

12th March 1942

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

Official Report

Volume II, 1942

(11th March to 2nd April, 1942)

FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1942



NEW DELHI : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1942

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

President:

The Honourable Sir ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I.

Deputy President:

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

Panel of Chairmen:

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir HENRY GIDNEY, M.L.A.

Sir HENRY RICHARDSON, M.L.A.

Sir COWASJI JEHangIR, Bart., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary:

Mian MUHAMMAD RAFI, Barrister-at-Law.

Assistants of the Secretary:

Mr. M. N. KAUL, Barrister-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. JAMNADAS M. MEHTA, M.L.A.

Sir ABDUL HALIM GHUZHNAVI, M.L.A.

Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—11th March to 2nd April 1942.

PAGES.	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1942—	MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1942—
Member Sworn 959	Starred Questions and Answers 1145—52
Starred Questions and Answers 959—67	Motion for Adjournment re Alleged unmannerly and rude Treatment by a British Officer of the Information Department—Ruled out of order 1152—53
Unstarred Questions and Answers 967—70	The Industrial Statistics Bill 1153
Motion for Adjournment re—Alleged misconduct of Soldiers at Hujur Paga near Poona—Leave refused 970—71	The Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Amendment Bill—Introduced 1153
Shortage of Wheat and Wheat Flour in Delhi—Withdrawn 971, 1014—33	The Indian Tolls (Army) Amendment Bill—Introduced 1153—54
Message from the Council of State 971	The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded 1154—1200
Election of Members on the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce 972	TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1942—
Election of Members on the Standing Committee for the Department of Communications 972	Member Sworn 1201
Election of Members on the Standing Committee for Roads 972	Starred Questions and Answers 1201—10
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways 972—73	Unstarred Question and Answer 1210—12
Election of the Central Advisory Council for Railways 973—75	Short Notice Question and Answer 1213—16
The Weekly Holidays Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee 975	Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce 1216
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded 975—1014	The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Introduced 1216—17
THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1942—	The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded 1217—68
Member Sworn 1035	WEDNESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1942—
Starred Questions and Answers 1035—38	Member Sworn 1269
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded 1038—88	Starred Questions and Answers 1269—76
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1942—	Statements laid on the Table 1276—78
Starred Questions and Answers 1089—90	Motion for Adjournment re Closing of certain Latrines to the Clerks of the Railway Clearing Accounts Office—Ruled out of order 1278—79
Statements laid on the Table 1090—93	Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways 1279
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded 1094—1144	

	PAGES.		PAGES.
WEDNESDAY 18TH MARCH 1942.		MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1942—	
Home Department Declaration of Expenditure issued under the Registration of Foreigners Act	1279—80	Members Sworn	1427
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded	1280—1328	Starred Questions and Answers	1427—37
THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1942—		Unstarred Questions and Answers	1437—39
Starred Questions and Answers	1329—33	Motion for Adjournment re Alleged Rowdyism by Soldiers at Bareilly—Not moved	1439—40
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1334—36	Home Department Declaration of Exemption issued under the Registration of Foreigners Act	1440
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	1336—37	Election of a Muslim Member for the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to the Hejaz	1440
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Communications	1337	Election of Members for the Standing Committee for the Department of Civil Defence	1441
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	1337	Demands for Supplementary Grants	1441—73
The Industrial Statistics Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1338	TUESDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1942—	
Election of a Member for the Central Committee of the Tuberculosis Association of India	1338	Member Sworn	1475
Election of Members for the Standing Committee for the Department of Labour	1338	Starred Questions and Answers	1475—91
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded	1339—89	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1491—95
FRIDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1942—		Statements laid on the Table	1495—97
Starred Questions and Answers	1391—97	The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1497
Motion for Adjournment re Alleged Rowdyism by Soldiers at Bareilly—Postponed	1397—98	The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1497—1501
The Indian Finance Bill—Passed as amended	1399—1415	The Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1501—02
Resolution re Moratorium on the payment of arrears from the Railway Revenues—Adopted	1416—24	The Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1502—03
The Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Amendment Bill—Passed	1424—25	The Federal Court (Supplemental Powers) Bill—Passed	1503—04
The Indian Tolls (Army) Amendment Bill—Passed	1425	The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Section 4)—Passed	1504—05
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1425—26	The Reciprocity Bill—Postponed	1505—07
Statement of Business	1426	The Delhi Muslim Wakfs Bill—Resolution for reference to Joint Committee—Adopted	1507—08
		The Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	1508—09
		The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	1509—10

PAGES.	PAGES.
TUESDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1942—contd.	TUESDAY 31st MARCH 1942—contd.
The Muslim Personal Law (<i>Shariat</i>) Application (Second Amendment) Bill —Circulated	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Proposals of the British War Cabinet concerning India—Leave refused
1511	1602—04, 1616—17
The Usurious Loans (Amend- ment) Bill—Motion not moved	Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Labour
1511	1604—05
The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill—In- troduced	Election of a Member to the Central Committee of the Tuberculosis Association
1512	1605
The Sugar Industry Pro- tection) Repealing Bill— Introduced	Election of a Member to the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to the Hejaz
1512	1605
The Code of Criminal Pro- cedure (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Sections 386 and 539-B)—Intro- duced	Message from the Council of State
1512	1605
The Indian Tea Cess Repeal- ing Bill—Introduced	Statement laid on the Table <i>re</i> Cases in which the Lowest Tenders have not been accepted by the High Commissioner for India
1512	1605—09
The Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Amendment Bill—Intro- duced	The Motor Vehicles (Amend- ment) Bill—Passed
1513	1610—16
WEDNESDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1942—	WEDNESDAY, 1st APRIL, 1942—
Member Sworn	Members Sworn
1515	1619
Starred Questions and Answers	Starred Questions and Answers
1515—23	1619—29
Unstarred Questions and Answers	Unstarred Questions and Answers
1524—33	1629—34
Competency of the Indian Legislative Assembly to entertain a Bill relating to a certain class of Multi- unit Co-operative So- cieties	Message from the Council of State
1533—36	1635
Messages from the Council of State	Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Civil Defence
1536	1635
The Weekly Holidays Bill— Passed as amended	Resolution <i>re</i> — Release of Political Prison- ers and Detenus— Negatived
1536—51	1635—56
The Industrial Statistics Bill—Passed as amended	The Supply Department —Withdrawn
1551—63	1656—74
TUESDAY, 31st MARCH, 1942—	Appointment of a Com- mittee on the Kamaran Quarantine Station— Withdrawn
Member Sworn	1674—86
1565	
Starred Questions and Answers	THURSDAY, 2nd APRIL, 1942—
1565—81	Starred Questions and Answers
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1687—94
1581—93	Short Notice Questions and Answers
Transferred Starred Ques- tions and Answers	1694—95
1593—97	Statements laid on the Table
Transferred Unstarred Ques- tions and Answers	1695—98
1597—1602	

- PAGES.	PAGES.
THURSDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1942—<i>concl.</i>	THURSDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1942—<i>concl.</i>
Motion for Adjournment re Alleged misconduct of European Soldiers at Sar- nath—Disallowed	The Sugar Industry (Pro- tection) Repealing Bill— Circulated
1698—1700	1703—21
Home Department Declar- ation of Exemption issued under the Registration of Foreigners Act	The Indian Tea Cess Repeal- ing Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee— Negatived
1700	1721—32
The Delhi Muslim Wakfs Bill—Nomination . . . of Members to the Joint Committee	The Abolition of Whipping Bill—Introduced
1701—02	1732
The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill—Cir- culated	Message from the Council of State
1702—03	1732

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 12th March, 1942.

