. Seven of them were Hindus and four were Muslims.

(b) No. The final orders regarding clerks were passed in August, 1940; the orders regarding the punishment of supervisory staff were issued in January, 1941.

(c) The amounts were trifling in all cases.

(d) Remarks regarding the failure to clear the outstandings were recorded against all the clerks concerned, except one Muslim who was new to the office. The remarks in each character roll were with reference to the work of the year as a whole, with a qualification regarding the failure in this particular case. The answer to the latter part of the question is in the affirmative.

(e) No. There was, however, some confusion in communicating the adverse remarks in two cases, owing to the inclusion of other remarks. This mistake has now been set right.

(f) The question does not arise.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETY.

150. Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will the Honourable the Railway Member be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration has any control over and any obligation to the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Mutual Benefit Society of the employees on that Railway;
- (b) whether the said Society possesses large funds collected from members and gives benefits to its members; and
- (c) if so, whether the said Society is registered under the law in force for the time being, or an exemption from registration was granted and, if so, for what reasons?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Glow: (a) The Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration exercise some control over the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Employees' Mutual Benefit Society; the Administration collects the subscriptions of the members and issues passes to cover journeys of persons engaged by the Society for the legal defence of its members.

(b) I have no information as to the magnitude of the funds; I understand the Society gives its members the benefits permissible under its rules.

(c) This is a matter for the management, but I am informed that the Society has not been registered and exemption has been obtained on the advice of the Registrar of Companies on the grounds that registration would serve no purpose.

THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETY.

151. Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will the Honourable the Railway Member be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the main object of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Employees' Mutual Benefit Society is to ensure proper defence of its members against criminal prosecutions launched against them for acts of commission and omission done in the course of the performance of their duties;
- (b) whether it is a fact that the Watch and Ward Department of the said railway are concerned with many of such prosecutions;
- (c) whether it is a fact that for some years past a very large number of members on the Committee of Management of the said Society are from the Watch and Ward Department; and

- (d) whether Government propose to institute an enquiry and ascertain how the Watch and Ward Department secure such unduly large representation on the Committee?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) Yes.

(b) No; but prosecutions may result from the activities of the Watch and Ward Department.

(c) and (d). No.

THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETY.

152. Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will the Honourable the Railway Member be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there were scenes of rowdyism at the general meeting of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Employees' Mutual Benefit Society held on the 31st July, 1940;
- (b) whether Government propose to make an impartial enquiry into the incident and also into the affairs of this Society; and
- (c) if the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, how the enquiry is to be conducted?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) Government are informed that there was no general uproar or any violence.

(b) Government do not propose to institute any enquiries.

(c) Does not arise.

RAILWAY QUARTERS OF THE RUNNING ROOM COOKS AND BEARERS FOR THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY GUARDS AT GHAZIABAD.

153. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to enquire and state whether Running Room Cooks and bearers for the East Indian Railway Guards at Ghaziabad are provided with Railway quarters close to their place of work? If not, why not?

(b) What are their duty hours?

(c) Is this privilege granted at other stations on the East Indian Railway like Aligarh, Tundla, Cawnpore, Allahabad, etc.?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) No, as quarters are not available there.

(b) 12 hours each daily.

(c) Quarters are allotted at those stations where they are available.

BOX PORTERS AT MORADABAD RAILWAY STATION.

154. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state what was the strength of Box Porters at Moradabad Railway Station, before the extension of Goods Yard?

(b) What is the strength of such porters now?

(c) Is it a fact that with increased work their duty hours have been extended from 8 to 12 hours a day, so that the necessity of employing extra staff may be eliminated?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) to (c). I have called for information and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

BOX PORTERS AT MORADABAD RAILWAY STATION.

155. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state what is the average weight of each Guard's equipment Box and Tail Boards, etc., that a Box Porter has to carry on his head in the Yards (Goods and Coaching) and what is the average number of trains during 12 hours' duty that the Box Porter has to attend now with Guard's Box, etc.?

(b) Besides Box Porters, are there any other class of inferior staff who are utilised on 12 hours' shifts at Moradabad Railway station? If so, who are they?

(c) What period of *inaction* during 12 hours duty are the Box Porters allowed to have as per Hours of Employment Rules?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: (a) to (c). I have called for information and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

DISTINCTION AMONGST INDIAN AND EUROPEAN GUARDS AND DRIVERS ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY IN THE MATTER OF RUNNING ROOM ACCOMMODATION.

156. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether there is any distinction amongst Indian and European Guards and Drivers on the East Indian Railway so far as Running Room accommodation is concerned?

(b) Can an Indian occupy a European Guards Running Room?

(c) What is the arrangement for Indian Christian Guards? Can they go to European Guards Running Rooms? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow: I have called for information and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

DIFFERENT CONDITIONS FOR EARNING UNDER-REST ALLOWANCE FOR GUARDS ON EAST INDIAN AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAYS.

157. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether it is a fact that on the North Western Railway a Guard returning to Headquarters after 12 hours *absence* and if booked out again before having 12 hours rest, is entitled to under-rest allowance, whereas on the East Indian Railway 8 hours' work is the essential condition for earning under-rest allowance?

For example: on 12th January, 1941 a Guard is booked by a certain train leaving his Headquarters at 16 hours and reaches his destination at 22 hours the same day. He starts back for his Headquarters on 13th January, 1941 at 10 hours and reaches his Headquarters at 14 hours.

He is booked out again the same day at 17 hours. On the North Western Railway he is entitled to under-rest allowance, but, on the East Indian Railway he is not entitled to this allowance? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: Yes; the reason is that under rule 512 of the State Railway Establishment Code, Volume I (copy available in the Library of the House) the grant of the under-rest allowance is subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by General Managers..

ORDERS FOR EMPLOYING MORE MUSLIMS IN ESTABLISHMENT SECTION ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

158. Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the North Western Railway administration has issued orders to offices subordinate to it that more Muslims should be employed in Establishment section; if so, why;
- (b) whether this order is issued under the Home Department resolution, dated 4th July, 1934, regarding ratio of minority communities in services: if so, the specific provision of the Home Department resolution in justification of the orders referred to in part (a) above; and
- (c) whether it is a fact that the Resolution referred to in part (b) above, refers to percentage of minority communities as a whole; if so, why the North Western Railway Administration want communal reservation in each section of an office?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: (a) I understand that the Administration has indicated that the position of Muslims in Establishment Sections should be improved; this has been done in pursuance of the general policy of securing as far as practicable adequate representation of minority communities in such sections.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative; the second part does not arise.

(c) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative; as regards the second part, the administration has not asked for communal reservation in each section of any office.

OLD SCALES OF PAY FOR RETRENCHED AND RE-EMPLOYED COMPILATION STAFF ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

159. Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to refer to his answer to part (d) of starred question No. 99, asked on the 15th February, 1940, regarding old scales of pay for Compilation staff on the North Western Railway and state the result of his examination?

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: The result of the examination of the case was laid on the table of the House on 11th February, 1941, in connection with part (d) of starred question No. 99 asked by Bhai Parma Nand on the 15th February, 1940.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

INTERFERENCE BY THE DELHI POLICE IN KHAKSAR ACTIVITIES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of a motion for adjourning the business of the House from Maulana Zafar Ali Khan. He wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance of recent occurrence, *viz.*, the unwarranted and undue interference of the local police yesterday evening near the Juma Masjid, Delhi, in the lawful activities of the Khaksar. The Honourable Member has not given any definite statement as to what happened. What was the lawful activity and what was the nature of the interference. He ought to have stated that.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): The Khaksars are permitted under the agreement entered into between the Government of India and that body to move along in a single line, without, of course, goose-stepping in military fashion, and also to retain their *belcha*. The local police interfered in this arrangement and they said "We won't allow you at all". They made all sorts of protests which went unheeded, and they had to disperse under protest.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan (Leader of the House): The Honourable the Home Member is unavoidably absent. I have tried to get information on any incidents that may have happened yesterday. The Chief Commissioner says that he has no information, but is making inquiries and will let me know or let the Home Member know what happened. Perhaps you would be pleased to allow the matter to stand over.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion will stand adjourned till tomorrow.

FORCIBLE COLLECTION OF WAR FUND.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of another motion for adjourning the business of the House from Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi. He wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, *viz.*, the forcible collection of War fund as reported in the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 20th March. The Honourable Member does not mention where this forcible collection took place.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): At Gorakhpur. As a matter of fact, it is going on everywhere but this adjournment motion refers to Gorakhpur.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That, of course, is a matter, which is the concern of the Local Government, and the Government of India have no power of supervision and control even though the United Provinces Government is not a Government responsible to the Local Legislature.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: My submission is that the war fund has to be sent outside India.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That may be, but the alleged forcible collection took place in Gorakhpur and not here in Delhi. The motion is disallowed.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume consideration of the Indian Finance Bill.

Honourable Members should bear in mind that, according to the arrangement arrived at between the Parties, all Members who want to speak must conclude their speech by 1-15 P.M., and then, in the afternoon, two Non-Official Members are to speak and the reply will be made by the Finance Member. Honourable Members have to regulate their speeches accordingly.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): May I ask whether only one Member will go on till 1-15?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no limitation as regards the number of speakers, provided the speeches are concluded by 1-15. Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.

Nawab Siddique Ali Khan (Central Provinces and Berar: Muhammadan): I would take only 15 minutes. I am very sorry that I committed a mistake the other day when I said that the All-India Muslim League objected to the officials remaining in the Executive Council of His Excellency the Viceroy. The Resolution which was recently passed at Bombay was in my mind, and so I committed that mistake. I am sure that my Honourable friend, Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan, General Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, will throw more light on the subject.

Sir, when we rose for the day the day before yesterday, I was saying that we knocked at the door of the Congress, but we were rudely repulsed. Then we thought that the only course left open to us was to approach His Excellency the Governor. We approached him and requested him to use his special powers given to him under the Government of India Act. We led a procession. We submitted a memorial on behalf of the Muslims of that province. The event was considered so important that the *London Times* published the news, but unfortunately His Excellency did not take any notice of it.

Sir, we are asked to have an amicable settlement with the majority party, which unluckily treated us in the same manner as Jews are said to have been maltreated by the Nazis in Germany. I will cite only one example to show that it is almost an impossible task to bring us on one platform unless the majority party promises to treat us as equals. Much has been said about the highhandedness of the police during the discussions on this Bill. I also wish to add my humble quota to it. In one case, Sir, a man was arrested on three of the many flimsy grounds:

(1) as to why he was called "Jinnah" by the people of his locality,

- (2) as to why a map of Pakistan was found in his house, and
 (3) as to why he went to attend the All-India Muslim League Session at Lahore.

It will be interesting to know what the Honourable the Chief Justice Sir Gilbert Stone, and another Judge, Mr. Justice Bose, said about the police *zulum* on the Chandur Biswa case which got very wide publicity. The two Judges have made observations about the prosecution story, the prosecution witnesses and the identification parades in the following words. Mr. Justice Bose said :

"It is only necessary to quote these figures to show the tragic farce into which these proceedings have by now degenerated and yet it was on the strength of these comic opera identifications that 145 men and boys were arrested and locked up for the night in a room 30' x 20'.

The conduct of the police throughout this case has been extraordinary, and in at least two matters outrageous. It calls for severe stricture. The two matters to which I refer are the identification parade at Biswa, and the confinement of 145 persons in a room 30' x 20' practically without food on a hot weather night. Over 200 persons were paraded in the sun in the middle of a hot weather day until some vomited with the heat, and later 145 persons were arrested and confined in a room 30' x 20' with practically no food on a hot weather night."

And, with regard to the closeting of these 145 men, Mr. M. N. Clarke, I.C.S., the Sessions Judge, says :

"It is more suggestive of the conditions in Nazi Germany at the present time than in an enlightened portion of the British Empire."

He further says :

"That is the comic opera story we are asked to believe, not indeed by the learned Advocate General, be it said to his credit, but by the prosecution. . . . And of the melodramatic heroes who tell us these stories here are a few examples."

The Honourable the Chief Justice says :

"This is a distressing case. The epithet is justified when we see in this case, where 43 men are standing their trial on a capital charge, witness after witness whose evidence is false, improved or tutored, going into the box.

It is also a case in which, though this Court is not concerned with politics, it is relevant and necessary to mention certain facts which at first sight appear to give it a political tinge.

In the course of that debate, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Shukla, himself did not hesitate to use the word 'murder' and to indicate that this was not a case of a riot but a carefully planned murder ruthlessly carried out. I mention this only for two purposes : (1) to explain the very extraordinary occurrences which followed shortly thereafter and the difficulties of the police and prosecution, and (2) to deprecate such observations which have in this case resulted, in my opinion, in the evidence being so improved, concocted, and tutored as to result in its being absolutely worthless, with the result that instead of those guilty of crime being brought to conviction no one is convicted."

Sir, my Honourable friends, Mr. Griffiths and Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, said the other day that there is no war propaganda to educate the people, and that people living in the mufassil know very little about the war. Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi went to the length of saying that war preparations in India were so scanty that it was difficult to face the enemy. Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, who seems to be in the know of things concerning the Government, went to the length of saying that there were only two anti-aircraft guns in Calcutta and that there were no air-raid shelters. One thing, however, is clear from this, *viz.*, that most of the Indians are indifferent to what is happening and that the Government have taken very little care for the protection and safety of my countrymen. The Congress, the largest majority party in the country, is offering civil

[Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.]

disobedience. The next largest party, that is, the All-India Muslim League, is neutral, because our offer of co-operation has not been accepted. The contemptuous treatment meted out to our offer is driving us slowly, but steadily, towards a place where we will have to think seriously as to what further course we should take to get our legitimate demands accepted. Our *Qaid-e-Azam* has said that during the war time, he would not insist on enforcing the Pakistan scheme. Sir, he said on the 19th November on the floor of this House :

"We may be less in numbers, and we are; but we could give you, I venture to say, and perhaps you do not know it, but I do, and I am not saying this by way of a threat, but by way of information to you, that we can give you hundred times more trouble than the Congress can give you if we so determine; but we do not want to. You will realise that. But we do not want to do it even now. The future—we will leave the future. Therefore, so far as the Government is concerned, that is the position of the Muslim League."

Sir, it must have been noticed that our Party is going step by step; we remained neutral when the Finance Bill was introduced in November last. Now, we have taken a further step—that is, we have decided to oppose the Finance Bill. The third step will surely be a serious one if the Government do not listen to us. Sir, public opinion is being flouted. They are recovering a punitive tax from those people of Burhanpur who are willing to help the Government. Government are using the ammunition which they should have used to blow the brains of Hitler and Mussolini to blow the brains of those people of Jubbulpore who are willing to co-operate with Government in the successful prosecution of the war. Government are counting on the support of arm-chair politicians who have no backing in the country. It is no use depending on those who, during the Congress regime, deserted the Government and became the supporters of Congress *raj*. Sir, let me tell you frankly that, God forbid, if the time comes, then these very people will not be ashamed to welcome Hitler and Mussolini at the gateway of India at Bombay.

My Honourable friend, Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, said the other day that he was proud of the sword arm. So are we. I believe the Government should know that *Qaid-e-Azam* is the man who can deliver goods *Azam* wields great influence and power in the Muslim world. Government should know that *Qaid-ed-Azam* is the man who can deliver goods on behalf of the Mussalmans of India. The war has entered a critical stage. Once it was said about the Nazi air raids that the bombs used to fall in fields, in sea, on hospitals or on empty houses, and they used to damage some doors or windows or used to kill an old woman. But now we hear that 2,000 churches have been destroyed, the Buckingham Palace has been damaged, and a part of the Tower of London is in debris, while we read only day before yesterday that Londoners were dancing when Germans were bombing. There is only one parallel example in history which is that "Nero was fiddling, when Rome was burning". We have heard from Sir Frederick James two very pathetic letters which he received from London and which were read out in this House. From those letters it is crystal clear that the Englishmen are passing through a critical time. All honour to those who are facing the enemy bravely and suffering patiently and cheerfully. If it is really wanted that the Mussaimans should help the Government, then the Government should come to some settlement with *Qaid-e-Azam*. Sir, I shudder to think of the day, if the Government continue to ignore *Qaid-e-Azam* and the

All-India Muslim League, when *Qaid-e-Azam* will raise his finger and ask the Mussalmans of India not to help the Government in their war effort. Believe me, Sir, the sword arm will be crippled and paralysed, and no help will be forthcoming.

Before I resume my seat, Sir, I wish to refer to a matter which was brought here by Sardar Sant Singh with regard to Sargodha District. My Honourable friend, Khan Bahadur Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, would have been the proper person to deal with the subject, but I find that he will not get a chance to speak on the subject. So, I take the liberty of refuting the allegations made by Sardar Sant Singh.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sardar Sant Singh is not present in the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member reading somebody else's speech?

Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: No, Sir. I am refuting the allegations which were made by Sardar Sant Singh on the floor of the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must remember that there are other Honourable Members also who wish to speak. The time is limited.

Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: I have got five minutes more, Sir, and within that time I shall finish my speech.

Sardar Sant Singh, while speaking on the Finance Bill, questioned the actions of the Punjab Government and that of the Deputy Commissioner, Sargodha. In connection with the application of the Defence of India Act towards the religious procession of his community, he stated that at Sargodha the anniversary of Guru Govind Singh was not allowed to be celebrated. The procession was interfered with, and at this time 31 persons are under arrest, for having attended the procession, under the Defence of India Act. Sir, on the opening day of the Session, the Honourable Member had also moved an adjournment motion about the high-handed action of the Deputy Commissioner on the occasion of the birth-day of Guru Govind Singh on the 5th of January. Then, on the 25th February, he had also asked several questions with regard to the same matter. Sir, it so happened that last year there was held a big annual meeting of the Anjuman-i-Islamia at Sargodha, and thousands of Mussalmans had gathered from different parts of the district. Unfortunately, the Sikhs wanted to pick up a quarrel with the Mussalmans there and gave them a grave provocation. There was every chance of a serious trouble occurring, but the Deputy Commissioner, who is a very capable officer and is respected by all the communities there and even the Sikhs about whom this matter was brought here have great regard for him, had to promulgate curfew order and order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code for several days. Then, in January last, the Sikhs of the town wanted a procession to be taken out. The Deputy Commissioner, who knew that there was a communal tension, fixed a route for the procession to be taken out, but the Sikhs refused to obey his orders and took out the procession from the other route where there was a mosque on the way and that is why some Sikhs were arrested. We

[Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.]

heard the other day that the Sardar Sahib had said something about the telegram also which, he said, was not transmitted to the proper authorities. As we knew that day, and the Honourable the Communications Member also told us the same thing, the Sardar Sahib did not know the actual wordings of the telegram, and on the basis of that he was attacking the Deputy Commissioner of Sargodha. It is true that if the Deputy Commissioner of that place had been Sardar Amin Singh, instead of Mian Aminuddin, then probably the Sardar Sahib would not have raised any objection. The Deputy Commissioner, as I have told you, is a very popular man there, and the Sikhs of that district also have no complaint against him. With these words, Sir, I oppose the Finance Bill.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are many speakers to speak this morning, I shall restrict myself only to one subject, and that subject is the Resolution published by the Government of India in the Extraordinary Gazette dated the 18th March, 1941, on the report of the Court of Inquiry appointed by the Government of India to consider the question of the dearness allowance for railwaymen. The Government of India in that Resolution have stated that they have changed some important particulars of the recommendations in the report of the Rau Committee, and they seem to say that these variations are made in agreement with the Railwaymen's Federation. I do not know whether the Railwaymen's Federation had agreed to the variations, but the Government of India take credit for having brought about an agreement between themselves and the Railwaymen's Federation. After having studied the agreement and the original report, I came to the conclusion that this agreement between the Government of India and the Railwaymen's Federation is like the agreement made by Herr Hitler with the Czecho-Slovakian Government or with the Governments of Rumania and Bulgaria. Sir, it may be an agreement, but it is an agreement, I have no doubt in my mind, which the Government have secured by a sort of coercion or under pressure, or, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, would say, at the point of the bayonet. I, therefore, do not attach much importance to this agreement. I feel, Sir, that the decisions which the Government of India have come to are unfair and unjust to the lowest class of railway employees. Not only the lowest class in the matter of pay, but unfair and unjust to a class of railway employees which are voiceless or at least consisting of people who have very weak voice especially with the Government of India.