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.

MEMBER SWORN.

Khan Bahadur Shams-ud-Din Haidar, O.B.E., M.L.A. (Nominated Non-Official).

STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(a) ORAL ANSWERS.

VETERINARY INSPECTORS CONFIRMED IN THE IMPERIAL VETERINARY RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

†180. *Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: (a) With reference to unstarred question No. 207 asked by Mr. Umar Aly Shah on the 25th March, 1941, regarding permanent Muslim Veterinary Inspectors in the Imperial Veterinary Research Institute, Mukteswar, and the reply given thereto on the 27th October, 1941, will the Education Member please verify and state the number of Veterinary Inspectors in the Imperial Veterinary Research Institute who were confirmed after July 1934, as there are reasons to believe that three (and not one as stated in the reply) were confirmed during the period?

(b) Will the Honourable Member please state the dates of appointments and confirmation of all the present permanent Veterinary Inspectors?

(c) Will the Honourable Member please state if any Muslim Veterinary Inspector has been confirmed since the issue of the Home Department Resolution of 1934, regarding the proportion of Muslims in the public services? If not, why not?

The Honourable Mr. N. R. Sarker: (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the table showing the dates of appointment and confirmation of all the present permanent Veterinary Inspectors. It will be seen from this that only one Veterinary Inspector was confirmed after July 4, 1934, the date of issue of the Home Department Resolution on communal representation in the public services.

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

(c) No. As stated above, only one officer has been confirmed since that date. He had been officiating continuously since July, 1938.

Statement showing dates of appointment and confirmation of Veterinary Inspectors (Research Assistants) at the Imperial Veterinary Research Institute.

Serial No.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Date of confirmation.
1.	Mr. M. K. Sreenivasan	9-11-1928	9-11-1929
2.	Mr. J. A. Idnani	1-10-1931	1-10-1932
3.	Mr. K. Raghvachari	26-9-1931	1-7-1934
4.	Mr. R. N. Mohan	2-4-1932	1-7-1934
5.	Mr. M. R. Dhandu	3-1-1933	1-7-1934
6.	Mr. S. Ganapathy Iyer	27-7-1933	10-2-1939
7.	Mr. Balwant Singh	9-7-1923	1-9-1924
8.	Mr. N. C. Sen	8-10-1929	1-9-1930
9.	Mr. S. K. Chowdhury	9-6-1930	1-9-1931

PAUCITY OF MUSLIMS IN THE STAFF OF THE IMPERIAL VETERINARY RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

+181. ***Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani:** With reference to starred question No. 506, asked by Mr. Umar Aly Shah on the 25th March, 1941, regarding paucity of Muslims in the staff of the Imperial Veterinary Research Institute, Mukteswar, and the reply thereto, will the Honourable Member for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

- what steps Government have taken to improve the position since then;
- whether any Muslim was appointed to any of the vacancies which occurred since then;
- whether, in view of the special consideration shown in particular cases as disclosed in reply to starred question No. 145 asked by Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan on the 18th November, 1940, any such consideration was shown towards Muslim subordinates in the matter of promotion to gazetted posts;
- whether it is a fact that there are Muslim subordinates in technical posts possessing qualifications and experience equal to those possessed by the incumbents of the gazetted posts;
- whether the said Muslim subordinates were offered any officiating chances in gazetted ranks to enable them to gain the necessary experience; and
- whether Non-Muslim subordinates possessing lower qualifications than those required for the posts have been provided with officiating chances and thus enabled to gain experience?

The Honourable Mr. N. R. Sarker: (a) Government have decided to reserve the right, in filling Class I and Class II posts, to appoint a Muslim candidate even if he is not the first choice of the Federal Public Service Commission, provided he finds a place in the list of candidates recommended by the Commission as suitable.

(b) No. No Muslim candidate has been included in the lists of candidates recommended by the Federal Public Service Commission.

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

(c) No "special consideration" was shown in the case of the promotion mentioned in reply to starred question No. 145 of the 18th November, 1940. The rules governing consultation of the Federal Public Service Commission do not require such consultation in the case of selection for appointment to a Central Service Class II post by promotion from a subordinate service.

(d) No.

(e) One Muslim officiated for a short period in 1941. Officiating promotions to gazetted posts are made with due regard to seniority and merit.

(f) No.

**IGNORING OF THE CLAIM OF A MUSLIM CANDIDATE FOR SURVEY OF INDIA,
CLASS II SERVICE.**

†182. *Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Education, Health and Lands please state whether it is or it is not a fact that the merit list of the Federal Public Service Commission was totally ignored in the recruitment to the Survey of India, Class II Service, for 1941? Is it a fact that a Muslim candidate who secured second position amongst Muslims on the result of the Commission's examination and had qualified in all papers, as required, was not taken and the post was given to the candidate who stood third? If so, why?

(b) Is it or is it not a fact that recruitment to the Upper Subordinate Service of the Survey of India is being made from the merit list of the Federal Public Service Commission's Survey of India, Class II Examination, on the definite understanding that the acceptance of this lower service on the part of these candidates would not interfere with their subsequent recruitment to Class II Service if successful at the next Examination of the Commission and otherwise found suitable by the Commission?

(c) If so, was the candidate referred to in part (a) above ignored? Is it a fact that he joined the Upper Subordinate Service by accepting the offer of the authorities on the result of the Class II Examination of 1940?

The Honourable Mr. N. R. Sarker: (a) The reply to the first part is in the negative and to the second part in the affirmative. The candidate who secured the second position amongst qualified Muslims at the examination was not appointed to the Class II Service of the Survey of India as his work as a probationer in the Upper Subordinate Service showed that he was unsuitable for the Class II Service, and the next qualified Muslim was appointed.

(b) Candidates who fail to secure appointment in Class II of the Survey of India on the result of the examination but get appointments in the Upper Subordinate service, are not debarred from appearing, if otherwise eligible, in the subsequent examinations or from selection for the Class II Service if found suitable.

(c) His claims were carefully considered, but for the reason stated in reply to part (a) of the question, he was not appointed to the Class II Service. The reply to the latter part is in the affirmative.

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

APPOINTMENTS OF A VETERINARY OFFICER AT MUKTESWAR AND AN ASSISTANT VETERINARY RESEARCH OFFICER, ENTOMOLOGY.

†183. *Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state whether Government are prepared to investigate the following cases, as promised in reply to starred question No. 153 asked by Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan on the 18th November, 1940, (reply given on 27th November, 1940):

Appointments in last November of (1) a Veterinary Officer at Mukteswar and (2) an Assistant Veterinary Research Officer, Entomology, with special reference to following points:

- (i) in view of the paucity of Muslims in the Gazetted classes in the Institute, was any direction given to the Public Service Commission that Muslims of prescribed qualifications should be given preference?
- (ii) whether the candidate selected for the post of Veterinary Officer had previously been rejected more than once by the Public Service Commission for many Gazetted posts including the one for which he has now been selected?
- (iii) how the qualifications of the rejected Muslim candidates compared with those of the candidates selected for these two posts?

(b) Will the Honourable Member be pleased to lay on the table the report of such investigation and the orders of Government passed thereon?