What the Government of India have done is, whereas the Rau report recommended that Rs. 3 increase should be given to all, what I may call, low paid railway employees or railway employees who get below what they call efficiency level or subsistence level, the Government of India have agreed to pay Rs. 3 only to those lowest paid railway employees who work in Bombay and Calcutta. At the same time, I must admit that the Government of India have raised the limit of pay of the people who are to receive this increased benefit of Rs. 3, they have increased the limit from Rs. 35 to Rs. 60 in Bombay and Calcutta. Other lowest paid employees have been given reduced allowance as compared with the allowance recommended by the Rau report. I must also say, Sir, that as regards the railway employees who work in larger towns like Sholapur and Poona, the Government of India have also raised the limit of persons,

who have to get the benefit, from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50, at the same time, reduced the increase from Rs. 3 to Rs. 2-8-0. In the case of rural areas, the allowance has been reduced from Rs. 3 to Rs. 2 while increasing the limit of pay from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30. The Government of India have tried to create the impression that on the whole their decisions are better than the Rau Committee's recommendations by bringing within the benefit of the report a new class of persons. But, Sir, if you study the report closely, you will find that the decisions have done a great injustice to the lowest paid railway employees. It is difficult to give exact figures, but in order to give the House an idea of what they have done, I would give my own estimate of the figures.

On the whole, there are about 70 thousand employees on the G. I. P. Railway. Out of these, according to my estimate, about 45,000 or 50,000 persons will get the benefit of the Rau report. Out of these 50,000, about 35,000 may be working in rural areas, that is, not in large cities like Bombay, Sholapur and Poona. Now, Sir, in these areas like Sholapur, Poona, etc., they may have added, say, about 10,000, more persons who get the benefit of the recommendations as compared with the number of persons who were included in the Rau report. Similarly, in the Bombay City, they have included about 5,000 persons, perhaps more as compared with the people included in the Rau report. What the Government of India, in my judgment, have done is this, they have reduced the benefit given by the Rau report to about 35,000 persons, and given some benefit to about 15,000 persons. That is, in my judgment, about 35,000 persons have been adversely affected by Government decisions and about 10,000 additional persons—I do not know the exact number, I am only forming an estimate—have been benefited. Sir, these figures show quite clearly that the Government of India have done injustice to the lowest paid railway employees who work outside Bombay and Calcutta.

Now, Sir, when you want to give less benefit, what ordinary wise men or good men will do is not to reduce the benefit of the lowest, the poorest or the voiceless, but if it is necessary to give less benefit, that it is done to the people who are better paid rather than to those who are less paid. But the Government of India's policy is always the reverse: I feel, Sir, this is a very wrong policy. I am surprised that that policy should have been followed especially by the present Railway Member. Moreover, I would like the Honourable the Railway Member to remember that when the Royal Commission on Labour considered this question of wages of railway men, the Royal Commission laid special stress that the lowest paid railway employees were not getting on the whole what they would call fair wages, and the Royal Commission recommended that at the earliest opportunity the Railway Administration should improve the wages paid to the lowest paid employees. Among these lowest paid employees are gangmen who work on the railway lines on repairs and some other kind of work, and apart from the consideration that it is wrong to make the lowest paid employees sacrifice for the sake of the people who are getting higher wages, apart from that moral consideration, I would like the Government of India to consider whether it is a wise policy for them to make the gangmen discontented. I think it is a dangerous policy. Recently we have been hearing of many serious accidents on the railways. Now, Sir, you may prevent accidents by having special officers, you may prevent accidents by having special kinds of engines, but, Sir, if accidents are to be prevented really, if the railways are to be made safe, then your

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

must keep the gangmen contented. You must treat them fairly. It is utterly a wrong policy for the Government of India to neglect the interests of the gangmen in order to give something more to those people who are getting more in order to avoid spending more money from their general revenues.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow (Member for Railways and Communications): The gangmen got a higher percentage of increase than any other class.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I am not talking of percentages. I had made it very clear in my last speech that it is always necessary to give the higher percentage of increase to the lowest paid than to the highly paid people.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: That is what we have done.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I have stated as my view that the flat rate of increase recommended by the Rau Committee was the right thing to do. Government have varied this in order to save some money. We have not received estimates of what actually it would cost if the Rau Committee's report had been accepted. My impression is that it would cost one crore and 50 lakhs. I do not know what Government's own recommendations would cost; I take it they would cost about a crore of rupees. So Government propose to save about 50 lakhs from the decision which they have taken.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: They do not.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I am unable to make any correct estimate; I make my own estimate. The Honourable Member will be entitled to place before the House his own estimate. I feel, Sir, that the Government of India are trying to save money and to save that money at the cost and by the sacrifice of the lowest paid railway employees.

Then, Sir, the Government of India have given some arguments as to why they have varied the conclusions of the Rau report. Their first argument is that by coming to an agreement with the Railwaymen's Federation,—and I have already stated what kind of agreement that is,—the Government of India have made the decisions or conditions more stable. I do not know

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: I do not think there is any such mention of stability

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I do not know if my copy of the report is wrong . . .

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: but, I may be wrong.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I shall quote the passage:

"But in fixing wages the results so achieved tend to give more satisfaction and to have more stability than the results based on analytical methods."

The Government of India feel that by coming to an agreement with the Railwaymen's Federation, and by sacrificing the interests of the lowest paid employees, they will secure greater stability.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: That is a misrepresentation. There is no question of achieving stability by sacrificing anybody's interests. There has been no sacrifice.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I am entitled to interpret the Government Resolution according to my own light. The Resolution is there, and I am interpreting it. Government have not explained what they mean by stability. I explain stability by stating that Government feel that if, after all, you take away something from these lowest paid people, gangmen and porters, they may not go on strike very soon, but there may be a strike. . .

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: We are not taking away anything from the gangmen; we are giving something to them.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: They are taking away from what the Rau report recommended. That is what I mean by taking away.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman (Finance Member): Giving them a smaller increase!

Mr. N. M. Joshi: They are giving less. I feel that it is not a difference of language, but a difference of substance. I, therefore, think that it is wrong for Government to try to secure stability by sacrificing the interests of the lowest paid. I myself do not know whether they will secure stability by this method, but in any case even if they secure it, I would say it is an unfair and unjust method of securing stability.

Then, they say that the method of agreement will give them better satisfaction. Sir, in this materialistic world, satisfaction depends upon money. If the Government of India by coming to an agreement spends only one crore of rupees, instead of one crore and 50 lakhs, the sum total of the satisfaction cannot be larger; it must be less. Then, take the numbers. I have already pointed out that the additional number of people who will benefit from Government's decision as compared to the decision of the Rau report will be about ten thousand, but about 35,000 people will get less; I use the Honourable Member's expression. If you want to secure satisfaction, should it be the satisfaction of the more highly paid people or of the less highly paid? I ask the Government of India to consider whether by varying the decisions of the Rau report they have either secured stability, and whether it is right to secure stability by this method, and whether they have secured the satisfaction of a larger number of people or of a smaller number of people. I feel that the Government of India have done wrong. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must remember that there are other Honourable Members who are anxious to speak.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I shall not take much longer. The Government of India have criticised the arguments of the Court. I shall not go into any details except to say that they say that the Court has, in the first place, recommended a certain subsistence level which, according to the Government of India, is not right. The Court has recommended that the subsistence level should be fixed in Bombay City at 35, in Poona and Sholapur

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

and other towns at 30, and in rural areas at 25. The Government of India give certain grounds as to why the subsistence level fixed by the Rau Committee is wrong. I think the Rau report in this matter has gone very carefully into the figures and stated their decisions in their report. The Government of India also complain that the Rau report has corrected in certain matters to a very small extent the figures given by the Bombay Labour Office. Here the Government of India have committed a mistake; perhaps they have not read the report. The correction made by the Rau report in the figures given by the Bombay Labour Office is a correction which was necessary according to the admission of the Labour Office.

The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow: That is not so.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I shall read what they say. The Rau report has corrected the figures given by the Labour Office regarding clothing,—that is really the main correction which they have made,—and this is what the report says:

“Two other groups enter into the general index number, namely, the clothing group and the miscellaneous group. In regard to clothing the official figure is patently and almost admittedly defective.”

The Bombay Labour Office have almost admitted it, because they themselves say that they have kept one figure regarding *Saris* used by the working classes, because they could not get the latest figures. This is what the report itself says:

“To mention only one source of error, *Saris* which constitute an important item with a weightage of 36 per cent. in the clothing group have been quoted in the same figure in the Labour Gazette since September, 1939, because their later quotations were not available.”

The Labour Office do not give the later quotations, because their figures were not available. The committee could get later figures by writing to the Millowners' Association.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Sir, perhaps it will save time if I state that whereas the Bombay Labour Office admitted that there were certain defects in their index, the correction applied by the Rau committee was entirely excessive and is certainly contested by the Bombay Labour Office.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I shall ask the Honourable Member to produce the report where the Bombay Labour Office have stated that they have the latest figures. After all, the figures taken by this committee are figures taken from a respectable body like the Millowners' Association. I do not wish to discuss whether the report was right or whether the Government of India were right, but any impartial observer studying the report will find that the Government of India were not justified in making remarks regarding the report of the committee. As to the general question whether the Government of India should have varied the recommendations or not, my own general feeling is that I am not quite satisfied with the justification which Government have given for varying the recommendations of the report. Apart from the other considerations, there is, what you may call a general consideration or a political consideration. We all want in our country that the workers should have confidence in the method of inquiry.

There are many complaints that the working classes in this country are inspired to go on strike or they are encouraged to go on strike, and they believe in the method of strike, but if the Government and the people in this country want to encourage people to have confidence in inquiries by committees, then it is necessary that the Government of India, unless they have very strong reasons, should not vary the conclusions of a Report of Inquiry appointed by them. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is again repeating himself.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: This is my last sentence, Sir,—I feel that the Government of India have made out no case for varying the decisions of the Court of Inquiry, and I wish they had given effect to the recommendations of that Committee. Sir, I thank you for having given me an opportunity to place my view before this House.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have given me. I shall be very brief, because I know there is very little time left. Amongst the many points that I wish to discuss, I shall centre my remarks on one or two things. I would, in the first place, refer to one thing, and that is the inequitable system of distribution of minimum wage of Rs. 55 on Railways.

Then, I would ask the Government of India and the Education Department to hurry up with the Pharmacy Bill, otherwise they would put the cart before the horse if they pass the Drugs Bill first.

Then, I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member, considering the alarming amount of profiteering that is going on in matches, to relieve the poor people by some attempt to stop profiteering which is becoming very rampant.

Another point I would ask him to consider, not as an expert financier, is to take income-tax monthly, instead, of annually, as is done by every other Department of the Government of India. He might give his thought to this. . . .

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Monthly payments are taken in the case of salaried people.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I may be wrong, but I wish to put it to you.

Then, a third thing I would ask my friend to consider is the imposition of death duties.

The next matter I wish to mention is, I agree entirely with the views expressed by my friend, Mr. Boyle, regarding the imposition of import duty on artificial silk yarn.

Then, one other question, I would like to ask him is, why extract so much money from the public by way of examination fees. The amount of money that Government get from examination fees and the amount it actually spends. . . .

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Examination fees of what?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Examination fees from candidates going up for examinations for papers and things of that sort.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I can assure the Honourable Member that the administration of entry to the public services is not a source of profit.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am not talking of public services. I am talking of all sorts of examinations for Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, and so on.

Now, Sir, I come to my point, and that is what I might call the hardy annual,—and that is the Posts and Telegraphs. I am glad that my Guru, Sir Gurunath Bewoor, is here. I shall briefly refer to some of the points as I am unable to deal with them in detail. In 1925, I led a deputation to the Secretary of State. In 1928, I got a reply that the reduction of the Anglo-Indian community in this Department would be gradual. It was an honourable reply given by the House of Commons, by the Secretary of State representing the Parliament, who represented the King. You ought to remember it very carefully. Till 1928, the Member in charge was my friend Sir Andrew Clow, and he had gradually raised the salaries of all the inferior staff, menials and others, and quite rightly too, because the Indian servants were practically kept on a starvation wage, and it was raised to a very decent living wage, and I am happy about it. There was no rise for Anglo-Indians, because they were dissatisfied with it. In 1928, I got a reply from the Government Department in this House assuring me that there would be a gradual rise. The same year came the recruitment for telegraphists whose number, as far as my community was concerned, was reduced from 60 to 20. In 1930, there was a stop in the recruitment of telegraphists due to excess of staff, and examinations for recruiting engineering supervisors were started, which reduced the admission of my community from 50 to 60 to nil. Thanks to the Member in charge. In 1931, there was a retrenchment scheme in respect of the services of Posts and Telegraphs, and the Anglo-Indians were badly hit more than any, and we were given 2 per cent. of the total and 5 per cent. of certain departments. The Government gave us 5 per cent. of the postal clerical departments and 20 per cent. of the telegraphs, which amounted to 6.1 of certain sections, but no engineering supervisor appointments. I protested against it in 1935. There was no recruitment of telegraphists that year: I am sorry, the Honourable Member is laughing. The postal job has given us 5 per cent. from 1935 to 1937, and candidates were available in plenty. In 1937-38, an examination system was introduced by the Director General for recruitment to Posts and Telegraphs, and we got direct recruitment 50 per cent. in the telegraphs, and nothing else. In 1939, the Stewart Committee sat, and, on my representation, that Committee was kind enough,—and I am thankful to Sir Andrew Clow and to H. E. The Viceroy,—to give us 40 per cent. of the 75 and others who were directly recruited, while we were denied every other post in Government, which means to say that the recruitment of the Anglo-Indian community in the Posts and Telegraphs has been practically ruined, and ruined by the Department today, and I unhesitatingly say so. The community that has served that Department so loyally has been treated so badly, and nobody can deny that. Their numbers have been reduced very considerably—I do not mind the reduction,—I have to be reduced, I know it,—but why do it in such a

clandestine manner? I have protested against this. I was given nearly 313 in postal. Every job has been cut off from my hand,—why? Because Sir Henry Gidney is supposed to have said, "We do not want posts in Postal Department". I never said that, and I challenge any one to prove that I ever said so. What I said was: "Why cut my hand off the usual channel which I have asked in the Telegraphs". Let it be gradual. Why cut me off so many jobs when the orders of the Government were that I was to be given so many. And why replace me in a channel in which I am not to be employed? Would you give me an excess in the Telegraphs for what you have reduced in the Postal? Let me have the same number of jobs as before. I have repeated this demand times without number on the floor of this House. What have you done? Sir, the Anglo-Indian community has been murdered by the Department. And do not laugh, let me tell the Deputy Leader of the Muslim League, to look up the records of the posts of engineering supervisors, and you will find that you are also sadly neglected, you have not got your 25 per cent. or anywhere near it. You will find that you are just as badly treated as we are. And who is the gainer? I leave it to you to imagine. This is my bone of contention. If Government give a promise on the floor of the House, it has either to honour it or put it in the waste paper basket and consider themselves as a second Hitler. Here a promise was given, and here is an absolute breach of the promise, and I am left with a future where I have been reduced of all jobs. I have been given a few jobs in the Telegraphs, and I have been denied every job in the Posts, and the Director General knows it is true. I challenge him to deny it. Why has he done so? Are we anathema to him? Have we not served his Department well? We have given our blood and our tears and our lives for him and this is what we are going to get in 1941. In the name of humanity, in the name of justice, and in the name of everything that is honourable in the British Empire, I protest against this treatment. I have fought and fought for the community and I give the Government of India an opportunity—I challenge them to take me to the Federal Court, and before that Federal Court I will show that section 242 has not been operated at all. I am not complaining because a war is on, and I am a peaceful, loyal citizen. But, God help, I am going to take it to the Federal Court, and, if necessary, to the Houses of Parliament when peace is established, and if the Act is there. . .

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar: Non-Muhammadan): By that time, it may be time-barred.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: You will be there and I will be there. But that is not the point. So long as it exists, it should be carried out. Government cannot take on themselves the position of Hitler, as they are doing in this Department. I know what is happening. The absence of the human touch is there in this and in every Department, and I protest against this. It is wrong. I repeat here that it is nothing else but a vendetta: and why is it done? Why am I not taken in the service? Am I to be chucked into the street, because I have given good service? Replace me certainly. I know I must be replaced and I am prepared to be replaced. I raise no objection to that, but I want to know why you are taking this kind of vendetta on me and take 1,300 jobs away from me by just a stroke of the pen. Why should that be done? I tell you that the members of that committee, if they have been made aware of this disastrous result, would never have signed that report.

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

I know for a fact that they were not aware of this, and why? We were never informed of it. I have a few hundred jobs in a Department which I practically monopolised. I am prepared to give it up. I had a few hundred jobs in the Telegraphs, but all the postal jobs have been taken away, and it is closed to me. Why? No candidates are available. I know that no candidates are available. For what? And yet before this report, any amount of candidates were available from 1935 to 1937. If there are not suitable candidates available, the Department is bringing in unsuitable people and unqualified people. Between the years 1935 and 1937 we had enough. Today we prefer infinitely to serve the King and risk our lives in the cause of the Empire; but in the Department where we worked, we have no future. That is the position that I want to place before the House. It has taken me years before I could get all the facts. I have tried all manner of means. I have tried appeals. I have had discussions with the Department and with the Member for Communications. If I am given another chance for discussion, I will place before him all the facts and show him that I am not wrong. But he will not hear me. All this happened before he took office—I do not blame him. If he is prepared to do this, I am quite prepared to have a conference; but otherwise I ask him to go to the Federal Court and see whether I am right or wrong and if section 242 is not being applied at all in a proper manner; and, as a result, the orders of the Houses of Parliament which are mandatory and statutory on the Government of India are being tinkered with and played with in the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

Sir Syed Raza Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, it is impossible indeed not to sympathise with the Finance Member. The Finance Bill he has introduced is a carefully considered war measure which, I am sure, he can defend on its merits. I should not be understood to mean that it is a perfect Bill or is not capable of being improved upon. My point is that, while affording scope for improvement, it is a Bill to which the Opposition would give its support in any country which was the master of its own destiny. In India, however, conditions are artificial, unreal and abnormal. Sir Jeremy Raisman, therefore, cannot complain if the financial test were to give the pride of place to political considerations.

I want to make a very short speech indeed. A good deal has been said about our industrial and fiscal wants. All I can say on the subject is that it is high time that the Honourable the Commerce Member started tackling the serious problems relating to the development of our industry and the future fiscal policy to be adopted by the Government of India. We have got reports of two Commissions—the Industrial Commission and the Fiscal Commission. The Industrial Commission was appointed in consequence of a motion which was moved in the old Imperial Legislative Council on the 19th May, 1916, when the last war was half way through. What is the Honourable the Commerce Member doing now? I have not the least doubt that both these reports are antiquated documents. The time at my disposal will not permit me to examine the provisions of both these reports, through which I have carefully gone; but I can say that both these are antiquated documents. This admission was made by the Commerce Member himself. Let him, therefore, consider what is going to be the fate of our industries after the war. The words “key industries”

were used by him, but he failed to point out as to what he or the Government of India consider as key industries. What test do the Government of India propose to apply to find out which industry is a key industry. Again, what form is the Government of India's aid to these so-called key industries going to take on the termination of the war? So far as the Fiscal Commission is concerned, all I can say is that the rigid conditions laid down in paragraph 97 of its report are so exacting that no country complying with these rigid conditions can give sufficient encouragement in the form of protection to its industries. The result of all this would be obvious to those who have even cursorily examined the Finance Bill.

We find that protection is enjoyed by the match industry in India. Strange to say, nearly four-fifths of the match producing industry in India is controlled by foreign capital and by foreigners in spite of the fact that there may be one Indian Director of the Swedish Company in India.