The Honourable Mr. N. R. Sarker: (a) (i). No. In each case the candidate recommended by the Federal Public Service Commission was appointed. Directions have been issued that, in future requisitions to the Federal Public Service Commission for the filling of Class I and Class II posts at the Imperial Veterinary Research Institute, an instruction should be included that "the appointing authority reserves the right to appoint a Muslim if he is included in the selected list of candidates recommended by the Federal Public Service Commission". The existence of such an instruction, however, would not have availed Muslim candidates for either of the two posts cited by the Honourable Member, as in neither case did a Muslim figure in the list of candidates recommended by the Federal Public Service Commission.

(ii) and (iii). Government are unable to discuss the qualifications, individual or relative, of the candidates for these posts. These are matters for the consideration of the Federal Public Service Commission and Government entertain no doubt that the Commissioners did consider them.

(b) Does not arise.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—contd.

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

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, yesterday I was dealing with the question of machine tools and with the productive capacity of our country. I find that in the few remarks that I made I have not been able to convince many of my friends

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

here as to the capacity of our industrial concerns to help Government in production in the matter of machine tools. What I pointed out was that we have not less than, in my humble opinion, 800 industrial concerns, each of which has got attached to it what is known as a mechanic shop or a workshop. So far as I know, most of these workshops attached to these industrial concerns have a large number of machine tools such as, lathes, wheel cutting machines, shaping machines, slotting machines, drilling machines, brakesmithies, tin and copper smithies, foundry, etc. During the tour we have had recently as members of the Defence Consultative Committee, I saw a good many workshops which have been created by the Government, and I must say that the work done there is efficient, good and as much as could be desired and I have a few specimens from them. Having said that much, I know, and everybody else knows that both in England and here we are short of machine tools. I have told you in brief that all endeavours have been made there and probably endeavours have also been made in this country to obtain these machine tools, to get hold of second hand machines that are lying throughout the country, that in England they have utilised a large number of industrial concerns to help them through their workshops to turn out the required things through their machine tools. I also pointed out that the same thing has been done in Australia, and the other day I quoted, and I shall again quote a few lines today that have appeared as recently as the 25th February last in an authoritative statement:

"Australia will soon have 36 Government munition factories working at full pressure compared with the 11 at the outbreak of the war. In addition there are 100 private annexes and an undisclosed number of private factories working for the munitions department. About 2,000 factories are working for the supply department on supplies and other things. This represents 100 per cent. increase in six months."

Yesterday my Honourable friend, Sir Vithal Chandavarkar—I am sorry he is not here—expressed the opinion that Government had taken an inventory of the machinery that was at present in the workshops attached to the mills. I immediately said, it is quite right. Further more, when I said that we should have the workshops attached to our factories to work for 24 hours, my Honourable friend desired to say something but I did not yield. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, said, "We are sorry you would not allow somebody who knows some facts to place them." I was sure of my facts and did not wish any interruption. But here we find that an inventory has been taken of the machinery working in the workshops attached to no less than 800 industrial concerns in this country. I concede, as Sir Vithal has pointed out, that *some* spare machinery from there and which would be usable for munition purposes were given to the Government. But that does not end the question as my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, would like us to believe, because he said in an interruption, "Sir Vithal has disposed of the matter." I say he has not. He has not been able to dispose of it and I am prepared to show and prove that at present we have workshops, 800 in number, which are used for the purpose of making repairs to the industrial concerns which are carrying on their business, but these workshops are not necessarily engaged in the repair works all the 24 hours. It is impossible to believe that most of the latest concerns should have workshops which would be engaged on their repair work for 24 hours. These workshops, as everybody ought to know, are used when there are breakdowns, and, surely, if a concern has a breakdown which would keep the workshop attached to it engaged for 24 hours, it must be a rotten concern, it must be as old as I said, 80 years, because I think the first textile mills were established 80 years ago.

[Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee.]

Therefore, my contention is that, although the industrialist is prepared, willing and anxious to help the Government so far as machine tools are concerned—in fact, when they have already offered their spares as my Honourable friend, Sir Vithal, has said, are we now utilising all these workshops for minor and other works? I say with confidence that we are not. I wish that the Government should carefully make an enquiry into that, and if they are assured that these workshops are not working for 24 hours, that all the mills are not working 24 hours, as an impression was given here in an interruption—mills are working,—few, for 24 hours, some are working for 2 shifts, 16 hours, but very few working 24 hours. But even if they are working two shifts and three shifts, 16 hours or 24 hours, my contention is that the workshops attached to them are not working for 24 hours and as has been the case in England and in Australia, the industrialists here are willing to come forward and the Government should take full advantage of these workshops. Let us take full advantage of these workshops at least until we are able to get sufficient tools. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, interrupted and said: 'You are aware of the fact that we want machine tools'. Yes, Sir, but we have not been told that in this House and in an authoritative way. We have only been told in the Defence Committee three months back and something in the Secret Session only a few days back, after the war has gone on for over 3½ years. Even then may I tell you I have already drawn the attention of my friend the Secretary in the Defence Department on the 24th January, pointing out these facts in a letter and the reply that he sent was almost the same reply as my friend, Sir Vithal, has given, to the effect that these machineries in the industrial concerns will be utilised when needed. . . .

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman (Finance Member): The Honourable Member spoke about machine tools for over half an hour yesterday, and he got to the stage, when four o'clock struck, of speaking on the Finance Bill. He is now giving the subject of machine tools a new lease of life, if I may say so, and he has resumed a subject which we understood him to have exhausted yesterday.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable the Finance Member can point out what the Chair can do in the matter of regulating such speeches, I should be very much obliged. The Honourable Member (Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee) ought to remember that there are other Members who want to speak. The time of this House is not the monopoly of any particular Member.

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee: I will consider seriously the advice given by the Chair, but I do honestly feel, having seen records of the proceedings of this House, that Members have spoken for much more than two hours or three hours, or five hours, and what I have to be careful is only that I should not repeat the matter; but I do not see why the Finance Member is allowed to interfere in this way; and now, when I find further that these Benches are empty (referring to the Muslim League Benches) and that they would have taken at least ten times more time

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member does not know that they will not take part in the proceedings.

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullahai Laljee: I will consider the advice, but I am now, Sir, doing my duty and I shall have to do my duty to my country, to my constituency, as well as I can. I was pointing out when my friend, the Honourable the Finance Member, interrupted me, that in the letter to me from the Secretary of the Defence Department it was stated that the workshops and the industrial centres will be taken into use and that shortly we will be considering proposals in connection therewith. Therefore, what I have been saying is true and correct that these workshops have not been utilised for 24 hours as we ought to do in the interest of the defence of this country and it is for that reason that I am pressing earnestly the most important and vital question before us of the machine tools and turning out of more munitions. I have been pressing this question on this House as strongly as I can and I think in fairness to the critical circumstances in which we are at present the Government Benches ought to welcome any suggestion in that respect. This clearly shows that what I have been telling over and over again.

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

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullahai Laljee: namely, that there is very little trust among the people, although they are anxious to help the Government.