Section 116 of the Government of India Act was referred to by the Commerce Member. I think that even within the scope of section 116 a lot can be done to encourage Indian industries; for instance, this would be a case in point. Is there any reason why a duty of 10 per cent. should be put on tubes and tyres and other rubber articles manufactured in India without imposing a countervailing duty on the imports into India of these articles? I cannot see where the justice of it is, where the reasonableness of it is. Time is very short and, therefore, I pass on. All I can say is that if the Government of India start dealing with the commerce and industry in right earnest now, even then I believe at the termination of the war they will find themselves unready; and if they go to sleep over it, I am afraid they will be caught napping.

The next subject I propose to touch very briefly upon is the question of Indians overseas. Now, in this connection, I want to confine my remarks solely to our present relations with Ceylon. Fortunately, the Governor of Ceylon has given a very cogent, definite, convincing reply to the protest that was lodged by his Ministers on the 11th February, 1941. That reply has already been published in the press, and I will not, therefore, refer to it at any great length. Sir, the position is this. Two Bills are before the Ceylon State Council today. One is the Non-Ceylonese Registration Bill, and the other relates to immigration and the regulation of certain matters by the Ceylon Government. The first deals with registration and the second regulates immigration and other matters. Both these measures are highly objectionable. The Governor has already spoken out his mind on these measures. The only question is what we on this side are going to do. My advice to the Government of India is this. Nobody wants at this critical juncture to be a party to anything which would further embitter feelings between any two parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations. At the same time, if even in this crisis any part of the Commonwealth is prepared to hit us, we should be ready to hit back. My advice to the Government of India is. Let them not take alarm at the idea of exploring the possibilities through the Commerce Department of our hitting back Ceylon in economic matters. I would go further and I would ask the Government to keep ready a Bill so that Government should be in a position to introduce that Bill in this House if the course of events in Ceylon goes against us. I know that it is open to any Member of this House to prepare such a Bill and introduce it, but I think it would be much

[Sir Syed Raza Ali.]

better if the Government themselves did it. I do not want Government at the same time to proceed with the Bill. But let them introduce it and keep it pending. Let us deal with the Bill in the spirit shown by the Ceylon State Council in dealing with these two objectionable Ordinances.

Thirdly, I will come to the question of the administration of the Archæological Survey of India. That is a painful subject. Unfortunately, what goes on in this country is that we demand Indianisation, and when an Indian is appointed, one section of us or another is prepared to find fault with that Indian officer who is put in a responsible position. But, Sir, there are limits to which the caprices and whims of an Indian officer can be allowed to go. I do not want to go into the unpleasant history of the questions which I put in this House, and I must congratulate the Government for making candid statements without any attempt at evasion. From those statements it appears that the administration of the Archæological Department, unfortunately, is rotten. Things have come to this that a matriculate junior is preferred to an M.A. in History who has written articles of value involving research work. Things have come to this that a man who had been sent to jail on a charge of theft, though that was a technical charge, is re-employed without any compunction. Things have come to this that a man who submitted a false bill for travelling allowance is allowed to go scot-free and the officer who wants to catch him is not allowed to do that, and the Director General, Archæology, deals with the whole question himself and does not take any notice of this most serious irregularity on which I have known responsible officers being dismissed. Let me make it clear that the Education Secretary has dealt with my questions on this subject candidly and fairly as far as he could, but I ask him to take note of the feeling of the unfortunate Muslim subordinates. There is a feeling to intense insecurity amongst them, and I put it to him whether he can devise any means for securing the confidence of the subordinate Muslim staff on the one hand and of the Muslim community on the other. Nobody wants really to embitter feelings further on this question, but surely it is high time that a strong check was put on the capricious exercise of power by the Director General of Archæology.

Sir, the next question is one dealing with recognition of communal unions, in which, I am sure, my Honourable friend, the Communications Member, will be interested. I happen to be the President of the Subordinate Accounts Services Union in Delhi, and I find that the union has made a number of applications for recognition. These applications have been turned down on the ground that it is open to the Muslims, instead of starting their own union, to join the general union. I think this objection comes too late when one remembers that this is a country in which separate representation prevails not only for Muslims, but for Europeans, for Sikhs, for the depressed classes, for Anglo-Indians. Even provision is made for the representation of these important communities in the public services. (Interruption by Mr. N. M. Joshi.) This policy has been carried right through. It is too late for the Government to preach the virtue of common unions and to say that the Muslims should join them. The Muslims are not going to join them. The only question is, are you prepared to deal justly by the Muslims or not? If you are prepared to deal justly, recognise these Muslim unions if they are found to be satisfactory, and I am

sure my own union is functioning in a satisfactory manner. Don't trot out this lame excuse that the Muslims should not start their own unions if other unions are available in the country.

Lastly, I would deal with the subject of the present political deadlock. This is a matter on which the attention of most of us is concentrated. In offering a suggestion or two on this question, let it be clearly understood that I shall not be speaking on behalf of the Muslim League Party, but will give expression to my own personal views. So far as the official spokesman of the Party is concerned, he will be speaking in the afternoon and will put the case of our Party before this House.

I value the effort recently made by no-party leaders in Bombay as showing that, while the country is doing its best to help England to win the war, it is not doing much to help itself. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who commands the respect of all important political parties, was associated with the Bombay Conference, but I am afraid he and his co-workers are not likely to succeed in devising means to bring the Congress and the League together. The Government can have an expansion of the Executive Council without the co-operation of these two parties, if it so desires, but such expansion will not touch even the fringe of the political problem. What are we to do? I suggest, and it is my personal suggestion, that a Commonwealth War Advisory Committee be established in London, of which, representatives of the Congress, the League, the Indian States and the Government of India, along with representatives of other countries of the Commonwealth should be members, the Congress and the League representatives to be nominated by the Congress and the League leaders. There is nothing so effective in introducing an atmosphere of goodwill as the association of people with common problems. Indian leaders will be in contact with each other as also with representatives of England and the countries of the Commonwealth in this committee. Such contact is bound to have effect in course of time, and we may thereby achieve results for which the present atmosphere in India affords little or no chance.

My second suggestion is that a Defence Committee with representatives of this House and the nominees of Indian States be established without delay to assist His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India in the conduct of war. The functions of the committee may be advisory. I am afraid they will have to be advisory having regard to the present Constitution, but there should be no prejudice against it, and it should not be treated as being just a tolerable nuisance.

May I say, before I sit down, that the European Group in this House have a unique opportunity of influencing the policy of Government on the one hand, and acting as a bridge between the Congress and the League on the other hand. I remember what valuable work was done by Mr. Lionel Curtis when the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms scheme was under consideration in this country for nearly 2½ years. I can say that if the European Group is so minded and realises the importance and the delicacy of the questions with which we are confronted today, it can take up work which was attempted and done very successfully by Mr. Lionel Curtis. In the European Group we find men like Mr. Buss, Sir Frederick James and the silver-tongued Mr. Griffiths who also has considerable experience of administration. I think matters are far too serious really to allow any Member of this House to be light-hearted or to indulge in cracking jokes. The European Group, if they want to do it, can do real service both to

[Sir Syed Raza Ali.]

India and to England. They are the people who are trusted by Government. They are people who can carry on conversations on important topics involving secret affairs with the head of any Government in any province. I also believe that here in Simla and Delhi they wield very considerable influence. Their influence in the past has occasionally been exercised to promote the interests of the country, though in exercising their influence they do not as a rule forget themselves—a matter of which I think I should not complain. But I do think matters are far too serious to allow the European Group to sit quietly. So far as I can see, they are the only body that can bring about a contact

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would remind the Honourable Member that other Honourable Members want to speak.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I attach very great importance to the last suggestion I have made—not that I don't attach importance to other questions on which I have touched.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza (Nominated Non-Official): Mr. President, as a solitary representative in this House of the Christian community, I am thankful to you that I have caught your eye in this debate, because, owing to the difficulties of obtaining audience in view of the procedure adopted in this House in a debate of this kind, Members, not belonging to any party, like myself, find it very difficult to obtain an audience, and were it not for the fact that I caught your eye

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must remember that seven unattached Members have spoken already.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: the result would have been that a community of more than 10 millions

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better get on with his speech.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: The subject on which I wish to address a very few remarks is one which is uppermost in men's minds today, I mean the political deadlock which prevails in the country, and how far and to what extent the solution proposed by His Majesty's Government as well as by His Excellency the Governor General in his declaration of the 8th August affects the community to which I belong. The solution proposed by His Excellency the Governor General in the declaration of the 8th August is that, to resolve the present deadlock, a Government, approaching a national Government, will be formed by expanding the Executive Council, and the method proposed for expanding the Council is by summoning representatives of important elements in the national life of India—I am quoting the very words of the Rt. Honourable the Secretary of State, as well as of those communities which, by long association with the British Government, have obtained a special claim for special recognition by the British Government. Sir, in pursuance of the declaration, His Excellency the Governor General invited a large number of leaders, including as many as 52 persons, to

whom he granted interviews, but, Sir, not even by name, was the great community, to which I belong, mentioned either in the Secretary of State's declaration or in the Governor General's declaration. Out of the 52 interviews granted to leaders, not one leader of the community to which I belong has been summoned. Is this justice to the community which I represent? Are we so negligible in the life of India that our interests are not to be consulted at all? Is it forgotten that we have contributed so largely to the national uplift in the matter of education on western lines to which we, with missionary capital and our own man power, have contributed? Only the other day we have rendered a signal contribution to women's education. Every community in Bombay acknowledges with thanks the services rendered by the new Women's College, especially those communities who object to mixed education. The college has been opened by those famous educationists, the nuns of the Sacred Heart, and is welcomed as a boon and a blessing. Unfortunately my community has been consistently neglected by the Government of India;—whether under the Government of India Act of 1918, or the Government of India Act of 1935, or the Government of India Act as administered under the emergency powers—section 92 of the Government of India Act, we have always been left in the cold. It is not so much a question of a deadlock with us; it is a question rather of a lock-out.

An Honourable Member: A stay-in strike.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: It may truly be said that Governments may come and Governments may go, but we stand "out" for ever.

Sir, I entreat the Government of India—who are now gradually parting with power in favour of a national Government (Interruptions "no, no") not to hand us over to a national Government branded with the brand of inferiority. Sir, I ask the Government to include us as an important element in the national life of the country, and give us our due place in the country's public life. But whatever the view of the Government of India may be, I am glad to say that our sister communities have always treated us and will continue to treat us with far greater consideration. They specially appreciate our freedom from communal bias. Sir, I am not disclosing a secret, but I may tell this Honourable House that only the other day important leaders of our community were approached by the emissaries from the rival majority parties to act as intermediaries in order to resolve the deadlock. I am not divulging a secret, but this is well-known to some of our leaders that they were asked to approach Mahatma Gandhi and the *Qaid-e-Azam*, but, Sir, unfortunately things had reached a stage

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): I am not aware of any such thing.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: things had reached such a stage that it was impossible for them to approach them.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Nobody has approached you?

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: I can say it is a fact that attempts were made to approach the leaders, but whether with success or not, I do not know.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: All I can say is that nobody has approached me. That is all I can say. And I do not know who the leaders are of the community to which the Honourable Member belongs.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: How can anyone approach one who is "unapproachable"?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is really an unjust remark to make, because Mr. Joshi himself sees me three times in the day and smokes a cigarette with me in the Lobby.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Now, Sir, I just want to say a few words on the political implications of the deadlock in its general aspects. A leading English magazine pointed out the other day that thirty-two *ex*-ministers were in jail and seven *ex*-premiers were also in jail, expiating behind the prison bars the "faith that is in them", and the paper adds, "Is it not a fact that these thirty-two *ex*-ministers and seven *ex*-premiers were elected to the Legislature by seventy-per-cent of the electorate?" Is it not a fact that seventy per cent. of the electorate feel that the political faith that is in them is declared unlawful by the Government, and more or less outlawed by the Government—because these leaders are put in jail for professing those faiths? Sir, it is not for me to explain the repercussions of this impression among the people on the war effort. I myself have attempted to do my bit with regard to the war effort. I have approached a large number of people, especially educated people, in British India as well as the Indian States, but I am sorry to say that Indian opinion, especially educated opinion, is averse to giving such help in view of the manner in which the national leaders have been treated. My reason for mentioning this here is to ask the Government of India to do all that is in their power to solve this problem and thus to quicken the results of the war effort.

How the deadlock is to be resolved, it is not for me to say; wise men have met in Bombay and have recorded their decisions, and where wise men have feared to tread, I certainly shall not venture to rush in, but one thing I should say, and that is this, that unless and until the promises that the Government of India have made leave the domain of "promise" and reach the regions of what lawyers call "performance" or "part performance", they will never fructify. Sir, promises made under stress are always open to the suspicion that when calmer conditions are restored, they may not be fully implemented. We all know what the promises made by the sick man of Hudibras resulted in :

"The devil was ill, the devil a monk would be,

The devil was well, the devil a monk was he."

It is in that light, I am sorry to say, that educated opinion regards promises made by the Government of India. I, therefore, ask, in all humility, out of love for my country, and out of love for the Empire to which I belong, that the promises made should be implemented at least by "part performance". My friend, the Honourable Sir Homi Mody, suggested that there should be something in the nature of a guarantee that whatever resolutions might be arrived at by the leaders of the communities should be implemented by Parliament. It is for the Government to consider that very valuable suggestion, but unless and until something in the nature of part performance is done, the people of India will regard these promises as written on sand.

Whatever the new Constitution may be, Sir, we feel that so long as you conduct the elections in the future on the basis of separate electorates, the present trouble will never end, and there will be all sorts of schemes for Pakistan, schemes for Hindustan, schemes for Khalistan, and schemes, shall I say, of Gidneystan, and so on and so forth—and unless the elections in future are conducted on a joint electorate basis with reservation of seats, things will never improve. Sir, look at the situation today: communities are arrayed not for peace, but they are arrayed in armed neutrality. They act not for the benefit of the country as a whole, but for the benefit of the particular community which they are representing. Their policy is one of "beggar my neighbour". Their prayer seems very much like the prayer which that of the Balkan States is said to have been:

"Oh, Lord, make me blind in one eye,
Provided you make my neighbour blind in both eyes."

That seems to be the attitude of the communities today, and unless and until that vanishes—and my suggestion is that it will only vanish by the institution of joint electorates with reservation of seats—this sad state of things will continue for ever.

Sir, the Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State for India suggested a formula for rectifying this state of affairs. He said that the whole of India should adopt the slogan, "India first". I saw the same slogan translated in a different manner in an anti-communal award meeting which I attended in Madras, where on the board of the dais was printed in bold letters an invocation to the mother land:

"Hindus and Moslems and Christians are we,
But all of us Indians in our worship of Thee."

And, side by side, was written:

"Hindus and Mussalmans and English are being
But all of us Indians in our worship of Thee."

Here lies the point of the suggestion made by my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali. Probably there is no community which will have greater influence in bringing about a solution of the present deadlock than the European community. The European community has a political consciousness and its tradition of nationhood but unfortunately there are people in the country who think that they have identified themselves too much with the Government to be able to give disinterested help. In this connection, I would invite their attention to what the Right Honourable Mr. Amery said. He said that even the British Group in India will help in the solution of the present deadlock by adopting the slogan which he proposed: "India first". So long as the solidity and strength of the Empire is assured, they should identify themselves also with India as a whole.

My time is up, and I do not wish to take longer time than I am allowed. So, with these words, I resume my seat.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan):
Mr. President, before proceeding with the subject of my speech, I wish to recite a Persian saying:

"*Chu dakhlat neesth kharch ahista tar Kun.*"

[Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur.]

The Persian philosopher and politician Sadi of Shiraz particularly advised the Governments that when their resources are scanty and poor, they should cut short their expenditure. This principle has not been adopted by the Government of India. That is our contention. When the army budget was 45 crores, our contention was that it could be reduced to 30 crores. In one of my speeches on the budget on a previous occasion I have proved this by facts and figures. Now, it has doubled itself. From 45 crores it has nearly doubled itself when it has risen to 84 crores. That is why we have got a deficit balance of nearly 20 crores and a half. Correctly speaking, it is 20 crores and 46 lakhs. Reduction could have been effected in so many ways and this deficit could have consequently been met easily. First of all, we are deadly against the principle of taxation, because without representation there cannot be taxation. Now, there is no representation here. Government have been going on with taxation according to their will and pleasure. Had they resorted to the advice by not allowing the Supply Department to give increases according to their will and pleasure, they could have effected substantial saving. In this connection, the House cannot but praise officers like Mr. Jenkins, I.C.S., who is the Secretary of the Supply Department and Mr. Ghulam Muhammad. So far as I know, these are the only two gentlemen who did not want any thing extra in the Supply Department, one from among the Indians and another from among the Europeans. All others have had their fat salaries. And as regards the salary cut, of course, it could have been effected very easily as a War measure. This is what I wanted to say regarding the advice referred to at the outset.

As regards the other two or three points that I wish to make out, I would like to invite the attention of the Government to them. During the last session we passed a Resolution in favour of the appointment of a pilgrim officer. Subsequently, a Special Officer was appointed by the Government of India for which they are to be thanked. Of course, the report is not yet published and we are afraid whether the Government will give it the attention that it deserves. The thing is this. The Government of India has been spending about 37 to 38 lakhs of rupees towards the Ecclesiastical Department. On a previous occasion this subject was fully dwelt upon by the Leader of our Party, though the Muslim League Party was not then formed. We know that it is a non-votable subject. But when have been spending 37 to 38 lakhs of rupees every year towards the maintenance of the Ecclesiastical Department, why have you reduced the pilgrimage charge from Rs. 30,000 a year to Rs. 12,000 a year? Formerly, when there was a Pilgrimage Department in the Government of India, they were spending about Rs. 30,000 a year. Now, if you go through the figures for the last three years, you will find that it has been reduced to Rs. 12,000 per year on the average. This amount goes towards the upkeep of the Bombay Port Haj Committee and the Calcutta Port Haj Committee. So far as the Karachi Port Haj Committee is concerned, not a single pie goes towards its upkeep because it is self-supporting. But this Rs. 12,000 is not at all enough. My contention is that if the report of the Special Officer should be favourable to our Resolution, the Finance Department should have no objection whatsoever to appoint a Special Officer to look into the grievances of the Hajis. Haj, as you know, sir, is incumbent on every Muslim who can afford to undertake the journey both physically and financially.

Now, I wish to bring one more thing to the notice of the Government and it is this. This point was also touched upon by my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali. As a southerner, I am also very much interested in Ceylon affairs. Ceylon has got many southerners, particularly, the Madrasis, and it is they who have built up Ceylon to a great extent. Just as our Mopla friends have built up the whole of Malabar and have converted it into a garden, similarly the Madrasis have made Ceylon what it is now.

Mr. H. A. Sathar H. Essak Sait (West Coast and Nilgiris : Muham-
madan) : Have you been to Ceylon?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: Our Honourable friend who represents Malabar justly feels proud of the fact that the Malabaris have had their share in building up Ceylon. Now, Sir, we are being ignored so much that even Acts are being enacted against our interests. The Ministers of Ceylon did not care even for the warning message of their Governor. Such is the state of affairs there. We should thank the Government of India for having taken a very firm stand regarding the Ceylon affairs and we hope that they will prove themselves firmer still in their resolution when the case of Indians is at stake there. The line of action suggested by my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, may be taken.

I am sorry to see that my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, is not here. Most probably he is absent in connection with
1 P.M. the deputation to which I want to refer on the floor of the House. So far as southern India is concerned, the skin and hides industry was in a great flourishing condition, now there is the danger of the industry collapsing. A deputation of about 10 or 11 members has come from Madras to place their case before the Commerce Member. Most probably today is the time fixed for interviewing the deputation by the Commerce Member. It is hoped that the Honourable the Commerce Member, not only because he comes from Madras, but also because he is an Indian with sympathetic views will interest himself a great deal in the skin and hides merchants of southern India. Sir, Trichinopoly which happens to be my own place is a place where there were a great many tanneries. Some tanneries have been closed down. Though I am not a skin merchant yet I am much interested in it, because many of these merchants are my constituents. Should the industry collapse many skin merchants would be ruined.

I wish to refer to only one other point before I conclude my speech. The other day, one of the Members of our party spoke something in favour of the Government, not exactly in favour of the Government, but in favour of the policy adopted by the Government as regards repression. That was his individual opinion. But some friends of the Congress Nationalist party unnecessarily attacked the whole of our party, the Muslim Leaguers. It was quite wrong on their part to have done so. My Honourable friend sitting behind me, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, and my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, attacked the Muslim League Party and said that the Muslim League Party was in favour of Government and that they are for repression and such other things. Unfortunately the Leader of the Congress Nationalist Party was not present then. This discussion was on the cut motion brought forward by my

[Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur.]

Honourable friend, Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi. When there was a Resolution regarding repression by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, all of us as a party supported him. Honourable Members of the Congress Nationalist Party are fully alive to this fact, and yet some of the Members belonging to the Party attacked the Muslim League Party that they are supporting the Government. It is not at all a fact.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I point out, Sir, that the Honourable Member has mixed up the speeches. I never said that the Muslim League Party are for repression. I never said so in my speech.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: I accept the correction. He found fault with our Party in some other matters. When the Resolution for the introduction of reforms in Baluchistan was under discussion, all these accusations were laid against the Muslim League Party by some Members of the Nationalist Congress Party including my friend. Let them deny that. With these words, I conclude.

Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha (North-West Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I would confine myself, with your permission, to say a few words with regard to an affair in my district of Sargodha in the Punjab to which my Honourable friend, Sadar Sant Singh, repeatedly referred in the House during this Session. Sir, although my Honourable friend, Nawab Siddique Ali Khan, tried to throw light on the matter, but he could not do full justice, because of the very little time he had at his disposal. I would deal with it fully within the short time at my disposal.

Sir, while speaking on the 11th March on the Finance Bill, my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, discussed the Defence of India Act, and, in the course of his speech, condemned the action of the Punjab Government and that of the Deputy Commissioner, Sargodha, for the application of the Defence of India Act towards religious processions, and stated that at Sargodha the anniversary of Guru Govind Singh was not allowed to be celebrated, that the procession was interfered with, and, at this time, thirty-one persons were under arrest for having attended the procession under the Defence of India Act. On the very opening day of the Assembly Session, the Honourable Member moved a motion for adjournment bringing into question the conduct of the telegraph authorities at Sargodha for their refusal to transmit telegrams of complaints against the high-handed action of the Deputy Commissioner on the occasion of the birthday of Guru Govind Singh on the 5th January, 1941. Then, again, he asked a volley of questions on the 25th February in connection with the same incident. Sir, although the motion for adjournment was ruled out of order by the Chair and the questions were properly answered by the Honourable Member in charge of the Department, yet I feel that there is a likelihood of some false impressions having been created in the minds of some Honourable Members of the House regarding the action of the Government, of the Deputy Commissioner and of the Telegraph Master, Sargodha, for having banned the procession and for having withheld the transmission of the telegrams in question on account of their being of objectionable nature. I deem it my duty to remove such misunderstandings that might have arisen as to the justice, fairness or otherwise done to the Sikh community.

Sir, a great communal tension existed between the Sikhs and the Muslims at Sargodha since last year when, at the time of the annual meeting of Anjuman-i-Islamia, Sargodha, Muslims had gathered in thousands from all the corners of the district, the Sikhs of Sargodha picked up a quarrel with the Muslims and gave them grave provocation, thereby inflaming their feelings. The communal tension ran so high there that an open clash seemed imminent. The danger was growing, as members of each community were pouring in the town every moment to measure their strength with each other. Had not the Deputy Commissioner shown great presence of mind, extraordinary courage and foresight at his own personal risk, to his own life, not a single Sikh would have returned to report what had happened, for the Muslims out-numbered the Sikhs and had good cause to give battle.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I know whether the Muslims, who the Honourable Member says outnumbered the Sikhs, were armed with sticks and swords and other weapons?

Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha: No. Some carried lathis. The Deputy Commissioner had to promulgate curfew order and an order under section 144 for several days to bring the town to its normal state of affairs. The saner elements among the Sikhs in Sargodha felt deeply grateful to him for his timely action which saved the Sikh community from a very awkward and critical situation. Now, the same community applies to the same Deputy Commissioner for a permit to take out a procession on the Guru Govind Singh birthday on 5th January. The Deputy Commissioner, who had such a bitter experience last year could not reasonably be expected to allow such a procession without imposing some restrictions and taking adequate precautionary measures in the interest of the public in general and the Sikh community in particular. He could have disallowed the procession altogether and would have been justified in doing so, but, out of regard for the feelings of the Sikh community, he granted permission with certain route restrictions against the desired proposal of the Sikhs in their own interest, as, in their proposed route, there lay a mosque which, according to the justified apprehensions of the Superintendent of Police, would in all probability have been the scene of bloodshed had the procession been allowed to pass that route. The Sikhs did not agree to restrictions laid down by the Deputy Commissioner on the procession route and, instead of resorting to constitutional protest, broke the law and took out the procession through the prohibited route in contravention of the orders of the district authorities. The result was that a few arrests were made. The cases against the arrested persons are still pending in Court and the Honourable Member ought to have refrained from alluding to them while discussing the wrong application of the Act under which they were arrested till they are finally disposed of. It is now for the House to judge if banning the route of the procession and the arrests made under the Defence of India Act was a justified action of the authorities or not.

As for withholding of the telegrams in connection with the above incident, it is also for the House to judge. The House will be surprised to know that the text of the telegram was not even known to the Honourable Member who was so eager to condemn the Government and

[Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha.]

moved an adjournment motion. The House can well judge the insufficient knowledge of the incident the Honourable Member might be having when he even did not know the wording of the telegram which was the basis of his wordy fight with Government. The substance of the telegram, and not the actual words, stated by Sardar Sant Singh in his question No. 138 replied to on the 25th February, 1941, reads as follows:

“Unarmed religious procession on the anniversary of Sri Guru Gobind Singh using customary route lathi charged by the police over 20 persons injured conditions of a few serious about 12 persons arrested so far lorry carrying Guru Granth Sahib taken by police Gurdwara management prevented by authorities from raising pandal in front of Gurdwara for holding anniversary dewan Sikh feeling perturbed.”

The Telegraph Master, as stated in his reply by the Honourable Sir Andrew Clow, was doubtful whether it was not of objectionable character, and, therefore, referred it under rule 15 of the Indian Telegraph Rules to the chief civil officer of the district (i.e., the Deputy Commissioner), and under his advice he treated it as objectionable. He apparently held that the whole of the telegram was objectionable. It is now for you to judge, Sir, what effect, in these circumstances, would have been produced, if a telegram of that nature, which I have just read, was transmitted and published in the newspapers. This would have only further aggravated the communal tension which was already serious enough. It will thus be clear that the Telegraph Master does not deserve to be accused, and no more so the Deputy Commissioner who has been indirectly the real target of the attacks of Sardar Sant Singh. The Deputy Commissioner, be it remembered, who is a most popular, and very capable and one of the officers of the Indian Civil Service in the Punjab, deserves appreciation from the Sikh community, but I would like you to know, Sir, that the Deputy Commissioner has come to deserve such unwholesome attention from my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, because the officer happens to be one Mian Aminuddin, and not Sardar Amin Singh. Had it been so, the criticism of the Honourable Member would have turned into appreciation. But Sardar Sant Singh is not to be blamed for that, because he represents the Sikhs of Sargodha district and must prepare a field to be returned again to the Assembly by his constituents. Picking up communal questions, right or wrong, has always been considered an easy way of becoming popular and widely known which at least in this case is not in the best interests of the people he represents. I am glad to say that the people of Sargodha do not hold the same feelings which Sardar Sant Singh has tried to create. The Honourable Member, in his deal in condemning the application of the Defence of India Act, not only attacked the Central Government, the Punjab Government and the Deputy Commissioner, Sargodha, but attacked even the highest judicial authority of his province, the Chief Justice of the Punjab High Court, who is considered to be, and actually is, above the politics of the country in administering justice. He described him as having been “influenced by the political issues of the day”, and he was also pleased to state that the relations between the Chief Justice and the Indian Judges are very much strained, and that there is a complete boycott between the two sections over some order of the Chief Justice regarding the trial of cases under the Defence of India Act. The responsibility of such a statement lies on the speaker himself, but from what I can guess, these might be the views of the Honourable Member himself, as we have not received such information from any other source. Whatever the facts may be, a

responsible member like Sardar Sant Singh should not have made such a reference to the Chief Justice in the manner he has done. He would, of course, by doing so, have a wide propaganda for himself for having been bold enough to attack the highest judicial authority of the province. I can with personal knowledge and full confidence say that the Chief Justice of the Punjab in the person of Sir Douglas Young is not only a popular judge, but is also the most conscientious Chief Justice, that Punjab has ever had. He is very much loved by the people of the Punjab who have implicit faith in him being absolutely fair-minded and just and far above the insinuation made against him by my friend, Sardar Sant Singh. Sir, I have done.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PARTIALITY OF THE CHAIR AND NAMING OF MAULVI ABDUR RASHEED CHAUDHURY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the House rises, the Chair regrets to have to read out a letter which has just been sent to it by Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury:

“Dear Mr. President,

I must protest against your way of selecting speakers in this House. You have been selecting speakers after speakers from this party and that party, I stood up 14 times to speak in the Finance Bill in the November Session last, but you gave me no chance to speak. This time I stood up no less than 14 times and you ignored me and gave me no chance. This shows that you are not doing your duty in this House impartially as is expected. I strongly protest against your partiality (sic) to me in this House.”

The Chair does not know what the Honourable Member means.

“The time has come for you to be either just to all or to vacate. Your impartial treatment (sic) can no longer be tolerated.”

The Chair thinks suitable action has to be taken. (*Voices of: “He must apologise”, “Withdraw the letter”, etc.*) Unless the Honourable Member is prepared to apologise the Chair will have to take proper action.

Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury (Assam: Muhammadan): Sir, I did not mean.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will tell the House what happened. As Honourable Members know, this is the sixth day that this discussion has been going on. A most unprecedented amount of time has been taken on this discussion, and this gentleman, Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury, belongs to what is called the unattached group, and of that group no less than seven members have had an opportunity to speak. Of the other parties, nine members of the Muslim League Group have spoken and they have taken nearly 8 hours, of the Congress Nationalists five members have spoken and they have taken 6½ hours, of the European Group five members have spoken and they have taken nearly 1½ hours, and the unattached Members have taken nearly 5 hours. There is a limited time at the disposal of the House and the Chair sent word to Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury asking him whether he would limit his speech to 10 minutes because that is about the time

[Mr. President.]

that the Chair thought would be at his disposal if the arrangement had to be carried out. This the Honourable Member refused to do. He did not agree to limit himself to any time whatever; and under the circumstances, unless the entire arrangement was to fall to the ground, the Chair could not give him an opportunity to speak. But this is the letter he has written and the Chair leaves it to Honourable Members to express their opinions about it.

Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury: Sir, I never intended to give any offence, nor did anything wrong.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The letter speaks for itself—unless the Honourable Member did not understand what he was saying. There cannot be any more serious offence for any Member of this House to commit.

Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury: Sir, I find the Chair has taken it too seriously and I withdraw it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It must be an unconditional withdrawal, with an ample apology to the Chair. If the Honourable Member is not prepared to do it, he will have to take the consequence. It is a most unwarranted and unjustified letter.

Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury: I do not like to impose any conditions to what I wanted to do and I, therefore, expressed what was in my mind. So I will withdraw it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not the apology the Chair is prepared to receive.

Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury: I am not prepared to offer any kind of apology.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Chair must ask the Honourable Member to withdraw from the House for the rest of the day.

(Maulvi Abdur Rasheed Chaudhury then withdrew.)

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—*contd.*

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Deputy President, I have been in this House for a short time and I have not acquired that versatility which

some of the Honourable Members seem to have of dealing with every subject under the sun, and dealing with it with seeming authority and expert knowledge. I shall, therefore, confine myself to the political and constitutional situation in the country, and I shall try to explain, as briefly as possible, the position of the Muslim League regarding this matter. Mr. Deputy President, when my friend, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan, towards the end of his speech, stated that the Muslim League Party had decided to oppose the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill, the Honourable the Leader of the House interjected: "Will your opposition be successful?"

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan (Leader of the House): No, Sir, I did not.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What did the Honourable Member say?

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: I am sorry, Sir, I seem to recollect that, but anyhow as the Honourable the Leader of the House says that he did nothing of the kind. . . .

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have not said I did nothing of the kind. I did not interject what the Honourable Member has attributed to me.

An Honourable Member: But the Honourable Member did say something?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes, I did say something.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: I do not know what the Honourable the Leader of the House said, but what we heard was what I have stated.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Sir, the Honourable Member cannot say that he heard me say something that I did not say unless his hearing is at fault.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: Anyhow, as far as hearing goes, it seems to me that it is not only my hearing, but the hearing of the whole House, which is faulty.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, no. I may briefly explain what I said. I put merely a question to the Honourable Member—do you desire your opposition to be successful?

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: If that is so, let me tell him that we do desire that our opposition should be successful.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I believe the Honourable Member to whom I put that question said "No."

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: I do not know what the Honourable Member said as he is not here to defend himself, but anyhow

[Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan.]

let me tell my Honourable friend that the Muslim League Party in this House does desire that the opposition should be successful.

Mr. Deputy President, we know the hybrid Constitution under which we are working. We know that the majority party, the opposition party in this House, having decided to withdraw from the battlefield of constitutionalism, the Honourable the Leader of the House, with his nominated official and non-official votes, who act as automatons, and with the ready and obliging support of the European Group which, I am sorry to say, is always at the disposal of the Government

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer (Bengal : European) : Quite incorrect!

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: can flout the opinion of this House, and even if the House succeeded in carrying the motion for opposition to the consideration of the Bill, I am not unaware of the storehouse of special powers of certification on which the Honourable the Leader of the House and the Honourable the Finance Member can draw. We know that this House, this Indian Parliament, compared to other Parliaments of free countries, is only in the nature of a toy parliament, but even if you play with toy soldiers, you must follow the rules of the game. It is a well recognised practice in every free Parliament that if the peoples' representatives have any grievances against the Government of the day, they are entitled to tell that Government—no supplies without the redress of grievances—and the opposition of the Muslim League Party is in accordance with that well established practice.

Sir, there seems to be a good deal of confusion regarding the position of the Muslim League in connection with the so-called political deadlock. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House,—I have read it related outside,—that the responsibility for the political deadlock is to be apportioned between the Congress and the Muslim League, and it seems to me that if you go on repeating something long enough, even if it is absolutely wrong, the people who are mentally lazy begin to believe in that. I would try to point out that the responsibility for the so-called deadlock does not lie on the shoulders of the Muslim League. It lies on the shoulders of the Congress and of the British Government. Sir, from the very beginning, since the declaration of the war, the Muslim League has repeatedly made its position clear. It has not confused the question of the future constitutional development with the question of the present constitutional advancement. All that the Muslim League said was that as far as the future is concerned, and all that we ask the British Government today, is that at an opportune time, as soon as possible after the war, or as soon as it is convenient to do so, the British Government should revise the Government of India Act of 1935 *de novo* in the light of the experience that may be gained by the working of that Act; and, secondly, that no Constitution should be forced down the throats of ninety millions of Mussalmans without their approval and consent. Now, I ask you, Mr. Deputy President, can any fairminded person say that it is an impossible position that the Muslim League has taken up? Some of my friends in this House and outside have stated that this means that the minority is asking for the right of veto. When they talk of minorities so glibly, they seem to forget that the Muslims in the whole of India may be numerically less, but they are

not a minority in the accepted sense of the term. They are a people, ninety millions strong, they are in a majority in certain parts of India, and, therefore, when you talk of them as a minority, I think it is a complete travesty of facts. I am sorry that those of our countrymen who talk of our demanding a veto do not appreciate the position, and yet a person living thousands of miles away from India is able to understand what the Muslim League demands. I refer to the statement that Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India, made in this connection in the House of Commons in August last. I shall in a moment read out a portion of that statement so that Honourable Members' memory may be refreshed, but before I do that, let me tell you that it is inconceivable that you can work any Constitution in this country if either the Mussalmans or the Hindus are opposed to it. It is impossible, and anybody who seems to think that a Constitution can be thrust down the throats of Mussalmans without their consent and approval—let me tell you, that he is living in a paradise of his own.

What did Mr. Amery say on this particular question? It is so clear that I do not think that any one could have put it better. He stated:

"His Majesty's Government have made it clear that they could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life."

I think in these few words Mr. Amery has understood the situation in India very clearly, and yet my countrymen who are in closer touch with the affairs in India go on talking of the power of veto by the Mussalmans. Now, Sir, what did Mr. Amery say about this power of veto? He says:

"To describe the need for such agreement as a veto on constitutional progress is, I think, to do an injustice to the patriotism and sense of responsibility of those concerned."

When my friends talk of the Muslim League asking for a power of veto, they seem to be under the impression that this country is their private property. Let me tell them that India is as much mine as it is any one else's living in this country, and I am as much interested in the welfare of this country as any one else. It is because of that that I say that for the sake of peace, for the sake of prosperity of India, you should not endeavour to thrust a Constitution on an unwilling people. If we really wanted to obstruct in the war effort, if we really wanted to take advantage of the misfortune in which Great Britain is involved, we could have easily said like the other parties, "You give us Pakistan here and now, and unless you promise that, we will not help you a bit." We have done nothing of the kind. I shall, Mr. Deputy President, deal with this question of the Lahore Resolution, which is popularly called Pakistan, at a later stage. But what I am trying to show now is to tell this Honourable House that the position that Muslim League has adopted cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be described as one of bargaining or taking advantage of a person who is in trouble and who is in an unfortunate situation.

As regards the present, what do we say? We say that it is not possible to create that enthusiasm amongst the people of India which is desired by everybody, it is not possible to make the people of India believe that this war is their own, unless you have Indian representatives, representatives of political parties, inside the Central Government, and in the provinces which are being administered at present under section 93 of the Government of India Act. In this connection, let me tell you what the

[Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan.]

Working Committee of the Muslim League has stated on the 16th of June last year:

"The Working Committee looks with alarm at the growing menace of Nazi aggression which has been most ruthlessly depriving one nation after another of its liberty and freedom and regards the unprovoked attack by the Italian Government against the Allies as most unwarranted and immoral at a time when France was engaged in a brave struggle against very heavy odds. The grave world situation demands serious efforts on the part of every Indian for the defence of his country and the Working Committee calls upon the Government of India to prepare the country in an organised manner to meet every eventuality. The Committee is constrained to state that the proposals for the defence of India indicated in the statements of Their Excellencies the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief as well as the statements of some provincial Governors are wholly inadequate to meet the urgent requirements of the situation."

Now, this portion refers to the War Committees that were announced at that time and were to be formed in the various provinces:

"The Committee therefore authorises its President to enter into communication with His Excellency the Viceroy with a view to explore the possibility of devising prompt and effective measures to mobilise the country's resources for the purpose of intensifying war efforts and the defence of India. The Committee is of the view that, unless a satisfactory basis for close co-operation is agreed upon on an all-India basis and not provincewise, between the Government and the Muslim League and such other parties as are willing to undertake the responsibility for the defence of the country in the face of imminent danger, the real purpose and objective will not be served and achieved."

I do not think that any party could have made its position clearer than what the Muslim League did. It realises the importance of fighting this war successfully. But let me tell you quite frankly that it does not trust the judgment of the British Government completely. When it asks for associating representatives of the Muslim League and such other parties as are willing to work in this common cause, it does so because it wants that the people of the country should have complete confidence in the Government which is, in the main, responsible for war efforts.