Now, coming to the Budget in details, as I stated, we find that the Honourable the Finance Member has done his level best to produce the best he can under the circumstances in which we are placed. He has told us that he has a large sterling balance lying in England. He has told us that he proposes to use 101 millions for the payment of the sterling debt, 70 millions in the month of March and another 70 millions in the month of January, 1943. If he can expedite that payment, because our money is lying there, there will be so much saving in interest. I also wish to draw the serious attention of the House to the fact that every day sterling balance is being accumulated and how does he propose to bring that money down, to India. How does he propose, if these monies remain there, that we shall be able to finance commerce and industry and our agricultural products. Of course, there are ways by which he can help us to divert some of these monies to America from which we can get some raw produce and some manufactured articles which may be useful to us. Anyhow this great balance lying there in England must cause great anxiety on account of the facts I have just now mentioned. The Honourable the Finance Member at this time has provided for one fourth of the deficit by taxation. In the previous budgets he has tried to lay down a certain ratio. I am glad that he has brought that ratio down but may I ask him one simple question. It is this. His very borrowing by loans for long periods is because of the fact that the advantages of these borrowings will not only accrue to the present generation but it will accrue more to the future generation. Even in ordinary cases when public works are undertaken, this principle has been always adopted for the same reason. So far as this war is concerned, if we succeed, which we hope we shall, then the benefit of these great sacrifices will accrue not to a generation, not for 25 or 30 or 50 years but let us hope for 100 years. If that is the principle on which all borrowing is taken, if that is the principle then our regular revenue budget ought to be adjusted accordingly. I ask in all fairness and equity, whether the present generation, the present people, who are sacrificing not only money but their lives, are to be taxed any more. They

[Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee.]

have been taxed for the last two years. Before that time they were taxed enormously which was admitted on all hands. Even at this stage when all sorts of sacrifices are being done by the people of the present generation, why should the Government think of taxing them any more? Are they capable of bearing the increased burden of taxation and is it fair to them? I think that all the present war requirements of the country whether they be of £100 or of one hundred million pounds should be met out of the loans and these loans must not be for 80 years but for 50 years in all fairness. So far as this country is concerned and the poor middle class people and the ordinary people are concerned, it was conceded even before the war that they were over-taxed and that they could not bear any further taxation. You have already over-taxed them for the last two years and you are going to tax them still further. As some Honourable Members have pointed out, rich persons would feel over the super-tax and the excess profits tax but they will not have bitterness in them because, after all, Government will protect their property. But what about the poor and middle class people? They have already been making considerable sacrifices and they cannot make both ends meet and yet you want to tax them further. The result will be that you will create bitterness in them. Do you want goodwill or bitterness among the masses who do desire that this war should end in our successes soon and that their country should be defended. In these circumstances, if you touch their hungry stomachs, then you will do the greatest wrong and no good will come out of it.

Sir, some of my friends on the Treasury Benches are very anxious that I must sit down. I do not know why my friends on the Treasury Benches are so anxious that I should close my speech.

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney (Leader of the House): I am not anxious.

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee: Thank you very much. I have never been a very great critic nor have I been one of those who have non-co-operated with you. But I must bring to your notice the facts which I feel consciously if I am to honestly co-operate with you. I hope you will take my remarks in that light.

Yesterday when I was speaking about the supplies I have said that I have very great regard for the ability of the Honourable the Supply Member. Very few Honourable Members know that we have been knowing each other for more than 45 years. We read in the same school in our very early days and we have been in the public life together for more than 25 years. I know that the Supply Department, of which he is the head, is doing wonderfully good work. But I do wish to emphasise that he does require further assistance to find out the ways and means to increase our production. He has been hard working and over working but that does not mean that we must not employ or explore every source which may be available or which could be made available. I need assure him that every industrialist in this country is more anxious to co-operate with him than they would have been anxious to co-operate with anybody else. Not only that, even if I say that the industrialists of this country love him, I won't be saying too much. Therefore, I do hope that the Honourable the Supply Member will take the remarks that I made yesterday in the light in which they were made, namely, to help the successful prosecution of the war.

Then, Sir, with regard to the overseas problem, I did not wish to say any hard words to our present Leader of the House. I said yesterday and I still maintain it that the conditions, unfortunately, are still existing which had been existing for some time past. I know the great difficulties under which he has to work now because of the war, but I do still desire that he will try to exert a little more so that the people of this country may feel not only obliged to him but feel that a serious attempt is being made and that equality of status is conceded to them as the subjects of His Majesty the King-Emperor which has been denied to them so long. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to speak only on a few items on the Bill which is before us. I want to make a few observations so that the Government may know what is happening in the country. Really speaking, nobody will grudge any kind of expenditure which is required for the defence of the country if it is properly spent. But if it comes to the notice of the public that the money which the poor people are giving is being squandered mercilessly, then they will naturally feel disheartened. If they come to know that the Government are not using proper vigilance over the Departments which are the spending Departments, they feel it all the more. I want to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Finance Member two things. First of all, it has come to my personal knowledge that in Meerut, the army authorities wanted some contractors to supply them motor lorries. They asked lot of contractors to come to their help. A contractor was selected, and his rate was Rs. 10 per lorry per day. After a few days another army officer got another contractor and gave him Rs. 11 per lorry per day. The result was that all the lorries which were working with the first contractor left him and went over to the man who was given Rs. 11 per lorry per day. The lorry drivers and owners naturally wanted to have one rupee extra from the second contractor. The first contractor went to the officer concerned and complained about this arrangement. He asked as to how could they work in the same district with two different rates. The contractor said that he knew that in Bareilly lorries were engaged at the rate of Rs. 12 per day. Then, another contractor came to Meerut, and they gave him Rs. 13 a day. The same thing is being repeated everywhere at Meerut, because you have got contractors, one was supplying at the rate of Rs. 10 per lorry per day, and the other at the rate of Rs. 11 per lorry per day. Afterwards, both these contractors were wiped out and a full contract was given to another man at Rs. 13 a day on the lame excuse that the other contractors could not supply the number of lorries required by the military authorities, say 600 or so per day. My good Sir, if you give me Rs. 13, I will give you double the number of lorries. This is what another contractor said. I say, this is sheer humbug on the part of the army authorities to squander money like this. They spend Rs. 3 extra per day per lorry, and for 600 lorries, they spend Rs. 1,800 extra per day. This is all unnecessary expenditure. Who has got to pay this extra money? It is the poor taxpayer of India. In the present Finance Bill, the Government have lowered the limit of taxation from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 1,000. They now collect income-tax on sums between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000 also which they were not formerly doing. Is it to give the army authorities extra money to waste that the Government are taxing the poor like this? The army people are putting into the pockets of contractors an extra Rs. 1,800 per day in one district alone. Or it may be that it goes into the

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

pockets of somebody else. Who is responsible for this scandalous waste of public money? I urge on the floor of this House that this case should be enquired into, a full investigation should be made, the bank accounts of the army authorities who gave this contract should be checked, and if you find that within the last few months, their bank balances have increased abnormally, then those funds should be confiscated. The Income-tax Officer might send notice to these army people who gave contracts, so that he can find out the exact income of these people. If these people are found guilty, no mercy should be shown to them. They should be dismissed summarily. People who are found corrupt deserve no quarters at the hands of the Government. At first, I could not believe that such corruption could be rampant in the Army Department. I do not understand why the army authorities should show such glaring partiality to some contractors unless they themselves have some interest in the contract. This has happened not once, but twice in Meerut. Last year too, there was a lorry contractor who did supply lorries, and he was told summarily that his contract ceased the next day. The contractor, who had collected a lot of lorries from the Punjab and other places, and who had paid for petrol and who had entered into sub-contracts, was told one fine morning that his contract ceased the next day. This was a great hardship caused to that contractor. The Government want to treat everything connected with the Defence Department as a great secret. We, the non-officials, to whose knowledge such gross corruption comes, cannot keep quiet. We have a duty to our constituency and to the tax-payers in India. We cannot allow our people to be taxed if only to place money at the disposal of the Defence Department for such extravagant purposes. If you cannot exercise proper control, if you cannot keep vigilant, then you must take into consultation non-officials who will supply you with proper information. You must wake up and find out what is the reason for all this extravagant expenditure. It will be dishonest on my part, if I say that I should allow my people to be taxed simply to squander the money like this. If you want to fight the enemy, if you want to defend India properly, I will be the first man to approve the taxing of the people to the utmost limit. In the case of income-tax, I would even suggest that you should lower the limit to Rs. 500. If there is an emergency, I am prepared to go any length to raise money for defence purposes. But it will be dishonest on my part if I go and say, you should tax my people simply to squander the money in the Defence Department. This thing has been going on, and it has come to my personal knowledge, and, therefore, I am bringing to the notice of the Government that there is some *goolmal* going on in the Defence Department and you must enquire into the matter. This thing has not happened in the Supply Department where contracts are given. But the contracts which are placed by the army authorities are not all straightforward. In some cases they give double and treble the ordinary rates. This leads to a lot of discontent in the country. It is not really proper for any honest man to keep quiet in the face of such malpractices. That is why I have exposed these people before the Government so that the Government might take proper steps. The Government should get hold of the contractors, and, through the help of the non-officials, they must sift out the truth. You must give the contractors a guarantee that no legal proceedings will be taken against them if they give proper information. On this condition, they will divulge the truth. Thus you will find that a lot of corruption has been going on. I suggest that these

people who are found corrupt should be discharged at once. They are a disgrace to the army; they are not the proper men to be placed in position of trust and responsibility at the present time. First of all, they should be discharged and then prosecuted. Whatever else you do, no mercy should be shown to them. War is knocking at our very doors; here some people think that, on the pretext of war, they could make a great fortune. While everybody is suffering, a few people must make money and they should get-rich-quick simply through this corruption. Sir, this is the first point I wish to bring to the notice of the Government.

The next point which I should like to bring to the notice of the Government is this. I cannot understand what is the reason for the Government taxing silver at the present moment. Before Japan entered the war, the price of silver was about Rs. 62-2-0 per 100 tolas sometime ago. That was fluctuating within a few annas this side and that side. But when Japan entered the war, it went up to Rs. 70 per 100 tolas. When Singapore fell, it went up to Rs. 80 per 100 tolas. The day when the Finance Bill was introduced, it went up to Rs. 81-8-0. But with the news of the fall of Rangoon, the price of silver went up to Rs. 89, and it gradually rose, so that today it is about Rs. 95 per 100 tolas. Where is the silver going? Why is the price of silver soaring like this? Does the Honourable Member realise what is happening to the currency position of India? Does anybody value his currency notes? Why are the people purchasing silver? Why are the people hoarding silver? Because they do not want to touch your currency notes. Therefore, they convert their wealth into silver. Has the Honourable Member taken any action on this? Why was the price of silver not controlled at once? As soon as Japan entered the war, when the Government saw that there was a tendency on the part of silver prices to go up, the Government should have brought in a measure to control the price of silver. I hear that the Reserve Bank has stopped the sale of silver. Your silver coin is getting discredited, because there is not much silver in it. Your note is getting discredited in the country, and yet you are taking no action. The result is that the price level is going up high and high everyday. Even the price of gold, which was remaining stationary at Rs. 40 per tola a few days before Japan entered the war, now has gone up to Rs. 56 per tola. Where is all this gold, and where is all this silver going? I was talking to an official of an Indian State last night. He happens to be coming from somewhere in Marwar. He informed me that in his part of the country alone, people had brought about eight crores worth of gold and silver. When war broke out, these people put up petitions to the Maharaja saying that they should be allowed free of customs duty to bring gold and silver into the State. The Maharaja agreed willingly. But the Minister was a little bit careful. It struck him to find as to what was the reason for these people wanting to bring gold and silver into the State. He thought "I must have at least some kind of statistics when they bring into my territory silver and gold", and he said that he would allow it to come free of customs duty provided they declared at the customs the quantity of gold and silver brought and its value, and provided also that they did not use it in the State. These people agreed and declared that they would not use it. Then he collected all the statistics and he was telling me last night that in that small State eight crores of rupees worth of silver and gold has gone and has been buried underground in three or four people's houses. Why not issue an Ordinance to bring back all this silver which has gone from British India and has been hoarded under the ground? You can stop this and stop the fluctuation,

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

You may say that the value of your rupee coin will go up, because it is a token coin only; but your old silver coin was also a token coin and did not contain silver worth the nominal value of the rupee. And what will be the effect if it goes up to Rs. 100 a tola? All your Edward VII and George V coins which are still in the market and not ceased to be in circulation will be melted. Then you will be faced with the difficulty that while your books in the Reserve Bank will show that there is so much coin in circulation, it will be only on paper and there will not be these coins in circulation. The result will be that those financiers who know it will know that the value of your currency must depreciate and it will go on depreciating. You have been seeing this for the last three months, from about the 7th or 8th December, but you have taken no action. Action should have been taken at once though it is right that your new George VI coin has come up to the same level. It may be a token coin, but its value has increased, because though it had originally six annas worth of silver, it will now have at least eight annas worth; and people think it better than your paper notes. The difficulty was met when you introduced the rupee note. That saved the situation and brought forth a lot of coins. But this year hoarding has come in on account of the rise of the price of silver and gold. Gold has gone up to Rs. 56 per tola, and a lot of people are selling their gold. Formerly it was going to meet your liabilities outside, and today it is being hoarded by a few people and put under the ground. So I think it is right and proper that Government should issue an Ordinance to requisition all the silver that they know to be hoarded and the Reserve Bank should issue a certain amount of silver at that rate which prevailed at a certain time. It may be Rs. 62 or Rs. 70,—I leave it to them, and if the Reserve Bank issues a certain portion every month, that will keep down the price. You may melt your old coins or the new coins, but, at the same time, the sale of silver should continue in order to keep prices down and not let the poor people suffer. You know what the Indian mentality is, and, during marriages, some amount of jewellery has to be given. They must purchase it, and if they do it now, it will bring them probably half the price after the war. If a man purchases silver now for Rs. 100, his capital will be reduced by Rs. 50 after the war.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: What about the silver that he had before which has now gone up to double the value?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: But the Honourable Member knows that the poor man here will never part with his silver in spite of the fact that he can make a profit and double his wealth. He will keep his little silver, because it may be valuable to him afterwards. Nowadays rumour-mongers are saying that the British Government are going; and this poor man feels that if that happens, your notes will be worthless like the German marks after the late war. This kind of rumour is going on and the poor man, therefore, does not want to part with this little silver, which may become afterwards his medium of exchange. So the poor man hoards it and keeps his jewellery for bad times when they come. When he is in difficulty, he goes and pawns his jewellery, rather than sell it although he has sometimes to pay interest which is equal to the value of the jewellery itself. He pawns it and pays interest of about 3½ per cent. per month on the security of the jewellery; sometimes he has paid even 6 per cent. per month, but he has got back the jewellery and not sold it.