Now, when we stated at that time that these War Committees were really piffling things and it was not really a serious effort to associate Indian opinion with the war effort, we were told, "No. Wait and see. This is a great opportunity for Indians to take an effective share in the war effort." On the authority of no less a person than Sir Homi Mody, who has been working on these war committees, I can say that they have failed completely. Sir Homi Mody himself, speaking on this motion which is under consideration, stated that it is necessary to associate Indian opinion more closely with war efforts, and it is exactly the same thing which the Muslim League had stated. Therefore, all that we want is that the British Government, in their own interests and in the interests of India, should recognise that it is impossible to get that support, that full co-operation from the people of India which is most essential at this critical time, unless and until you can make them believe that it is their Government and that can never be unless there are representatives of the various political parties in the Government.

Now, Sir, as against that, let me tell you what the Congress position is. The Congress position is "nothing doing for the present unless you concede here and now what we want regarding the future." The Congress wanted that a declaration should be made immediately that India is a free country from today. It should be declared that India will have a right, not will have a right, but has a right, of framing its own Constitution by means of a Constituent Assembly elected on adult franchise, and

then, later on, the famous Poona Resolution came in. To my mind, that Poona Resolution was not an alternative to these two proposals. It was a device to see that that declaration regarding the freedom of India is given effect to immediately. The Poona Resolution demanded that a national Government should be formed responsible to the Legislative Assembly. Let me tell you that as far as the Mussalmans are concerned, we could not possibly accept any one of these three demands that have been put forward by the Congress, because the acceptance of any one of those demands means prejudging the issue regarding the future Constitution of India. Therefore, the Congress position is that we are not prepared to do anything unless and until you concede our demands here and now, knowing fully well that the Mussalmans and other minorities could not possibly accept them. Now, I ask you this. It does not matter how often the Congress leaders may go on repeating that they do not wish to embarrass the British Government but in actual practice they do want to embarrass you, and not only that, but they want to take advantage of your misfortune. Then, Sir, after that what happens? After having failed in their pleadings, after having failed in cajoling the British Government into accepting the demands of the Congress and letting down the Mussalmans and all other minorities, they decided to start civil disobedience, and the General of this army of Satyagrahis declared, as his war aim, the right of freedom of speech. The satyagraha, according to what the Congress says, has not been started with the object of getting any one of those demands conceded, but the objective of satyagraha, according to them, is to get from the British Government the right of freedom of speech, the right to preach what they like. Let me tell you not in my own words, but in the words of the General of Satyagraha, the Congress wants the right to preach that "you will invite Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini to take what they want. If those gentlemen desire to occupy your homes, you will vacate them. If they do not give you free passage out, you will allow yourself, man, woman and child, to be slaughtered." This is the freedom of speech that they want, and can any sane person think for a moment that any Government worth the name could allow any party to have such freedom of speech? Even if you gave the Congress this freedom of speech, there are millions and millions in this country who have neither lost courage nor patriotism, nor self-respect and they shall resist and see that this kind of freedom of speech is not practised in this country. The object is not really to gain this privilege of preaching what I have stated just now, but the object of the Congress is to coerce the British Government into accepting those fundamental demands of the Congress, and I have the authority of no less a person than Mr. Gandhi when he stated that a settlement during the war between the British and the Congress is not possible as long as the Congress demand is not conceded. Let me tell you, and, through you, let me tell the Government overseas, that if they allow themselves to be coerced into this position of letting down the Mussalmans and other minorities, they shall have established an infamous record for themselves. No nation could ever be guilty of such an infamy as the British would be if they allowed the Congress to have their own way.

Now, Mr. Deputy President, this being the position of the Congress, that they are not prepared to look at anything as regards any settlement for the present, how can any one, any fair minded person really accuse us that we are responsible for the deadlock. There is no question of a settlement between the Muslim League and the Congress. In November, 1939, His Excellency the Viceroy invited the leader of the Muslim League and

[Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan.]

the President of the Congress and Mr. Gandhi. The Congress stated then and there that these matters regarding any arrangement for the present were subsidiary matters, and as long as the Congress demand regarding a declaration for the independence of India and Constituent Assembly and so on was not met, they were not prepared to look at anything. I ask you, how can any one really blame us that we are standing in the way of there being any change in the present position for associating Indian opinion with the Central Government and in the Provinces?

I have heard it stated, and I think some Honourable Members stated here on the floor of the House that Mr. Jinnah, I suppose by Mr. Jinnah they mean the Muslim League, does not want any settlement. He is always against any settlement. A more unfounded allegation I have never come across. Mr. Jinnah, at the time when the Viceroy had invited these three leaders, stated that he was prepared to consider any proposal and the proposal that was made by the Viceroy; and as recently as November last year, on the floor of this House, Mr. Jinnah, turning round to the Congress stated: "Let us have a settlement and put up a united demand"! Sir, it is stated that, because of the claim of the Muslim League that it is the only authoritative and representative organization of the Mussalmans there cannot be any settlement. We do not ask any organization to recognize our claim. It is not a question of claim. It is a statement of fact, and no number of denials by anybody or by any party can change facts. The Muslim League today is the only authoritative and representative organization of the Mussalmans. What is the use of people coming and telling me that "You are saying that the Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organization, therefore how can there be a settlement?" Well, if we are not a representative organization, then what authority, on whose behalf, are we to have a settlement? Sir, some of the Honourable Members here stated that, because we have passed a Resolution at Lahore which is popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution, therefore all the doors for a settlement are closed. Why? Why are they closed? Am I not entitled to put forward any proposal which, in my opinion, will secure peace and prosperity and freedom for this country? Is it only the right of others, and am I only to go there to dot the i's and cross the t's? Do I say today, do I make it a condition precedent that, unless you agree to my proposal, I am not prepared to talk to you? It is an absurd suggestion that is being made by certain persons.

Now, Sir, let me briefly say a few words about my Honourable friend, Sir F. E. James. He stated—I think I would like to state it in his own words—that "today the policies of the major political parties are aiming, or have already aimed, a vital blow at the settled policy of successive British Governments for the last twenty-five years with regard to India. What is that settled policy? First of all, the achievement of the organic and constitutional unity of India as a whole, and, secondly, the establishment in this country of representative institutions on a democratic basis." I would only like to add here that when he says "has received or is about to receive a severe blow", let me tell him that it has already received a knock-out blow, and it is no longer in the ring of Indian politics! Sir, my Honourable friend, Sir F. E. James, stated that he has been in the political life of this country for twenty years. He reminded me of a professor at

Aligarh. An English gentleman had come out from England to teach at Aligarh, and the first thing in Urdu that he heard was :

*"Khana mez par,
Cha mez par."*

He concluded that "mez par" meant that it was ready, and so, whenever he wanted his carriage to be got ready, he would say, "gharry mez par"—and mind you this, he continued to do after having been at Aligarh for over twenty years. Now, Sir, as regards the democratic parliamentary system of Government, let me tell my Honourable friends that a democratic parliamentary system of Government is only possible in a country which has a homogeneous people and one society. What do you have in India? You have two major communities here; I do not care whether you call them "communities", whether you call them "nationalities" or you call them by any other name,—whose religion is different, whose culture is different, whose social life is different, whose personal laws are different, whose ideals are different, whose whole outlook upon life is different,—and yet some of my Honourable friends still seem to think that the "raising of hands and the counting of heads" is the only right type of Constitution for this country. Sir, I have a very great regard for the religion, for the culture, for the social life of my Hindu friends, just as I expect them to have for mine, but I will just give you an instance. I read it in the papers the other day that in Bombay on the sea shore a swimming bath has been built, and "it is meant for Hindus only". Now, when my friends refuse to swim even in the sea with me, how can you ever imagine one unitary form of Government for the whole of India

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Do they refuse to allow you to have a bath in the sea?

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan: Sir, let me tell you in all earnestness and with all sincerity, and I appeal to every well-wisher of the country not to consider the Lahore Resolution or the Pakistan Resolution of the All-India Muslim League as a device to destroy the country. We are as much interested in the welfare of India as anyone else; but we, after having had experience of so-called democratic parliamentary systems of Government, have come to the conclusion that that system of Government can never work satisfactorily in this country; that if you want peace, if you want that the Hindus and Mussalmans should in future not be flying at each others' throats, you should give them equal opportunities to develop themselves according to their own ideals and according to their own culture, and that can only be if both of them have the freedom and have the power to develop themselves in accordance with their own ideals and their whole system of social life. I appeal to my Hindu friends,—do not think for a moment that the Mussalmans are the enemies of the country. I want them to look at this problem with an open mind. Look at this problem with this idea that here is a proposition, here is a proposal which we have put forward which, according to us, will secure the freedom for India at the earliest possible moment and which will establish peace and prosperity in the country. Look at it from that point of view. Sir, I have met a number of my Hindu friends who have been opposed to this Resolution, and have come to me to discuss Pakistan. They said, "We want to understand". I said, "But you are opposed to it without understanding." They said, "Yes, but you see, Pakistan, Pakistan, no, no, any—how you explain to us"—and let me tell you, I have met very responsible

[Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan.]

Hindu gentlemen, and after we had discussed it in a friendly manner as between two men, we came to the conclusion that this was really a proposal which should be considered with an open mind and an open heart. Sir, the same appeal I make to all my Hindu friends in the country—do not think that, merely by your saying that you are opposed to it, you will succeed in making the Mussalmans give up Pakistan. The only sensible thing is—consider this proposal in the spirit in which it has been put forward before the country; and I have no doubt and I feel convinced that those who are opposed to it today will be in support of it tomorrow. Sir, in this connection, let me tell my Honourable friend, Sir Frederick James, and other Europeans in this country and in England, that as long as you keep on dangling this carrot—viz., unitary form of Government for the whole of India and democratic parliamentary system of government,—before some people, you make it impossible for the Hindus and the Mussalmans to come to a settlement and for the country to have peaceful evolution. My countrymen, the Hindus, think that this is the best thing that would give them domination over the whole of the country, and as long as they go on deriving some support and some hope from you, they will never look at any proposition, however reasonable it may be and in whatever spirit it may be put before them. Therefore, my appeal to my British friends is: Let us recognise the realities of the situation. I dare say that you did believe in all honesty and in all sincerity that what was good for your country would be equally good for India. But it is possible for a person to be mistaken. Do not think that you can never make a mistake. The experience has shown that what is good for your country can never prosper in this country.

Now, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the so-called expansion of the Viceroy's Council. My Honourable friend, Sir Frederick James, when speaking on this motion, stated that the Poona Resolution was no good; the Resolution passed by the Conference held at Bombay recently was not of much assistance. But he did not tell us what his proposal was. I think in a way, although he did not say so openly, he did hint that the Viceroy's offer really held the field and that was the only possible solution. I hope I am interpreting him correctly.

Sir F. E. James (Madras: European): May I just make that perfectly clear? My argument was that in the event of the two other propositions failing, the only remaining and possible practical proposition before the country was the Viceroy's offer.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: Sir, I wish my Honourable friend had told us what his proposal was. In his speech he might have made some possible suggestions as to what, in his opinion, would be the best solution. But as he has not done so, I take it that his solution is at the present moment the Viceroy's offer. Sir, let me tell him and my other British friends here that we have every sympathy with those Britishers who are undergoing those terrible trials that were referred to by Sir Frederick James in his speech. If we are unable to accept the Viceroy's offer in its present form, it is not that we have no sympathy and we have no pity for the people of England who are putting up such a brave fight against very heavy odds and Nazi aggression. Therefore, I do

want this to be confused that in spite of the people of Great Britain suffering such terrible losses, we are still thinking in terms of the Viceroy's offer and its acceptance or not. At the very beginning of my speech, I stated that the Muslim League had demanded that something should be done which will give real authority and substantial power to the representatives of the Muslim League and such other Parties as were prepared to come in in the Government at the Centre as well as in the Provinces and I stated the reasons for doing that. Now, Sir, let me examine the Viceroy's offer. As far as the principle of that offer goes, I have no quarrel with it. As a matter of fact, the principle of that offer is exactly what the Muslim League had been demanding since the beginning of the war. But when you come to giving effect to that principle, the whole thing is nullified. What was the offer that was made to the Muslim League? It is on record, and it is not a secret. The offer made to the Muslim League was: "We will give you two seats in the Executive Council". That is all. As far as the total strength of the Council is concerned, the reply was, "I am sorry I cannot tell you". As far as the portfolios are concerned, "it is within my discretion". As far as the question of any other Party coming in at a later stage is concerned,—the Party that is stabbing you now in the back—and as to what would happen to the Muslim League in that event, "I am unable to give you any assurance on that point". Now, I ask you, Mr. Deputy President, could any decent Party or self-respecting man accept such an offer? It is not really giving any real power and real authority to the Mussalmans and those others who may be willing to come in in the Government at the Centre. It is trifling with the whole thing. It is only plying with the 90 millions of Mussalmans. Let me tell you that the days are gone when people could be treated like children or could be fooled. The Secretary of State stated in his statement that whether the Congress came in or whether they did not, His Excellency the Viceroy will go on with his proposal of the expansion of the Executive Council. Why does he not go on with the expansion of his Executive Council? I see my Honourable friend, Mr. Chapman-Mortimer, pointing towards the Muslim League. I have just stated—perhaps my friend was not very attentive—that no decent Party could accept the offer in its present form. We have never said "No." How could we? Our demand from the very beginning has been that this is the least that we want the British Government to do. We do not want them to change the Constitution: we do not want them to frame any new Constitution at this critical moment. We know that there are other and larger issues in which the British Government are involved. But there can be only two reasons for the British Government in not going on with their proposal. One is that, either you really do not mean to part with power, or that you are still frightened of the Congress and you are afraid to do anything which might displease that mighty organisation. There is an impression gaining ground in this country that the British policy is to placate those who are out to stab them and to let down those who are out to befriend them. They want to co-operate with those who do not want to co-operate with them, and they do not want the hand of friendship of those who are ready and willing to extend it to them. Let me tell you that if this impression gets hold of the imagination of the people, then you will not have a single friend left in this country.

Mr. Deputy President, some Honourable Members suggested, leave the Congress alone, leave the Muslim League alone, leave any other party

[Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan.]

alone, but go on with the expansion of the Executive Council. I do not know what benefit it would be either to the people of this country or how it would help in the war efforts if some of the political orphans were seated over there. If you are not able to get any organized people, then don't you think you should ponder and consider over this matter? There must be "something rotten in the State of Denmark" unless you believe that the whole 400 millions of people of India have gone mad and they are not really worth bothering about. The suggestion was made by my Honourable friend, Sir Frederic James, and I saw in the papers yesterday morning that the princely order is also of the same view, that the Government should go on with the appointment of a War Advisory Council, and have on that Council representatives of the Princes and of the Provincial Governments. To my mind, Sir, like the War Committees, this is another flank movement. If you have the courage, why not make a frontal attack? Let me tell you that by this device, you will not succeed in either befooling Indians or getting that support which India is ready and willing to give you, but which you are not prepared to accept.

Mr. Deputy President, I have given the reasons as to why the Muslims in this country feel slighted by the treatment of the British Government. To the Government, it seems, the only party all-in-all is the Congress. If you cannot get them to come with you,—and I have shown that you will never get them to come with you,—then you do not think it is worth while to bother about other nationalities and other parties in India. This is really slighting the 90 millions of Muslims and playing with them. We do not know how you administer the departments of the Government. We do not know what money is actually required for the defence of India and for fighting this war successfully. We have no share in the power and authority of the Government, and yet you come to us and say, vote so much money blindly and trust to our judgment, and we will see to it and do what we think fit. Sir, let me tell the Government that we, the members of the Muslim League Party, are not prepared to follow blindly like that. When the history of the British rule in India comes to be written, the period since the beginning of the war will be a period of suspension, and not of action. Let me tell you that in your own interest, and for God's sake, in the interest of humanity, do not appear as if you are paralysed and do not allow your judgment to be suspended. Get on with the job. Take the hand of friendship of those who are willing and ready to march forward with you, side by side, as equal partners in a common cause, but not as your camp followers.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, the debate has taken six long days and now we are coming to the end of it. My Honourable friend, who just preceded me, introduced his speech with the observation that there are Honourable Members in this House who have to their credit a status of long standing in the House. They have also considerable versatility and they are therefore, in a position to bring under discussion every subject under the sun. That is not my general habit, at any rate. I am not one of those versatile persons who can and want to touch anything that can be easily laid hands on. But anyhow, this time I find that besides one or two important points on which I want to make certain statement in this House, there are certain minor points to which I should make a passing reference before I deal with those important questions.

Sir, I wish to make a reference to the fact that the Honourable the Home Member appointed a committee of three experts of Hindu Law. I am glad he has appointed this Committee and referred two Bills to that Committee, relating to the rights of women for further investigation and report. This is a Committee which is presided over by a learned Judge of the High Court, and I am sure that the necessary enquiries will be made and a report will be received which will give the Honourable Member and the Government of India a basis to frame their legislative proposals on. My main reason for introducing this topic is this. There is no doubt that, in appointing this Committee, the Government have done the right thing. But there was already one Committee appointed with regard to one of the two Bills in question in pursuance of a suggestion by the then Leader of the House, Sir Nripendra Sircar. I think when the Bill relating to Hindu Women's Right of Maintenance and Residence was referred to this Committee, it was a matter of courtesy which the Home Department should have observed that the Members who had before agreed to work on the Committee first appointed should have been told that the old Committee stood dissolved. That little act of courtesy still remains undone. Therefore, I have brought this matter particularly to the notice of the Government now. I am glad that a new Committee consisting of very able and competent lawyers is appointed. But, in view of the fact that certain gentlemen who were asked to serve on the previous Committee without any remuneration, agreed to work without remuneration, it was necessary to inform those Members on the appointment of the new Committee that the old Committee on which their services were requisitioned stands dissolved and their services were no longer required. This is a little matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable the Home Member.

Then, Sir, after that, I have to thank the Government of India for having made some small provision by way of donation to the Indian Women's University at Poona. It is a very important thing that the cause of the higher education of Indian women is helped by the Government. I have been specially asked by Lady Thackersay to convey thanks to the Government of India for that, and I am doing that pleasant duty on behalf of the authorities of the Nathibai Thakersay Indian Women's University.

Then, Sir, I want to deal with another question which has been considerably agitated for some time in this House. Honourable Members of this House know that a string of questions has been asked with regard to the Archæological Department and replies have been given by the Education Secretary to the questions asked here. I think the Secretary is sufficiently strong to defend the Department, but I want to remove some misunderstanding which this string of questions, though perhaps not aimed at creating, is likely to create. The attempt seems to be to make out that the Department is under the charge of an incompetent officer. In fact, this morning one of the speakers behind me made that particular point. I think there are persons who in my opinion are better qualified to say whether the present incumbent of the office is or is not fit to hold the office which he does at present. Probably my Honourable friend will concede that Mr. Yazdani, the Director of Archæology of the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, is one of the few persons who has a reputation as an expert archæologist in this country, and his opinion in a matter of this kind ought to carry at least a certain weight with Honourable Members of this House and those who are concerned in this matter.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

I should like to read one or two passages from the speech which Mr. Yazdani delivered as President of the Indian History Congress at Lahore when the fourth session of the Congress was held in 1940. It was after the publication of the report of Sir Leonard Woolley to which also a frequent reference is made by those who attack this Department. Speaking of the general achievements of Indian archæologists, and speaking of them in terms of praise, Mr. Yazdani goes on to say in regard to the present incumbent of the office of the Director General as follows:

"I should also mention the name of the present Director General of Archæology, Mr. Dikshit, whose excavation work at Mahenjo-Daro, Paharpur and other places is of the highest quality and stands above any criticism based on petty jealousies. Further, his encyclopædic knowledge and close intimacy with every phase of Indian archæology make him eminently fit to hold his responsible office and to discharge its multifarious duties with efficiency and distinction."

My friend, Sir Ziauddin Ahmad, observed yesterday and particularly called upon the Education Secretary to keep always on his table a copy of the report of Sir Leonard Woolley and also the list of questions that are put in this House and use the same as a guide to him in dealing with this department, and in considering the reforms the critics may have in mind to improve it. I would, therefore, like to bring to the notice of this House certain observations made in his speech by Mr. Yazdani in regard to the report of Sir Leonard Woolley because he is in a better position to judge of the utility of the report as well as the correctness of the conclusions drawn by him than any layman who knows very little or next to nothing about archæology and the scientific work done under its direction.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: Sir, may I just point out, if my Honourable friend will allow me

Mr. M. S. Aney: I would have been very glad to be interrupted and allow my friend to have his say, but I must make room under the arrangement for my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, to come in at 4-30 P.M. That is my difficulty; otherwise, I would not deny this little courtesy to my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: The point was about his anti-Muslim policy, and not about his competence. I challenge his whole mentality which is anti-Muslim.

Mr. M. S. Aney: My Honourable friend has made his allegations; they are there, and the Department will investigate them. I only want to remove a certain misunderstanding and impression which the string of questions have created. The stick with which an attempt was made to beat him was the report of Sir Leonard Woolley. So I want to show what Indian archæologists have to say upon that report, and in what light they look upon the report itself. I am not entering into the communal matter at all; I am dealing with it from a different point of view. He approached the Indian archæological problem from a wrong point of view; that is the criticism of Mr. Yazdani on the report of Sir Leonard Woolley:

"Looked at in this way the difference between the work carried out from a national point of view in one's own country and the work carried out in foreign countries for the equipment of museums for purposes of scientific study is very marked, and

apparently this difference was not fully taken into consideration when the Government of India selected Sir Leonard Woolley to advise them in regard to the future exploration and excavation work of this country. Sir Leonard Woolley is undoubtedly an expert of international reputation and he has done multifarious work at Ur and other places, but his training and his entire experience are that of a Museum-worker. This was principally the reason why during his visit to India, he first failed to appreciate the talent and outlook of the officers of the Archaeological Survey, and secondly in his observations he did not take into consideration that India had developed national consciousness to the full, and her historical monuments and other antiquities are to be dealt with as heirlooms and not movable relics to be distributed to various museums for purposes of scientific study. These remarks, however ungenerous they may appear, are based on a close study of the Report which Sir Leonard Woolley has submitted to the Government of India."

That is the value which Indian archaeologists attach to his report. I will read one more passage and finish with this point. After pointing out the various defects of the working of this Archaeological Department, a suggestion is made that an Archaeological Adviser should be appointed by the Government of India. To that suggestion of Sir Leonard Woolley, as a patriotic Indian, Mr. Yazdani gives a very good reply:

"It is not known what action the Government of India propose to take on Sir Leonard Woolley's Report, but it is apparent that the appointment of an Adviser from outside, particularly in view of the rapidly growing political consciousness of the country, will not much help in bringing about the required reforms either in the standard of the efficiency of the officers or in the quality of the archaeological work."

I have only touched on this point to show that the report of Sir Leonard Woolley should not be considered as the last word on the subject. Whatever defects there may be in the Department, they should take steps to correct them; but I do not want the impression to go about that an incompetent officer is at the helm of it. A scientist and a scholar of considerable reputation is there, and I venture to say that he is one of whose achievements in the field of archaeology we Indians ought to feel legitimately proud. The report of Sir Leonard Woolley is not one which is not at all regarded by Indian archaeologists as a dispassionate document. What the object of the Government of India was in bringing an expert like him to make an investigation, one does not know: that is for the Government of India to say, but I can say this much that his report is certainly not above reproach.

Then, a few words about the Census. Many people have said many things about it—I have no time to go over it all; but in two sentences I want to sum up my observations about it. I do not wish to say anything about the manner in which the census operations were carried on, because that point has been criticised by my friends. Dr. Banerjee and Sardar Sant Singh sitting behind me, from the points of view of the Hindus. The Hindus have many complaints to make against the census operation in the Punjab, and I received telegrams from respected and revered men like Raja Narendra Nath and others to the effect that innumerable mistakes have been committed; deliberate omissions have been made, and so on. It means that in certain provinces, as a consequence of communal bias of the enumerator, a good deal of confusion and inaccuracy has crept in into the work of enumeration and that the census record has become unreliable. It looks like that. When I and Bhai Parma Nand first met the Honourable the Home Member and discussed this question, we suggested from our own point of view certain remedies. Certain suggestions

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

were accepted by him, and certain others he did not think it worth while to accept. Anyhow, the position is there, and I only invite the attention of the Honourable the Home Member only to two important points. There is evidence with me to show that in so far as the work of enumeration of the aboriginal tribes of Assam and Bengal and Bihar are concerned, the tea planters there have used their influence to see that the members of what they consider to be aboriginal tribes will not give out their religion as Hindu. In spite of specific instructions issued by the Central Office, a circular was issued by one responsible member of the Tea Planters Association—I do not know whether he is the President or the Secretary—I fancy his name is Mr. Webb—to the effect that enumerators, who are more or less servants in the tea gardens there, should see that none of these persons show themselves as Hindus, because this is likely to give weightage to the Hindus, which would be detrimental to the interests of the country. That is what he wrote

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): They have been our trustees all along.

Mr. M. S. Aney: An attempt like this has been made to defeat or even to flout the instructions. The second thing I wish to bring to his attention is that the Adi-Dharmis in the Punjab have been treated as part of the Scheduled Castes; and in giving representation to the Scheduled Castes, in accordance with the Poona Pact, which is taken out of the number allotted for Hindu representation, they have been taken into account and they got their representation on the Provincial Legislature. It is, therefore, fair that in the tabulation the Adi Basis or Adi Dharmis also should be shown as Hindus and they should be counted along with them. On that point a good deal of correspondence has taken place between certain persons from the Punjab and the Central Census Office. I believe the office is in possession of that literature. My point is this: the Punjab Government and the Superintendent of the Census there say, we shall not count them as Hindus—he has already given a reply to that effect. It would be grossly unfair to the Hindus that they should give some of their representation to them as members of the scheduled classes belonging to the Hindu community; and yet in the enumeration of the Hindu population they should find no place at all. It is anomalous and unfair and inequitable. I think, the Census Department should take immediate notice of this piece of injustice, and it should not be allowed to prejudice the Hindus when the tabulation of census figures of the Punjab population is to be made.

I have dealt only with these two or three minor points to which I thought I should make a reference, there were others which I
 4 P.M. now deliberately omit for want of time. I now proceed to deal with what I regard as the principal aspects of the present situation. My Honourable friend, Nawab Liaqat Ali Khan, the General Secretary of the Muslim League, has on behalf of that League made a very lucid statement explaining the position of the Muslim League as regards the present situation and the stand it has taken in this matter. Now, Sir, one thing is certain that the present situation in this country is one with which all parties are completely dissatisfied. About that there is no doubt whatso-

ever. The Government is involved in a war. It certainly stands in need of the co-operation of the people. If the sense of this House is taken, there is, I believe, general agreement amongst the Members of this House that this war has to be fought and won. So far as that goes, there is general agreement. But the main point is this: what efforts will be sufficient to secure that co-operation of the people without which it will be difficult for the Government to carry on this war and fight it with the vigour and strength that is needed. The situation today, as we see it, is, in my opinion, very precarious. We find that countries after countries in Europe have succumbed to the onslaught of the German armies, and we do not know what the situation will be in the near future in Yugoslavia or Turkey or other countries even. These are days of intense anxiety, and on the decisions of some of these countries will largely depend the course of the war operations in the near future. I go further and say that, upon the decisions that may be taken by certain countries in the near future, the fate of India will also largely depend. Therefore, there is the greater need, in my opinion, for the Government of India to see that their war efforts are receiving the greatest possible active co-operation of the people of India. If the proposition is visualised in this way, Government also should find no difficulty in understanding as to what is the proper way to get that greatest possible co-operation. As my Honourable friend, Nawab Liaquat Ali Khan, has just mentioned, in order that the people should make the maximum effort and give their maximum co-operation to the Government of India in the matter of the war effort, it is necessary that the people of India should feel that it is a fight which is being fought by them in their own interest. I have never seen that people have anywhere taken the risk of entering into a war and making all the sacrifices which a belligerent nation has to go through simply on the satisfaction that they are fighting a righteous cause. Philanthropy has played very little part in inducing nations to take risks of that kind. It is self-interest alone—you may call it enlightened self-interest or national self-interest—that can impel a nation to make a national effort of that kind. The people of India, therefore, want to see that it is a battle that is being fought by the people of India in the interests of the people of India themselves. That is a position that the Government have to create, and unless they succeed in creating that position, their war effort will always be of a limited nature. I have particularly drawn the attention of the Government of India to the point that the war situation today is one to cause serious anxiety. Suppose Germany succeeds in becoming the master of the Suez Canal and Japan succeeds in becoming the master of Singapore, India will have to defend herself, and very little assistance can India expect from Great Britain in that hour of need. May I know, what is the preparation that the Government of India have made or are making to enable the people of India to defend themselves in such a contingency? It is not an altogether imaginary contingency. In order that the country may be in a position to defend herself, you will have to take suitable measures to prepare the whole nation to defend the country. This is not a fight between one army and another; this is a fight between one nation against another. The nation has to take the risk and husband its entire resources in order to win the war, and, therefore, it is necessary that the Government of India should do something in order to create a conviction among the people of this country that this war is being fought, not for the sake of establishing democracies here and there, but for securing to the people of India their legitimate right to be the masters of this country, if not now, at least at the end of the war. That is one thing.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

Then, as another friend of mine suggested, suppose a statement to that effect is made. There is the statement made by Mr. Amery the other day; the purport of his remarks can be construed to mean, that the British nation would not be vindicating her war-aims unless she is in a position to secure to Indian people their legitimate right to be the master of their own country. Some statement to this effect has been made by him, but still that is all vague. A clear and definite statement has to be made that, at the end of this war, India shall be in the same position as any other self-governing Dominion of the British Commonwealth including the Dominions of Canada and South Africa or Australia shall be at that time. A clear statement of that kind indicating, if possible, even a time-limit will be very helpful. My friend, Mr. Jinnah, may not agree with me, because he and the Muslim League have got different ideas about it, but such a statement will, in my opinion, go along way to create and establish the *bona fides* of the British Government, that they will not hold on to India after the war after the people of this country have been called upon to make the supreme sacrifice—that stigma of slavery would not remain there

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: We shall doubt the *bona fides* of the Government if they made such a declaration.

Mr. M. S. Aney: That is quite true.

Then comes the next point, and it is this, that in order that a declaration like that must inspire confidence among the people, what should the Government do? They have to do something immediately in order to inspire confidence in any announcement they might make. I shall not call upon the Government of India to do anything to modify the Government of India Act, but is there nothing which they can do without modifying that Act, as a gesture to indicate that they are in earnest, they mean business, and they are going to act upon it? I believe the suggestion made by the Conference which recently met at Bombay deserves to be considered from this point of view. It may be, there are people who have taken objection to the people who organized the meeting and who met at the Conference on various grounds; some asked—who are they? Can they deliver the goods? These are slogans and phrases which we have all heard so often. I do not know what is meant by delivering the goods,—has any one of us goods to deliver at all?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Delivery of goods means votes.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Now, so far as the war is concerned, it is claimed by the Government of India that India and Indians have made a splendid response. Although one party, *viz.*, the Muslim League has remained neutral and another party, the Congress, is sending its members to jail. If, under such circumstances, the Government say that India is behind the war efforts, then why is it that a party of public men which is outside these two groups should not be in a position to do something to add to the war efforts already made? That is the question which one has to answer from a national point of view. After all, it is not true that those who are most vocal are the only representatives of this country. I, therefore, suggest that, in order that the Government may establish their *bona fides* that they want to grant Swaraj or Dominion form of Government,

or whatever form of Government it may be, after the end of the present war, they must make a beginning now, a beginning which will appeal to the people that there is going to be real transfer of power. That is the true test. I think my friend, Mr. Jinnah, was right when he criticised certain proposals made by His Excellency the Viceroy that, after all is said and done, though he was willing to co-operate on certain conditions, the general apprehension he expressed on the proposal was that it did not seem to him from the nature of those proposals that there was any indication regarding the real transfer of power. Therefore, that was one of the reasons why those proposals failed to evoke the enthusiasm which otherwise they would have or to evoke the response which the Secretary of State or the Government of India had expected. If they want to make any further proposals, they must bear this criticism in mind and frame their proposals accordingly. What I say is, if you do not want to modify the Government of India Act substantially and come out with a long Bill to amend the Act, you can certainly come forward with certain proposals which will convince us that you are prepared to rely upon Indians in their war efforts. I, therefore, ask, if you want to trust them in the prosecution of the war, where is the difficulty for you to keep an Indian as a member in charge of defence? That, in my opinion, is the crucial test. If you want to create a kind of Government which shall consist of Indians, then in order to get strong support from the people of this country in the prosecution of this war, you will have to take them into your confidence in the matter of defence. How can you take the people into your confidence unless you place an Indian in charge of defence? That does not necessarily mean that the man in charge of defence will dictate his policy on strategic matters. That will be a matter entirely for His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to decide and lay down. In strategic matters the Indian Defence Member need not have any voice at all, but there are questions of policy as regards recruitment and defence expenditure as regards the rapid Indianisation of the army, Indianisation of the officer ranks and things like that—these are all matters on which the assistance of the Member in charge of Defence will be of great use. Not only that, but I will go further and say, unless you create a completely Indianised Executive Council, people will not be fully satisfied, and every activity designed to implement the war activities which will be a kind of additional support to the country, activity like industrialising the country, activity relating to militarising the people and things like that, those activities will not take a national form, unless there is a wholly national Government established at the Centre. It may not be responsible to the Legislature, but it must be a Government which shall work jointly, and not merely a Government composed of heads of departments with a label on their heads, "Executive Councillors". There must be joint deliberation, and also an assurance to the effect that, His Excellency the Viceroy, with due regard to his responsibility to the Crown, shall abide by the decisions reached by such a Council after joint deliberation as far as possible, and that important departments such as Finance and Defence will be entrusted to them. If such a step were taken by the Government of India, it will at once appeal to the imagination of the people outside. They will see that there is a genuine change of heart, there is no longer that distrust and suspicion which exists now. Do you think that in the whole of India you will not be able to find 10, 12 or 15 persons,—men of the type of Mr. Jinnah and others,—to take charge of Defence, and on whom you can rely? Where is the difficulty?

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

And if you say that you cannot find even 10, 12 or 15 persons on whom you can rely in this vast continent, why have you been ruling the country for nearly 200 years now?

Then, Sir, so far as the suggestions made by the Bombay Conference are concerned, they are, in my opinion, of a practical nature, and unless some steps in the direction indicated in the Resolutions of the Bombay Conference are taken, unless some effort is made to part with real power, it will be difficult for you to secure that assistance which will be inevitably needed if you are determined to win this war. You have to depend upon America today. It is fortunate that America has decided to give you as much assistance as she can, it is fortunate that you have got a reliable ally in America,—but mind you, this is a war which is being fought in the air, on the high seas, and on the land. You cannot ignore the long distance, the big oceans that separate you and America. The war will have to be fought in the Indian ocean,—it may have been fought in the Mediterranean—we do not know that. In these circumstances, you should be in a position to see that India by herself is made a centre where every possible preparation for war is made. You should be in a position to get as large a number of soldiers as you want. I would rather ask you to introduce conscription, but how can you do that? To introduce a measure of that kind requires the real support of the people behind, and a Government that wants to rule by the sword is not in a position to be bold enough to introduce a measure of conscription at all. If you have to take steps of that kind, you must make them a nation of soldiers, a nation of sepoys. Then alone you can fight against any threat of invasion coming either from the west or from the east, and that can be successfully repelled by the people of India even though you may not get the necessary assistance from America. With such a big country at your disposal, with its vast resources at your command, it is for you to make an effort to see that all of them are available to you in your hour of need. That requires that you have to do something to appeal to the people. You have to make them believe that this war is being fought, not merely for the sake of helping Great Britain with whom we have been associated for 150 years, but for being free from the control and domination of Great Britain hereafter immediately after the war is over. That sense of freedom enables men to put forth supreme effort. That sense of freedom enables men to venture and to risk. That sense of freedom has worked miracles before, and it will work miracles hereafter. I, therefore, want the Government to bear in mind that they have to do something to inspire in the hearts of young India that confidence,—that this is a battle that is being fought not merely to end war—I do not know whether any war is going to end all wars in the world at all, it is probably going against human nature to suppose that anything done by man is going to end war hereafter. It may not end war but at least it will create a conviction amongst the people that we shall end at least our slavery if we fight in this war. What you have to do immediately by way of an earnest is to create that strong conviction in their mind. Armed with that conviction, the Indian people will certainly stand by you, and you know, Indian soldiers that have been sent abroad have been able to render a good account of themselves, you yourselves have given a graphic description of the heroism and bravery that they have shown in the battles they fought in Africa and other places. Now, with that kind of element which can be had in abundance, why should you not make an attempt to enlist the support of the whole country? If you do not do that, I shall consider

that Great Britain is culpably negligent of her duty towards the people of India. Again, it may be that you rely upon such assistance as you may get from America to fight this war. But if the war comes nearer the gates of India, I always shudder to think what would be the position of Indian people. They are all left armless here. They are a disarmed people, no effort is being made, and a few soldiers, half a million or so men which we have got will be dispersed by you here and there, and the country will go entirely undefended. Is that the position in which you want to leave this country? Do you think that you will have discharged the trust, of which you have been talking so glibly for so many years, when you leave the country in a time difficulty in this helpless position? That is the point that I want you to take into consideration. Here is a moral issue. It is not only the question that you are fighting the cause of democracy, but you have to look at the matter from the further moral point of view. You have been in charge of this country for the last 150 years. All your resources in England and your resources stored in America and which you expect to come, may be available to you, and yet this country may be faced with an invasion from the west or from the east, and then with what are we going to fight? One day the Honourable the Finance Member or somebody else on the Treasury Benches said, "Well, we rely upon, in such a case, the British Navy and the British Air Force", and so on. The British Navy, if it can, will certainly come to our help, I do not deny their *bona fides* for the time being, but if it cannot come, what will be our fate? Shall we simply look up to the heavens and say, "Please protect us and our so-called custodians also"! That is the position in which you want to leave this country. That is the reason why I call upon the Government to see that you do something to carry Mr. Jinnah with you, to carry Mahatma Gandhi with you, and if there is insuperable difficulty in getting them, then carry somebody else with you, and I am sure if you carry somebody else with you, they will know how to bring Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi together. That is the way to bring about a settlement between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah. I have no doubt that those whom you will for the time being take to your help will vacate their seats when Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi come to take their places which are their due.