That is the mentality of the poor man; in having his jewellery, he thinks it is in his own bank. It is, therefore, wrong to suppose that on account of the rise in prices he will bring out his silver and sell it in order to make a profit. That he will never do. Sir, my advice to the Government is that they must take immediate action in stopping further rise in the price of silver and bringing out into the market all the hoarded silver. A certain limit—say, 100 tolas or 200 tolas—or even 1,000 tolas should be fixed, and nobody should be allowed to keep more than that as bullion. If, in that way, you are able to throw into the market crores worth of silver, this tendency of discrediting your notes will stop. You should make every effort to see that this idea that your note is valueless should not prevail in the country, or else the responsibility of the Government will never be discharged properly. You must keep your note

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has made that point often enough.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Now, Sir, the other point which I want to bring to his notice from the poorer people is this—the Honourable Member may communicate it to the Member concerned, because I do not find all the Executive Councillors present at the moment. It is the question of supply of wheat and wheat flour. Although it was debated yesterday, I feel that this point was not discussed. You cannot control the price of wheat unless you control the price of coarse grain. You have not so far taken any steps to control the sale price of coarse grain. Only one glance in any newspaper in the morning will show you that barley flour is selling at less than 7 seers to a rupee—I think, exactly 6 seers and 12 chattaks; *bajra* is still higher; gram has gone up to 7 seers; and wheat, as you know, is selling at 7 seers to a rupee. Now, if the cheaper and coarser grain becomes costlier than wheat, naturally the tendency of those who were accustomed to use that would be to turn to wheat and wheat flour, because it is more sustaining. If a man needs half a seer of coarse grain at one time, he will only require $\frac{2}{3}$ rd of wheat flour in its place, and he can very well do with that. I am glad that while I am on this subject, the Honourable Member has come. Sir, I was just saying, before the Honourable Member came, that unless you control the price of coarse grain, you cannot control the price of wheat. The price of coarse grain ought to be controlled, otherwise you cannot control the price of wheat and wheat flour properly. At present wheat flour, barley flour, *bajra* flour, gram (*channa*) flour are all selling at about the same price

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): All that was fully discussed yesterday.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Sir, I am sorry I was not here yesterday.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not matter.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Sir, I was told that this coarse grain matter was not brought to the Honourable Member's notice, and that is why I am doing that now.

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

Sir, I think all the coarse grain should be requisitioned, as otherwise this difficulty of scarcity of wheat will not be overcome. I, will, therefore, advise that immediate action may be taken in the matter of control of prices of coarse grain, because the crop has only just been harvested and wheat crop is coming. Coarse grain must sell cheaper, otherwise there will be a great deal of difficulty when the new crops of wheat come into the market.

As regards the proposal in the Finance Bill to bring down the limit of taxation from 2,000 to 1,000, although the Honourable Member says that this money will be some kind of accumulation, I think it is very inadvisable. I do not think it will bring much relief while the prices are going up. The prices are getting higher and higher, and the man who suffers the most is the man whose income is fixed, say between one thousand and two thousand. He has got fixed income, and he cannot increase that in any way, and then he is saddled with this. Of course, an ordinary labourer, even if he is getting six or seven annas per day, can increase that to, say, twelve annas. He will go and ask, "I am not willing to work for this salary or for this wage as it does not even bring me sufficient food. The price of food has gone up. I must get more." He will get more and may not suffer so much, but a lower middle class man, whose income is not elastic, whose salary is fixed and which cannot be increased, has got to be content with what he gets. And then you have taxed him. You know that his bare necessities have gone up very high—foodstuffs, cloth, house rent, in fact every thing costs more. He cannot indulge in any luxury, but he has got to pay for the education of his children, and for many other things which are bare necessities. I think it will not bring you so much relief as it will cause hardship to the man whom you are proposing to tax. A tax is good if it brings lesser evil and greater benefit, but if it brings lesser benefit and greater evil, that taxation is bad in principle. In this case, I think, it will not bring so much benefit to the Government as it will bring hardship to the poorer classes. And, therefore, Sir, at least I feel—though it may be necessary—that this taxation is inadvisable. The Honourable Member has given figures which are so mixed up that we do not know what will be the net benefit which he expects for the Treasury. Then, it will involve extra expenditure for the collection of this tax—that was tried once and he found that that was hopeless—and I do not think that it will make much material difference now and specially when the war is going on, when you have to keep the poor man contented, when you have to make a gesture that the Government are not in much trouble, it is not conducive to keeping proper order in the country if you tax the man who carries about all kinds of bad rumours in the towns and villages. I think your policy should be not only a merely mercenary policy. The other side should not be ignored. You have to keep the masses contented so that they may not think that bad time is coming. You have got plenty of people whom you can tax. Why insist upon a high level of the minimum of Excess Profits Tax? You could reduce it. You could get much more from that. Why not reduce the limit in the case of people who have been making extra profit? Excess Profits Tax means that the man is making extra profit on account of the war, and he should make payment towards the war. The man who is benefiting should be taxed, and not the man who is already suffering on account of the war. You are brushing both with the same colour—the man who is getting all the benefit on account of the war, and the man who is losing everything on account of the war.

There should be some kind of proportion in that. The man who is losing everything should not be made to lose further, while the man who is benefiting should be taxed to its maximum limit. I think this would have been the proper course.

I will now make a few very short general observations, as this is not a
 12 Noon. year when everybody should ventilate the grievances of his constituency. I will speak on only two or three matters, about which I have spoken before. We hear that Calcutta is in the danger zone and it has been so declared by the Government of Bengal, and we find that a lot of people have left; but we do not know what action has been taken to remove our valuable things from Calcutta. I attach great value to our books in the Government of India Library there and the exhibits in the Museum. You cannot replace these things if a bomb destroys them. There are certain very valuable books and records which have been there for a very long time, and there are also manuscripts which cannot be replaced. The articles in the Museum also should be removed to a safer place. I have always suggested that they should be removed to Delhi, as there is no justification now for our Government of India Library to be kept in Calcutta; it was kept there when Calcutta was the Capital of India. Now Delhi is the capital,—not Calcutta; and Delhi is a central place where students, who want to conduct research, can do so. Calcutta has a big population which can use the Library in a better way than Delhi, but that can be done by the Library of the Local Government, not the Government of India Library. The Government of India Library must be transferred immediately from Calcutta—the valuable records and manuscripts should be shifted as soon as possible

Mr. N. V. H. Symons (Government of India: Nominated Official): May I just inquire of the Honourable Member whether his remarks are theoretical, because I was talking to the Maharaja Bahadur Tagore only a few weeks ago, who is the Chairman of the Trustees of the Museum in Calcutta, and they have done all this already. If he has any information that something is left undone, we shall be very glad to do it.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I am very glad to know it and it gives me great satisfaction; but will the Honourable Member throw some light as regards the Library?

Mr. N. V. H. Symons: That is the immediate concern of the Education, Health and Lands Department.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I would like that the Honourable Member in charge of that Department may take note of this and follow suit. (Interruption.) I do not care for the buildings; buildings can be erected and re-erected many times, but the stock is valuable and cannot be replaced—a few bricks can be put up any time you like. But valuable things should be shifted immediately to places which cannot be in the danger zone.

I would like to make another general remark. In India it is only that person who is absolutely anti-British that would like today that the war should not be fought properly, but I think such people will be very few who would not like to defend their own country at this time and who are not ready to shed their blood and contribute all their wealth for the protection of India. Everybody is prepared and willing

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

to do his little bit and to sacrifice the maximum for the safety of the country. But the present political situation is stopping people from taking part as they really desire; and any delay in coming to a decision and hanging on will not do. It is very satisfactory that we have learnt some good news that something is being done and will be done soon.

What it will be and how it will satisfy the people of this country, I do not know; we have not been taken into confidence by the Prime Minister of England; but we know that he has arrived at certain final conclusions which are being sent through an accredited Member of Parliament. It may or may not satisfy the people of this country—it depends on the nature of the final settlement which will come. The Muslim League

Party took their decision before this news came; they were thinking that their voice is not heard properly, and they were not taken into confidence in the administration, and they had no share in the administration, and, therefore, they felt that not much value is attached to their co-operation. They think that unless they are given proper voice in the Government, it will not be right and proper to tax the people or to vote for taxation which will not be consistent with what they have been demanding in the past. Therefore, they feel obliged very reluctantly—they would have liked to give full support, but they think that as the Government have not come to any final decision and have not taken the Muslim League Party into confidence and have not given them any power in the day to day administration of the country and in the expenditure of the money which is to be voted, it will not really be honest for them to vote for this taxation. That is the position of the Muslim League Party when they decided to vote against the Bill.

But as I have made it absolutely clear, this is not to be inferred that the Muslim League or its members do not intend to help the Government; many members have been helping the Government in the prosecution of the war and are doing everything possible in their individual capacity everywhere; they are free to do what they think honest and proper. But as a party, and, as an organisation, they think that in its official capacity the organisation cannot, consistently with the rejection of their demand, take any responsibility of supplies, unless the responsibility in the expenditure also is thrown on their shoulders. They would have been very glad to vote for this Budget or for whatever other object intended for the prosecution of the war, to defend this country and to render whatever help necessary for the maintenance of law and order, provided they were given an effective voice in the Government, and not treated as untouchables. Such a position the League did not like to accept, and that will be the attitude of the Muslim League throughout in this matter in regard to the voting on this Bill. It may be somewhat unfortunate, but I should like to make it quite clear that there is no disposition on the part of the Muslim League or any member of it to be an impediment in the way of the Government in the prosecution of the war. They are always ever ready and willing to give the Government whatever assistance that is required of them. They do not want to be a hindrance in the successful prosecution of the war, but they feel that unless and until their demands, which are just and legitimate, are met, unless and until they are given an effective voice in the administration of the Government, I am afraid, they cannot vote for this Bill. Sir, I have finished.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, this is the 31st month since India has been at war with Germany and her allies. During this period, Sir, many a political leader has demanded a real transfer of power to the people of the country. From many a platform voices have come with different proposals to induce men in power today to part with real power, so that India's mind and soul may be with them in the present war. But every time some excuse or other has been put forward by His Majesty's Government to put off this demand, that is, transfer of real power from the hands of the bureaucracy to the hands of the people. Today, Sir, after raising so many hopes for a declaration, we discover a statement has been made in the House of Commons by the Premier of England giving certain information to this country. The most important part of the statement is the sending out of Sir Stafford Cripps to this country on an important mission. I, Sir, extend to him a hearty welcome to this country. It is really a good and happy sign.

Then, Sir, the second thing which we are told in this connection is that His Majesty's Government have reached certain definite conclusions, but they are not willing to announce the same; they have left it to Sir Strafford Cripps to come to this country and do it at some psychological moment with some psychological background. However, one thing is clear that there is going to be a further transfer of power from the bureaucracy, if that declaration contemplates any such transfer at all. I may say, Sir, that there is still time to take adequate steps for the transfer of power, though in some quarters we find there are some differences of opinion. Some people, particularly that class which always supports the Government, which always holds that Government could do no wrong, it is always wise and whatever is done by Government should always be supported, that type of people, however, feel that there is no use of handing over power to Indians. They ask can it advance the war effort even by one jot or add one piece or material towards that? Sir, such an argument can only be advanced by those who have not given full thought to the value of another important factor which goes to win the war, and that factor is the morale of the civil population. Sir, during the thirty-one months of the war, I can say without any fear of contradiction from any serious minded man, that the people of this country have been falling slowly and steadily into that attitude of mind which is called sullen. They are becoming indifferent to the course of the war, and such an attitude is certainly not conducive to increasing the morale of the civil population. I think my friends will agree that the necessity for increasing the morale of the civil population has been brought home to His Majesty's Government, for I find in the declaration itself that the background which has led to the making of this declaration is described in these words by the Premier of Great Britain:

"The crisis in the affairs of India arising out of the Japanese advance has made Britain to rally all the forces of Indian life to guard their land from the menace of the invader."

This statement proceeds on the clear understanding of the situation which was made clear in the House of Commons during the last debate, that the attitude of the civil population in Malaya and Burma has not been one of helpful co-operation. As a matter of fact, it was reverse of it. In order to avoid that danger, the British Government has been forced to the realisation of this fact that India must be saved from that

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

situation. We are not concerned with the motives which have led His Majesty's Government to come to a decision at this late hour to part with real power, provided the declaration, the terms of which are not known to us, contains such provisions which will satisfy Indians in regard to the transfer of real power.

We have been pressing from these Benches for the last 2½ years that England can win this war provided India fully co-operates with England; England need not look to America, England need not look to Russia, England need not look to outside help provided India can be persuaded to put forward its full effort to the winning of this war. But, unfortunately, it was not to be so. England looked to Russia in preference to India, England looked to America in preference to India, for the winning of this war. And today we find England in difficulties. We have spoken many a time on the floor of this House, to the Members sitting on the Treasury Benches, change your outlook, do not look to any other direction, look to India and India will stand by you. But, as I said before, the reply was given, "Can political India give a man more, a single thing more than what the Government are getting for the war effort?" I am, in this connection, reminded of a story which was narrated the other day in the Non-Party Conference. The story is from the Aesop's Fables. A man went with his hounds for a hunt. He set the hounds behind the deer, and there was a race between the deer on the one hand and the hounds on the other. The deer escaped. The master became exasperated with the hounds and asked them, "How is it that after my having fed you for such a long time you could not catch the deer?" The hounds made the reply, "Sir, the deer was running for its life, while we were running at your bidding". That is the difference between voluntary effort and forced effort. You may get men, you may get money, you may get material, but it is at your bidding.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths (Assam: European): Is not your life concerned here?

Sardar Sant Singh: I will refer to that point very soon, but at this time I am busy trying to persuade you to do something which really matters, not to try to argue it out, whether this thing is for the good of India, or that thing is for the good of India. I know that our life is concerned, I know, I fully realise and appreciate the criticism of my Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, that the defeat of India means greater suffering for the Indians than for a handful of Englishmen in India. But do you realise in your turn that the defeat of the democracies in this war will mean complete destruction of England?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Of course, we do.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am glad you realise it. So, the duty or obligation does not sit on one shoulder only.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: On both.

Sardar Sant Singh: That is what I was trying to persuade—that the responsibility lies on the shoulders of both, and that responsibility can

be discharged only when both are working as allies, as friends, as equals, not as superior and inferior, not one as a master and the other as servant. That is what I am trying

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Sir Stafford Cripps comes.

Sardar Sant Singh: He is coming. I am glad he is coming, I have said that. I started this speech by welcoming him. At the same time my Honourable friend's interruption has reminded me, "Will not Sir Stafford Cripps meet the same fate which Montagu met when he came out to India in 1919-20?" History has not forgotten it. Whatever recommendations were made in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report were not fully given effect to by the Parliament later on. We have yet to be careful as to whether what he does, what he thinks proper to be done after consulting the great parties in India—will it be given effect to by His Majesty's Government? The only indication that we get in this statement is that he is coming with

An Honourable Member: full authority.

Sardar Sant Singh: I cannot say, full authority, but with some authority.