The position then is this. An attempt should be made; Government should not rely upon these differences and continue in this negative attitude. My grievance against you is this. The Government is continuing, is persisting in their negative attitude, making the difference between Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi, between the Congress and the League, and other things, as an excuse for doing nothing. The psychology of the people is a matter which the Government of India must seriously consider. My Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, said something about propaganda. You may carry on any propaganda. If your words are going to create a certain impression among a section of the people outside, that propaganda is not going to make a change. Propaganda can only succeed when there is a receptive mind to hear it, otherwise it does no good. Every day people hear the radios, the B. B. C. broadcasts, but the impression which such broadcasts create depends upon the mood of the man who listens to those broadcasts and statements. I, therefore, warn you, and you should bear in mind that you have to create a proper psychology among the people, and that psychology is this. They must feel that they have the country's battle to fight and they have to win this war in the interests of

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

India herself. I am sure, if the necessary step is taken and some effort is made and the Government of India cease to continue in this negative attitude and make an attempt to bring about unity between the Hindus and Mussalmans, the solution ought not to be beyond the capacity and statesmanship of British statesmen. I do not agree with my friend, Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan, on his Pakistan scheme. He says that he has explained his point of view privately to some unknown person and succeeded in converting him. I am certain in my conclusion that nothing will be a greater disaster to this country and to the safety of both Hindus and Mussalmans, to the best interests of Hindus and Mussalmans, than to allow the discussion on Pakistan to go on in this country, and that is the reason I have taken up that question, and whenever I get an opportunity I have to say something against one whom I have been always respecting as a model gentleman and a sincere nationalist among the 35 crores of Indians in this country. I have respected Mr. Jinnah like this for many years. But during these three years I have to say something which, from the bottom of my heart, I would not like to say, but the situation is of such a nature that I am compelled to do it. But, I leave aside that question for the present as my Honourable friend has given an assurance. They all believe in Pakistan, but it is not going to be a live issue now. He is not going to ask you: "Unless you concede the demand of Pakistan, I am not prepared to co-operate with you". That is not the position which he has taken, and, in my opinion, it is an attitude of which the Government of India ought to take note. With this helpful attitude it should not be difficult for us.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: We have never said otherwise.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I accept what you say here, but there is an impression abroad that.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaqat Ali Khan: Absolutely wrong impression.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Wrong impression,—I am glad to hear that. Now that an authoritative assurance has been given, I do not want to give out what my misunderstanding was about the situation.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Our position has been very clear. It is this. We divide the problem of India into two parts, present and future. As far as the future is concerned, we say that when the time comes to examine the whole constitutional policy of this country, we shall discuss various schemes. We believe in Pakistan. We stand by it. As far as the present is concerned, our position is that we are willing, only for the prosecution of the war successfully, to co-operate with the Government within the framework of the present Constitution. Our only quarrel has been that the Government do not take us seriously and have not shown any signs of accepting our co-operation with real and substantial authority in the Government at the Centre and provinces.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I hope Government understand now what the policy of the Muslim League is. Anyhow, my point is this. So far as the setting up of any Government for the transitory period during the time of war is concerned, the ideal of the Muslim League is not going to come in the way. As one of the optimistic humble workers of India, I believe,

if my friend and some persons willing to co-operate in war effort and members of the Congress, if we can fortunately get them now, sit together and work together to run the administration in pursuit of a common effort to win the war and prepare the Indian nation, probably the need for the demand of Pakistan, about which he is feeling today so keenly, may also be obviated and the question may not at all arise. . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: . . . or may be accepted.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It may be one way or the other. I am prepared to take things either way. The real beginning to end the dispute is not by keeping them at arms length, but by making an effort to bring them together, entrusting them with the responsible duty of running the Government, trusting them, leaving the Government entirely in their hands and vacating your seats for them.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What about non-violence?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am not a non-violent man here, nor are you, I believe. Where I am talking of war effort, I am sure, the Honourable Member realises that he is addressing one who is not a believer in non-violence.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What about it? How are you going to meet it?

Mr. M. S. Aney: If they believe in it, they will not come, and if they come, they will not believe in it. One of the two things you must take.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: How can you come to any settlement?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I have told you to start with those who can settle, and that settlement will make others fall in line, and that is the way in which things are to be solved.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I agree with you: Start with those who are violent, and then others will become violent afterwards.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Those who are violent will join in carrying on this effort and others may later on come and their spirit of patriotism may be aroused and it may prepare them to co-operate in the effort of violence. My argument is that you should move to do something at once, so that it may be of use to you and to the country generally. Non-violence of certain section will not come in your way. My suggestion only means this. It is not by sitting tight in one's own position and indulging in platitudes about differences between Hindus and Muhammadans that difficulties will be solved. They have to be solved by taking some courageous action. You have to take courage in both hands. Take some risk also. If you do that, you will find that India is more reliable, stronger and useful than any ally you can find across the oceans. You will have to pay for them, but India will pay for you and win this war. With these words, I have to declare that I am unable to support the motion for consideration of the

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

Finance Bill, because today, at any rate, I find that there is no authoritative statement that the suggestions which we are making are going to be accepted or even favourably considered by the Government.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Sir, I find myself in an extraordinarily difficult position. I have just listened to two very eloquent speakers who made it perfectly clear that no argument that I could adduce about the merits of my Finance Bill will have the slightest effect on their outlook or on their decision.

Here we are at the end of six days' debate which has ranged over a fairly wide field and which has occasionally, indeed quite often, touched on the question of finance, and it is my task to answer the debate and endeavour to get the assent of the House to a motion for a consideration of the Bill and the leaders or representatives of two principal Parties in the House have already assured me that on grounds, which have nothing to do with finance, they have not the slightest intention of accepting this motion. Well, Sir, I feel like a guest who has somehow strayed into the wrong party. I feel like a man who is clad in a coat of mail and has wandered into a fancy dress party where they are playing at animals.

However, nothing deterred, I shall endeavour to deal with a few outstanding points relating to the financial issues raised by the Bill, and so I come down to the humdrum level of discussing in some detail the arguments which have been advanced on the plane of finance. Several Members of this House, and I notice that the line has been widely taken in the Press, have criticised the Budget on the ground that there is no attempt at retrenchment. The word "retrenchment" has frequently been coupled with the word "economy", but I should like to emphasize that there is an important distinction between the two ideas. As I conceive it, retrenchment is a policy which has to be faced up to at times when the level of the nation's economic activity cannot support the full volume, the full overheads of the Government, and it is necessary for the country to make up its mind that it is going to cut down the overheads and that with that cutting down will go a reduction in the scale of the Government's activities. That is the important thing about retrenchment. It is not merely that you reduce the Budget. You cease to do certain things which you were doing before. You cut off branches of the tree. In fact, you lay the axe about you. Now, Prof. Banerjea complained that retrenchment committees in the past had done the wrong thing. They had cut off the wrong branches. They had interfered with or reduced nation-building activities. Well, Sir, what does he expect to happen if he were to embark upon retrenchment now? Is it the security activities of the country that he would expect to reduce, or does he not see that if retrenchment were possible now, it must inevitably fasten on those very activities which he is the last man to wish to see reduced. So, the word "retrenchment", in my opinion, is entirely out of place at a time like this, because the problem, at a time like this, is to enable the Government machine to take on more activity if possible. We are continually being asked to control this and control that, to see that this should not happen and that should not happen. In times of what I might call "deflation", in times of recession, we are told usually to leave things alone, to keep our hands off business and to let the horse get its head up, but this is not a time of that kind. Now,

by general consent, the scope of Government's activities is daily being widened and, therefore, the whole conception of retrenchment, that is to say, of lopping off branches of the tree or of reducing whole parts of the machinery is entirely out of place. So what is intended clearly is not retrenchment but economy,—economy in the day to day administration of the functions of Government, and with that I entirely agree. I entirely agree that it is the duty of Government, and, in particular, that it is my duty, to see that the activities which Government must undertake at this time are carried out with the maximum regard for economy. Well, Sir, I have explained on more than one occasion what endeavours we have made to meet this requirement and, in particular, in the sphere of supply, I have explained the machinery which we have set up in our endeavour to secure, concurrently with the execution of the duties of the Department, the securing of the maximum economy, and I was glad to hear from an Honourable Member, who certainly was not patting Government on the back, that he admitted—I am referring to my friend, Mr. Huseinbhai Laljee,—that in the matter of the control of the prices at which contracts were being given out, the Finance Department was being efficient in securing economy. I have had several instances of our effectiveness in that field, but I will mention one which I do not think I have previously mentioned in this House, and that is that I have had several suggestions from several quarters that the excess profits tax should be placed at a hundred per cent. Now, the interesting thing is that these suggestions have come from more than one firm which were completely engaged in war contracts and that seemed to me an extraordinary thing, and I discovered that these firms felt that they were labouring under the disability that they had their full capacity booked up by Government at prices which—not to put too fine a point on it—would not leave them liable to the excess profits tax. They were, however, very concerned to see that their rivals, that other firms were taking their civil and non-war business and were making handsome profits and they would be in a position to pay the excess profits tax. I merely mention that, because it is literally true, and it is a most extraordinary and interesting phenomenon, but one thing that it does prove is that over a large field the contracts which are being placed by the Supply Department with the assistance of the Finance Department are not such as to leave scope for excess profits.

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

But, my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, asked me another point. I understood that he was satisfied as regards the information which had previously been given in regard to the financial machinery of the Supply Department, a financial machinery which was operating concurrently with the Supply Department—but that he wished to know what the Finance Department had done in order to equip itself to deal with the greater burden of controlling the expenditure over the rest of the field. Well, Sir, apart from the field of supply, the main field of expanded expenditure is defence, and in that field I can give an indication of the expansion which has been necessary in order to secure that the continuous transactions are watched from the financial point of view. The pre-war strength of the Military Finance Department—the figures I have here relate both to military finance and supply finance—but the pre-war strength of the Military Finance Department consisted of 13 officers, that is, one Financial Adviser and 12 Deputy and Assistant Financial Advisers. The present numbers are

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

forty-one; so there has been an increase of no less than 28 officers or something of the order of two hundred per cent. in the higher staff, to whom is allotted the duty of watching the day to day decisions which involve expenditure. In the Military Accounts Department, which is responsible for the initial audit and accounting of all expenditure incurred by the Defence Services and which is responsible and which has to see that the orders of the Finance Department in respect of expenditure and allocations are observed, the position is that the pre-war superior service officers were 59, the Deputy and Assistant Controllers were 86, and there was a subordinate staff of over 3,400, making a total of some 3,600 employed in that Department. The present position is that there are 77 superior service officers, as against 59; 110 as against 86 in the next grade, and 5,400 odd as against 3,400 odd of the subordinate staff, so that there has, therefore, been an increase of some 60 to 70 per cent. in the local staff which sees that the orders are carried out. Then, again, there is the organization of the Controller of Supply Accounts. He performs the functions of the preliminary audit and accounts in respect of supply expenditure. There the position is that, as against a pre-war staff in all of some 185, the staff now is 330 in strength. In addition to all this, the Auditor-General has found that his work of audit has been greatly increased, and it is under his orders that the Director of Audit of the Defence Services works, and there also there has been a substantial increase in the number of the staff employed. My object in giving these details, Sir, is to assure my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, that we have not ignored the importance of equipping ourselves to carry out the additional responsibility which is thrown upon us by the greater volume of expenditure and the greater number of places in which such expenditure arises.

I come now to another aspect of the question of economy, which was touched on by the Members of the European Group, by Mr. Boyle, and, again, by Sir Frederick James. They made a reference to the expenditure of Provincial Governments and they wished to know what the Central Government was doing in that matter in the way of giving a lead or of discussing certain aspects of our present situation with those Governments. Well, Sir, I will deal first with Mr. Boyle's suggestion. He wished to know, I think, whether those Provinces at least which find themselves in a position to do so should not now be asked to undertake a larger measure of certain war activities, such as, air raid precautions or civic guards. Well, Sir, that is a question which has already occurred to me. The position a year ago was that the Niemeyer arrangements had been altered to the disadvantage of the Provinces, as Prof. Banerjee pointed out, because it was felt that in war conditions the operation of that Award would be anomalous, that it would continue to place increasing sums at the disposal of the Provinces which would probably not need them for immediate purposes and that it would reduce the revenues of the Centre which would find itself faced with ever-growing requirements. Well, Sir, even the amended Niemeyer Award has so operated to some extent and it has left the Provinces in a position more favourable than they could ever hope to be but for the outbreak of the war, and it is still the case that the Central Government is a good deal worse off and faces a more difficult position than it would have done obviously if war had not broken out. Whilst a year ago and before one could foresee the operation of the amended

Niemeyer Award, I felt that it was fair to offer to undertake certain liabilities occurring in the Provinces which are not strictly within the orbit of defence but belong rather to the nature of passive preparations such as can be taken by Local Governments or even local authorities—whilst at that time I felt that I ought to make that offer, I now feel that it would be reasonable to approach the Provinces with a request that they should take over a larger share of the cost of these activities and I feel that the response to that suggestion would not be an unreasonable one. Most of the provinces find themselves comparatively well off; some of them find themselves distinctly affluent at the present time.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): And some are in a hopeless condition.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: As Prof. Banerjea says, some are not as well off as they would like to be. They have had to have recourse to additional taxation, the necessity for which I certainly could wish they had avoided. I believe that an appeal even to those who are in some difficulty would not fall on deaf ears for the reason that all the Provincial Governments do feel that they would like to bear their share in defraying the cost of measures of this kind which obviously must be taken in the interests of the country and in the interests of the provincial populations. This brings me to the aspect which Sir Frederick James was concerned about. He was concerned, I think, that there should be a restriction on non-essential expenditure by the provinces. The suggestion which he has made is not familiar to me in the sense that I have not thought it out in any great detail. I think it is a suggestion which is derived rather from conditions in Britain where obviously the competition by local authorities with His Majesty's Government in carrying out works would lead to increase of prices and inflationary conditions. Now, in India you have not got the same problem. In regard to man power, for instance, there is no reason why the provinces should not continue certain activities or even expand them because those activities would not trench on a limited supply of man power as they would do in Britain. As regards money, I have already said that it would certainly suit the Central Government better if Provincial Governments could refrain from raising additional taxation at this time because obviously the needs of the Centre are such that the capacity of the tax-payer is likely to be heavily drawn upon for Central purposes and any other demands which are made on the same pocket must conflict to some extent with the requirements of the Centre. But the main point is in regard to certain essential materials and this is where, I think, the answer is a satisfactory one. In regard to essential materials, the position is that no authority can go ahead with the consumption of them unless it has been allotted a certain priority. And that machinery ensures that there cannot be wasteful consumption on non-essential objects. That is the position which has to be most carefully watched in this country. It is not a matter of money or of man power so much as a question of certain key materials. I would say that that is really the most effective way of checking an undesirable diversion of effort at this time. I think also that Sir Frederick James had at the back of his mind a feeling that any public works that the provinces might wish to embark upon might more suitably be left for the period after the war when we should face problems of recession. Well, Sir, I think that those Provinces which find themselves in possession of surpluses at this time are

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

already conscious of that aspect of the matter. In fact, I know they are and that is why both in Madras and in Bombay which are in the happy position of enjoying large surpluses the money is being put aside into a fund which will be available for financing desirable expenditure at a later stage.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: What about Bengal?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Bengal is apparently not embarrassed with a surplus, and, therefore, cannot compete in public works.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: There additional taxation is being levied.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Additional taxation is being levied, that is true, but I cannot help that.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: The Honourable Member ought to give them advice.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Has the Honourable Member any idea as to why there is a surplus in Bombay?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am afraid I cannot discuss questions of provincial finance; at any rate, not on the floor of the House.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Perhaps the Honourable Member will draw the attention of the Bombay Government to the fact that a 10 per cent. tax on property is not justified.

Sir H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): And let the Honourable Member also point out that our drinking bill has gone up!

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Well, Sir, that is all I have to say on the subject of economy in its various aspects.

Now, I come to the question of taxation and loans. But before I do that. I would like to deal for a moment with those Honourable Members who have remarked on the size of the defence budget and who seemed to have some doubts as to whether a defence budget of that size was fairly attributable to Indian requirements and whether the scheme of allocation of expenditure between India and His Majesty's Government was being worked with due regard for India. On that point, I have no hesitation in giving my Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, and those who have raised this question, I have no hesitation in assuring them that the interests of India are being as carefully watched as they were in the first instance when the settlement was made. How then, they appear to ask, can the defence budget have reached such figures? Well, Sir, I would remind them of the kind of criticism which was being made about eight months ago in June and July when the collapse of France took place. At that time, the proposals of the Government of India for the expansion of its armed forces were regarded as insufficient, in fact they were treated almost with contempt in certain quarters. I remember quite well that at

that time an expansion by 100,000 men of the Indian army, the garrison of India, so to speak, was regarded as a miserable addition to the armed forces of India. Nevertheless an expansion of 100,000 men costs something between 15 and 20 crores a year and if we have succeeded in adding strictly on India's own account to the defence expenditure of India more than that sum, it is because we have succeeded in expanding the armed forces of India by a greater extent than was then indicated and because the troops in India are now far more nearly adequate to the kind of task which my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, just indicated they might have to face. I do not know what are the views of Mr. Aney on the subject of the scale which defence expenditure should reach in preparing India to meet the contingencies which he visualised. But I do know this, that at the present moment, India, in relation to her defence expenditure, is in an extraordinarily fortunate position because the battles which are to prevent these emergencies from coming to the frontiers of India are being fought outside the frontiers of India, the financial liability of India for the cost of those wars is so limited and so small as to be almost negligible in relation to the cost of modern war. That was the position which resulted from the Chatfield report and from the financial settlement with His Majesty's Government. It is a position which is so favourable to India that I make bold to say that if any other Government were to occupy these Benches, the first thing which it ought to consider is whether the arrangement is consistent with the self-respect of India or whether they should not proceed to make a larger contribution to the cost of fighting the common cause.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: When is this Government going?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I do not know. But I do know that if and when you come to occupy these Benches, you will have to deal with this question. That is the question with which you would have to deal because I claim that we, in dealing with these matters have been almost unduly anxious to ensure that we should not be criticised on the ground of sacrificing the interests of India or of securing for India a settlement which was not as favourable as any reasonable construction of the circumstances could make out. So, the position is that wars go on, that fighting goes on outside India. Fighting is very expensive. It is one thing to raise an army, equip it and keep it in garrison, it is another thing to send that army out to fight battles, where it may lose the whole of its equipment and then have to be re-equipped *ab initio*, it is another thing to make supplies for the army which is supposed to be in one position when it may have to abandon that position and leave the whole of its depot possibly its bases with all the supplies which have been painfully and at great expense conveyed to that particular point. There are losses and very colossal losses connected with the war which India is at present spared and so long as the war does not come to the frontiers of India, she will under the existing settlement with His Majesty's Government continue to be spared those enormous losses.

I feel, therefore, Sir, that so far from expressing surprise at the size of India's defence budget, Honourable Members should appreciate the realities of the situation, as I consider that my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, shows he does, and should be surprised at the modesty of these figures. I will say this, that the settlement, such as it is, is being administered in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the arrangement, that it is

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

audited by the Auditor General on behalf of not only Indian interests but also on behalf of the Controller and Auditor General of England who is responsible for satisfying the British Parliament, that England also is receiving a fair deal in the operation of this settlement.

Before I leave this subject, I should like to give a slight indication of certain figures which it has not been possible to place before the House, but which indicate and which bear on this question of the relative burden of India and England. I mentioned in paragraph 20 of my Budget speech which I should like to read now:

"I should here point out that the increase of Rs. 24-31 crores shown against item (3),

which was India's own defence measures:

"over our normal defence expenditure by no means reflects the full magnitude India's war effort since it excludes the cost of supplies and services rendered by India to His Majesty's Government, which is substantially greater than this amount."

Then, I went on:

"I should also mention here that His Majesty's Government besides paying in full for all such supplies and services are providing free of charge much of the equipment needed for the modernisation of the Army in India and for the initial equipment of units now being raised in pursuance of our expansion scheme."

Well, Sir, it has been asked what the extent of this expenditure by His Majesty's Government may be. We are not in a position to give accurate figures and these figures have not been presented in any estimates which have been laid at home. But I am now in a position to give a rough indication of them. As regards the equipment which His Majesty's Government are providing free of charge in connection with the expansion and modernisation of the army in India, we estimate that that is roughly of the order of 40 crores of rupees. And as regards the cost of the supplies and services which India is rendering to His Majesty's Government, that is to say expenditure incurred by His Majesty's Government in India in addition to the expenditure debitable to India, it is of the order in the current year of 43 crores, and in the coming year it is already estimated at 91 crores but is expanding. So that it is by no means impossible that the expenditure on supplies and services by His Majesty's Government in the year 1941-42 in India may exceed 100 crores of rupees. I mention these figures in order to put in proper perspective the increase in India's defence expenditure and to dispel the doubts of those who wonder whether the allocation between India and His Majesty's Government is fair and is in India's interest.

I shall now deal briefly with the further criticism which has been voiced on the question of taxation *versus* loans. Sir Cowasji Jehangir was of opinion that the whole of the additional cost on defence should be met by borrowing.

* **Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Not at all times. I said there is no justification for additional taxation just now.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Yes, I get that; and he tried to compare our position with that of His Majesty's Government in Britain and to draw the inference, I think, that I was pursuing a more orthodox and drastic policy than was being pursued by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England. The position may be roughly looked at in the light of

certain bold figures. The total of Indian revenue before the war may be taken to have been of the order of 85 crores; our budget before the war was of the order of 85 crores, and after the revenue which I propose to raise this time has been raised, the revenue will be of the order of 115 crores. So that the position is.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Sir, may I point out that that is not quite correct? With the additional taxation which he put on six months ago and the addition he now proposes to put on this figure has been arrived at. It is not this year's taxation only but both taxations.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I said our total revenue as compared with pre-war, if these taxation proposals are carried out, will be of the order of 115 crores. In other words, as compared with the standard of 85 crores the taxpayer will be asked to bear a burden of 115 crores, or an additional 30 crores. And that is including all the various forms in which he is laid under contribution, including for instance the railway contribution. Now, in Great Britain one may approximately take the pre-war figure to be of the order of 850 millions. As a matter of fact it was getting nearer a thousand millions because they were already taxing for war. But I exclude the fact that in the last year before the war they were already taxing for a large defence effort and it is fair to take the basic figure as about 850 millions which, as accident will have it, is comparable with our 85 crores. Now what is the position? The present scale of taxation may be estimated as between 1500 and 1700 millions. I take 1500 millions which is usually regarded as a more accurate figure.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I gave the actuals.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am giving the broad figure. The position is that the burden on the British taxpayer has gone up from 850 millions by another 650 millions to about 1500 millions. Of course the remainder, a sum of 3000 millions or more is having to be borrowed, and it is on that that my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has concentrated. He says, "There they are borrowing 3000 million pounds in a total budget of 4500 million pounds, whereas you in a total budget of 126 crores are only borrowing about 13 crores. I agree entirely with my Honourable friend, Sir Ziauddin Ahmad, that the only possible way to approach a comparison of this kind, the only possible way to apply a criterion, is first to ask what it is reasonable for the tax-payer to bear today in the way of sacrifice, and when you have decided that, to have resort to borrowing. You should not start off,—and this is my answer to Dr. Banerjea too,—with a pre-conceived idea that there is some sacrocaut *a priori* relation which should be maintained between taxation and loans in all circumstances. There is no such thing.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: "In the present circumstances of India". I said.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Just as for the individual at different stages there can be no fixed ratio between the amount which he has to spend on consumption and what he should provide by saving, and so on for his old age, so in a case of this kind it is impossible to have an *a priori* fixed proportion between taxation and loans. You have to remember, when laying off burdens for the next generation, that the experience of history is that the next generation always has its own problems to face as well. We must not think that because we are now

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

involved in one of the greatest world wars of history we are therefore in an exceptional position. I believe that if we cast our mind back over the blood-stained history of man we shall probably find that the type of life we are living now is much more normal than the type of life which was lived by (say) our grandfathers in the last quarter of the 19th century, that the piping times of peace of Victoria's day, steady progress and scientific discovery and so on and the gradual rising of the standard of living—that that is one of the few high spots or purple patches of history, and that on the whole from generation to generation man finds himself involved in the kind of trouble in which we are now. Therefore, at any rate it is highly optimistic to assume that our children or grandchildren will not only be able to care for the troubles of their day but will be able to pay for the bad debts which we leave them

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Member whether we are not carrying on the burdens of 1914-18, even up till now? We are carrying on the burdens of our predecessors and we ask the future generation to do likewise.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Is that a reason why we should ask that our burdens should be carried in a similar manner?

Mr. M. S. Aney: The future generation will be Communist and will repudiate all debts.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The Honourable Member reminds me of the impassioned orator who said "Why should we do this for posterity? What has posterity done for us?"

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: It may perhaps sound very amusing to the Honourable Member, but I would like him to come down to facts.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not giving way.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am dealing with facts: I am dealing with facts which are familiar to those who deal with these problems and it is almost a commonplace of economics and public finance that the duty of each generation is to provide by toil and sacrifice, by tightening its belt, to provide for the cost of the problems with which it is faced and not to pass them on until it finds it is impossible to do any more: it is then that it is entitled to say to its children and to its grandchildren, "Well, I did my best and you must bear whatever is left to bear."

Now, I come to the question of taxation. There have been several suggestions. I am grateful to my Honourable friend, Sir Homi Mody, for reminding the House that there is no such thing as a perfect tax. Nevertheless he seemed to go on to criticise almost every tax which was included in the Budget, without suggesting exactly how they could be replaced. He made constructive suggestions of a destructive kind. But first of all I have a lance to break with Sir Homi Mody and that is this. On the occasion of my speech on the general discussion on the Budget, I made certain remarks which apparently led Sir Homi Mody to think that I belong and have for some time belonged to what is known as the appeasement school. I can assure Sir Homi Mody and I claim that there

is no person in this House against whom that charge can less justly be made. I have the strongest personal reasons for always being, as indeed I have been, very emphatically of the opposite view. But it is a different thing to sit here and see wiseacres stand up and tell you what you should have done ten, fifteen or twenty years ago, who talk as though they had the monopoly of prophetic wisdom and that if they had been in charge they would have been building aeroplanes in India twenty five years ago and they would have been manufacturing torpedoes and submarines and I know not what. That is very difficult to stand and it was in no mood of complacency that I defended existing governments against the charge which is laid against them by critics of that kind; and it remains true that a fair share for those sins of omission must be laid on the peoples as well as the governments and although I have heard many many witty and interesting speeches from Sir Homi Mody during the last ten years, I do not remember to have heard a single one on the theme of "Arm now for war will come tomorrow."

Sir H. P. Mody: I was not at 10, Downing Street, or I should have done it.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Neither was I

Sir H. P. Mody: You placed second-rate men there: that is your trouble.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Now, Sir Homi Mody prefaced his remarks on the subject of taxation by exhorting me to have more courage. He spoke of indirect taxation and the curious thing was that although he was obviously charging me with lack of courage for not increasing the salt tax, he never once mentioned the word 'salt' in the whole course of his speech. It was very curious that, even as a non-official critic, he found that it tasted a bit too strong; nevertheless he thought that we were lacking in courage in not facing up to certain indirect taxes which obviously would yield a good deal

Sir F. E. James: Trying to put salt on your tail!

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Quite. But I thought I should be able to include my friend, Sir Ziauddin Ahmad, in the same criticism because he approached the subject by the method of artful allegory. He talked about lions and tigers and I said "Ah, I smell salt". But he did, I must hand it to him, he came out with it finally and he suggested that the salt tax ought to have been increased. I will tell Sir Homi Mody that as I am not a politician, as it is my highest ideal to carry on the stewardship of this country's finances according to what I believe to be the best interests of the country, I shall tell him that the salt tax and other taxes are taxes which undoubtedly have to come under review and that there are circumstances in which the salt tax should undoubtedly be increased, circumstances in which it will be the duty of the Finance Member, whoever he may be, to increase that tax. But those would be circumstances which are somewhat different from the circumstances prevailing at the present moment. At the present moment the additional expenditure of the Government is largely in spheres which increase the

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

income of the commercial and industrial classes, and it is unfortunate that within the last year the developments of the war have operated so as to reduce the income of the agricultural classes. In that situation, Sir, it seems to me that it would be extremely difficult to defend a sharp increase in the indirect taxation which must fall to be borne by the masses of the people rather than to insist on an increase in direct taxation. It is true that direct taxation is now getting to what I may call a very respectable height. But it is also a fact that, broadly speaking, the classes on whom direct taxation falls are at the present moment in a better position to meet higher taxation than they have been in the past; and that is the answer which I would give to Sir Homi Mody; and I trust that in future when he means salt, he will not talk about a certain monosyllabic commodity and that like Sir Ziauddin Ahmad he will even be able to mention the subject of a cotton excise duty. I have received many other suggestions on the subject of new taxation. It may interest Honourable Members to know that at and about the time of the Budget I have a very large and miscellaneous dak. It is surprising how many people in this country are interested in the problems of the Finance Member, and how many suggestions I receive for new taxation and for easy ways of solving my problems. I will not say that all of them find their way into the waste paper basket, because it would be a pity to deprive my office and my subordinates of the amusement which I get out of reading these communications,—so I pass them on,—I won't say for what they are worth, for that might be unkind. However, it does sometimes happen that surprising suggestions are made. I think it will be perfectly honest of me to say that I have never yet derived an actual idea from this type of correspondence, but it is extraordinarily amusing, and even if it is anonymous, I can never refrain from reading it with special curiosity. Well, Sir, I cannot undertake the task not only of justifying the taxes I have imposed, but of explaining why I did not impose certain others instead of them. But my friend, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan, mentioned the possibility of an excise on cigarettes. Well, Sir, I exclude no possibilities from my purview, but I would assure him that there are very good reasons why any tax which has ever been mentioned in this House has not yet been adopted or has not occupied a higher priority on the list; but I would say this to him. Why, when he admits that the smoker is undertaxed or is a suitable subject for taxation, why does he criticise the doubling of the match tax which as a matter of fact in respect of 90 per cent., is a smoker's commodity or a smoker's tax. I know, and my wife complains that I am not only the biggest consumer of matches in my household, but that practically speaking I am almost the sole consumer. I consume at least a box of matches a day, because I am a pipe smoker; it is not merely my own experience, but it is common knowledge that, I should say, more than 90 per cent. of the matches in this country, certainly a very very large proportion is consumed by smokers, and the commonest way by which matches are retailed is by the purveyors of *bidi*s and tobacco; and the mention of *bidi* will perhaps remind my friend, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan, of one of the difficulties about the excise duty on cigarettes.

My friend, Sir Homi Mody, made a suggestion about the excise duty on matches which I must acknowledge would be a useful one. It is true there is a problem about fixing the retail prices of matches in such a way

that the revenue receives its fair share and yet the retailer or the trade is not invited to profiteer, and I agree with him that it may well be that the solution of this problem requires that other units should be devised and that it is not necessarily the best thing to have boxes of 40, 60 and 80 sticks and to have your tariff so to speak based on those. But I am satisfied that the legal position is that we are in a position by notification to cater for these intermediate sizes, and that is why I have not attempted to propose an amendment in the Finance Bill in order to deal with this matter, although it is one which will receive my attention and which I am prepared to discuss with the trade.

Sir, I shall only be a few minutes more, but I feel that I must deal with one or two other remarks on the subject of taxation, and, in particular, with the art silk question. Now, Sir, several Honourable Members of this House have spoken on that subject, and suggestions have been made. The impression has been created that some serious mistake has been made here,—a duty has been levied on art silk yarn, which is the raw material of a certain industry,—no corresponding duty has been levied on the finished product, and something is seriously wrong. Well, Sir, let me state the facts about this. First of all, I must point out that the duty on art silk fabrics at the present moment is no less than five annas per square yard, which until quite recently meant an incidence of over 100 per cent. *ad valorem* and which at the present moment is probably over 50 per cent. Now that duty has risen. It has reached that level by successive stages, and certainly in the last of those stages the duty on art silk yarn remained unmoved. There was no suggestion then that an anomaly was being created; there was no suggestion then that it was wrong to leave the art silk yarn duty out of relation to the piecegoods duty. But what happened? The duty was put up to five annas a square yard in order to protect the cotton textile industry. The imports of art silk piece goods were on such a scale that this tender plant was beginning to wilt; it was feeling the draught and had to be protected. At the last stage at which this happened,—I think it was in 1937.—the position was that the revenue from the importation of art silk piecegoods was to the tune of two crores of rupees. It was suggested by the representatives of the cotton textile industry, that although this was a very substantial revenue interest, it was not necessary to sacrifice it. It would not seriously suffer if the duty were cocked just a little higher. It was then four annas; they suggested six annas a square yard; "By six annas a square yard you will get your money and we shall get protection, and we shall be able to sell our finer counts without undue competition at 50 per cent. more; even if the import fell off, you will still get your revenue." Well, Sir, my predecessor,—and I was then one of his lieutenants,—was not entirely convinced by this argument. He agreed to advance to five annas. I was certain that by putting it at anything more than five annas we should lose a good deal, and even at five annas I had serious apprehension. What happened? That little act of protection, which is hardly known, cost us very nearly a crore of rupees,—a crore of rupees, mark you, in a total budget of some eighty and odd crores, on a single commodity. Now, Sir, do you wonder that I am a little suspicious, a little dubious, when my friend Sir Homi Mody offers me the money in another form? The fact is, we have been bitten and we are shy. Now he says how easy—take one anna off the yarn duty and put another anna on the fabric duty. Well, Sir, I have no doubt whatever, that speaking entirely from the point of view of the revenue, I would rather not touch

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

either. But if I did, I would say to my friend—will you guarantee, would you be prepared to make up the loss that might occur? I should be tempted to say to the Bombay textile industry which now urges that this should be done, that the duty on piecegoods should be put up,—I should be tempted to ask them whether they would be disposed to make up any loss that would occur by alternative taxation. I notice that after the little bit of history which I have just mentioned the cotton textile industry itself went into the business of weaving art silk. Having got us to put up the duty on artificial silk piecegoods without touching the duty on art-silk yarn, they realised as acute business men that there was a new textile industry which would yield more money than cotton textile and so they went in for that too, and that explains the anomaly which Mr. Boyle brought to my attention that it is the Bombay Millowners' Association who protest. It is the protagonists of the cotton textile industry who protest against this injustice to the art-silk industry. It is because they have gone into the business.

Sir H. P. Mody: What about giving some relief in the matter of exports of art. silk cloth.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I agree that that suggestion is on an entirely different level. The question of relief to export trade from a duty levied on a raw material which went into the making of a finished product—that is on a different level, and I can at least say this that it is a principle which deserves serious consideration at a suitable time. I should also point out on this question of duty on art. silk piecegoods that it is a protective duty; although it was classified as protective, not in the interests of the art. silk weaving industry, but in the interests of the cotton textile industry, nevertheless, there it is. Should there be a case, though I leave the House to judge what I think of the case,—should there be a case established for the protection of this industry, it would be possible,—it would be possible I say for Government to take action without legislation. But a simple calculation will show that the duty on a pound of imported art. silk piecegoods is something like 30 annas. There are roughly six square yards to a pound and it is 30 annas. The duty on a pound of yarn has now been raised from 3 to 5, so that this industry has been subjected to the hardship of having a protection of 27 annas a pound reduced to 25!

Sir H. P. Mody: I am afraid your education is incomplete.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I would like my Honourable friend to work that out in percentages.

There only remains one other tax on which a few remarks were made, and that is tyres. I did expect that in connection with tyres at any rate, the old subject of inflation and deflation would again have cropped up, but nobody seems to have taken advantage of that opportunity. I shall be a very short time on that. I want to indicate why it is possible to impose an excise of 10 per cent. on the tyre industry without doing anything to the import duty on tyres. In the first place, at the present moment you have not got conditions of very effective competition, but a more important and permanent consideration is this. The duty on tyres

is a revenue duty which has grown up for purely revenue reasons. There was no guarantee, there was no question of protection of any industry. On the contrary it is a matter of my own personal knowledge that when this industry was set up and the question was put to me, I pointed out that the growth of this industry inside the country would have a certain effect on revenue, and that whereas we probably would not take steps to introduce a new tax until the amount involved was appreciable, the industry should certainly not expect that we should see our revenue lost without taking any steps to compensate ourselves. If whenever an excise duty is imposed an equivalent amount is added to the customs duty, it is quite clear that the whole of that increase comes from the consumer. When an industry grows up behind a revenue tariff, it is by no means clear that the cost of any taxation levied on that industry must wholly come from the consumer. It may easily be the case that an industry in that position is deriving profits some of which it should share with the exchequer which has lost by reason of the reduction in imports. That is a position which is surely familiar to Members of this House. It is only in the case of a protective duty that there is an absolute obligation unless the amount of protection is to be reduced. There is then an obligation on the Government if it introduces an excise to maintain the some margin between the domestic and imported product, but it does not follow at all that in case where you have a revenue duty,—and some revenue duties are extremely high—any industry which grows up inside the country is entitled to a protection equivalent to the whole of the revenue duty which happens to exist when that industry is set up. It is a matter for examination and consideration and a case has to be established. What I am satisfied with here and now is that the imposition of an excise on the tyre industry in India even without any corresponding increase in the customs duty does not seriously affect the industry.

I will only touch further on one small point, and it relates to Mr. Joshi's speech this morning. He dealt with the question of dearness allowance and he spoke—of course, we do not expect gratitude from leaders in Mr. Joshi's position, but still we do expect that they will not entirely misrepresent the action which we have taken. He spoke as if we had actually given more to the more highly paid railway staff and less to the lower paid staff. He conveyed the impression that, instead of giving an allowance we were taking something away, or he would suggest that we were giving less to the lower paid workers than we were giving to the more highly paid workers. That is entirely incorrect. In no area do the lowest paid men get less even in terms of money than those more highly paid, and proportionately they will everywhere get more. Had I approached the question from the point of view of strict justice on which Mr. Joshi laid to much stress, I could not have agreed to the generous scale which the Railway Board have granted. We are giving substantially more than either we or any provincial Government regard as justified by a mere economic analysis of the position. That is my position with regard to these dearness allowances. Therefore, when Mr. Joshi suggests that the element of negotiation has operated to reduce the compensation received by the workers, his statement is not correct.

Sir, I fear I have wearied the House. I regret that I could not get up to speech till very late. I shall now cease to tax the patience of Honourable Members as I have taxed their pockets.

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

"That the Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in, or imported by land into, certain parts of British India, to vary the rate of the excise duty on matches leviable under the Matches (Excise Duty) Act, 1934, to vary the rate of the excise duty on mechanical lighters leviable under the Mechanical Lighters (Excise Duty) Act 1934, to vary the rate of the duty on artificial silk yarn and thread leviable under the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to fix maximum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, to fix rates of income-tax and super-tax and to continue the charge and levy of excess profits tax and fix the rate at which excess profits tax shall be charged, be taken into consideration."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—46.

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

Bewoor, Sir Gurunath.
Boyle, Mr. J. D.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Caroe, Mr. O. K.
Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.
Clow, The Honourable Sir Andrew.
Daga, Seth Sunderlal.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
Dālpāt Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.

Dehejia, Mr. V. T.
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
Dumasia, Mr. N. M.
Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
Gopaldaswami, Mr. R. A.
Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
Gwilt, Mr. E. L. C.
Ikramullah, Mr. Muhammad.
Imam, Mr. Saiyid Haider.
Lemaieel Ali Khan, Kunwar Hajee.
James, Sir F. E.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Kamaluddin Ahmed, Shams-ul-Ulema.

Lawson, Mr. C. P.
Maxwell, The Honourable Sir Reginald.

Mazharul Islam, Maulvi.
Miller, Mr. C. C.
Muazzam Sahib Bahadur, Mr. Muhammad.

Mudaliar, The Honourable Diwan Baharur Sir A. Ramaswami.

Mukharji, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Ogilvie, Mr. C. M. G.
Oulsnam, Mr. S. H. Y.
Pillay, Mr. T. S. S.

Rahman, Lieutenant-Colonel M. A.
Raisman, The Honourable Sir Jeremy.

Rau, Sir Raghavendra.
Shahban, Khan Bahadur Mian Ghulam Kadir Muhammad.

Sheehy, Mr. J. F.
Singh, Maharaja Bahadur Ram Ran Vijai Prasad.

Sivraj, Rao Sahib N.
Spence, Sir George.
Thakur Singh, Captain.
Tyson, Mr. J. D.
Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

NOES—28.

Abdoolah Haroon, Seth Haji Sir.
Abdul Ghani, Maulvi Muhammad.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.
Deshmukh, Mr. Govind V.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Habibur Rahman, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Liaquat Ali Khan, Nawabzada Muhammad.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.
Rafiuddin Ahmad Siddiquee, Shaikh.
Raza Ali, Sir Syed.
Siddique Ali Khan, Nawab.
Umar. Aly Shah, Mr.
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
Zafar Ali Khan, Maulana.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday the 21st March, 1941.