An Honourable Member: Final authority.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is it final? I am glad if it is going to be so. Whatever it is, at any rate, there is some hesitation in saying that he comes with full authority to settle the matter finally and once for all in this country.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Don't spoil his chances in advance.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am not spoiling, I will be the last man to spoil his chances. But there is one thing

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): What about Hitler?

Sardar Sant Singh: How does he come in this picture except in your imagination? I never referred to Hitler. Why should he obsess you? Please let me go on. From the statement of Mr. Churchill I find that still certain conditions are insisted upon and those conditions are. One thing is very important which I forgot to mention, and I must admit that that will be a great advance if it is given effect to, and that is this. Referring to the August offer he said:

"This amounted in short to a promise that, as soon as possible after the war, India should attain Dominion Status in full freedom and equality with this country and other Dominions under a constitution to be framed by Indians by agreement amongst themselves and acceptable to the main elements in the Indian national life."

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): That is an old story.

Sardar Sant Singh: That is the old story of August. Later on, in this connection there is one thing said:

"We had thought of setting forth immediately the terms of this attempt by a constructive contribution to aid. . . . (I do not like the word 'aid'). . . . India in the realisation of full self-government. We are however, apprehensive that to make a public announcement at such a moment as this might do more harm than good. . . ."

Sir Gowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Where is the point in your circle?

Sardar Sant Singh: The point which I am trying to make is this—the recognition of the principle put forward by the Non-Party Conference, attainment of status equal to that of other members of the Commonwealth after the war. That is a new phrase. It goes beyond what we call Dominion Status. That is the point which I was trying to make. But I find that there are again three conditions laid down, three hedges laid down. The first is, “subject to the fulfilment of our obligations for the protection of minorities, including the depressed classes”, the second is, “our treaty obligations to the Indian States”, and the third is, “to a settlement of certain lesser matters arising out of our long association with the fortunes of the Indian sub-continent”. Those conditions in the Declaration of August, 1940, are still there.

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney: May I remind the Honourable Member that in that portion of the present announcement the Premier is only explaining what is meant by the Declaration of 1940.

Sardar Sant Singh: He is emphasizing the same three obligations. Somehow or other His Majesty's Government think that these are their obligations which must be discharged. It is the same old story of obligations. We say that these obligations no longer subsist. An attempt should be made, as is said in the latter portion of this statement, that an agreement between the various sections and political parties should be evolved.

An Honourable Member: Martially?

Sardar Sant Singh: Yes, sometimes martially, at other times mutually.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): If it is not evolved, then do you expect the Government to coerce the Minorities?

Sardar Sant Singh: If it comes from the genuine desire to settle the question and to arrive at an equitable settlement, I would not mind it.

An Honourable Member: Mind what?

Sardar Sant Singh: What I mean is that there should be a sincere and genuine desire to settle the differences in this country. That must be the proviso, with a capital P. It should not be like the Communal Award of 1932. However, the position which is made clear by this statement is that something must be done and delay should be avoided. Any attempt to delay matters will frustrate the very object of the visit. Sometimes good cometh out of evil. The entry of Japan into the war and its treacherous assault on the neighbouring islands and on our neighbour has made the British Government realise that India becomes a springboard for defeating Japan's purpose, a base from which invasion can be repelled and I say that realisation should have come much earlier than it did.

I now come to the second point and that is His Excellency the Viceroy's call to action that was published yesterday. There is one sentence in that Declaration and I would request the Honourable the Leader of the House to explain its implications. It is this :

"I send this message to all men and women who live in this land, whatever their politics or religion or their race, you will be invited during the next few weeks to enrol yourselves in the National war front."

May I know what this means. It has set people thinking in many ways. I will await the reply of the Honourable the Leader of the House. I want to know whether any fresh legislation or some other action is contemplated like compulsory conscription. I should like this sentence to be explained, with all its implications.

The third point which I want to raise in this debate is that the Central Legislature has been consistently losing ground during the last 2½ years, since the declaration of War. The Members of this House have not been invited to give their opinion on vital matters. Changes have taken place in the legal and constitutional field which could have been referred to this House for disposal. I do not say that the Government have done anything illegal or unlawful. What I say is that the propriety of doing the things through the Legislature, in preference to ordinances, should have been considered by the executive of this country. May I, in this connection, say, without meaning any offence to the esteemable gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches or who have been occupying the Treasury Benches, that they have been there for several years now and their Government, as shown by the results of this war, has proved to be an utter failure. Your policies have gone wrong. Your methods have gone wrong and today you are nothing but defeatists in this country. You boasted of the defence of this country and have complained that Indians cannot manage the defence of this country. Where is that boast? Has it not blown over. Have not the hard realities of the situation proved to you that whatever you have done you have failed to achieve any substantial result today. The enemy is nearer the shores of India. He is actually knocking at the door. Why should you keep your seats there and not give place to better men,—to those who can work to win this war. The British Government during the last 31 months of the war has changed several times.

An Honourable Member: Who are the better men? Give their names?

Sardar Sant Singh: We judge you by your failure. A tree is known by the fruit it bears. Your policy has been proved to be wrong and yet you do not vacate those seats and make the Government a national government. All Parties want that the power should be transferred to the people and yet you still think that the Parties are wrong and you are right. I never thought any religious sect of any denomination claiming such infallible men as the members of the I.C.S. in this country. When are you going to realise that you have been guilty of all the misdeeds that have resulted in bringing this peril and in giving away Rangoon and Burma to the enemy? The policy should be revised and it is high time that you should vacate your places and give them to Indians with better brains, better initiative and probably better initiation of policy than you have been able to do. I will presently show you how far their success is written in what they have been doing. Forty-five Ordinances have been issued over the

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

head of this Legislature during the last 31 months, several of which have been amended more than twice and some of them have been amended as many times as four. Could this have happened to these Ordinances if they had been passed, after a proper deliberation and if proper thought had been given to the legislation before it was promulgated? I will give some instances. The Coffee Control Ordinances had to be amended more than twice. Similarly, the Indian Coinage Ordinance had to be amended several times. But I am not concerned with these small Ordinances which have no principle or policy behind them. I am concerned principally with those Ordinances which have some policy behind them.

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney: The House should be prepared to accept the allegation of the Honourable Member that some of the Ordinances have been amended more than once.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am not stressing that point. I stopped it. What I said was that I will deal with those Ordinances which involve the question of principle and policy and I will confine my remarks only to those now.

I will, first of all, refer to Ordinance No. 2 of 1942. This Ordinance is to provide for the setting up of special criminal courts. Nobody will dispute the fact that the civil courts of a country are the forum where the liberties of the people are protected. It is left to the civil courts to defend the rights of ordinary men against the executive act of the Executive Government. My friend, Mr. Joshi, should be interested to hear this because he has recently presided over the Civil Liberties Union Conference. It is all right to enunciate the principle that civil liberties should be protected, but we cannot ignore the forum in which such civil liberties are protected. The civil courts in this country are established by various Statutes both of the Central as well as the Provincial Governments. It is a revolutionary change to create new Tribunals and new courts, and I claim on behalf of the elected Members, rather on behalf of all the Members of this Honourable House and the Upper House, that it is the privilege and the duty of the Legislature to have a voice when new Tribunals or courts are set up. I want to make it once more clear that I do not question the legal right of issuing an Ordinance but I question the propriety of issuing an ordinance particularly when a change of a revolutionary character is contemplated. I want to make it further clear that I do recognise and appreciate to some extent the necessity of doing something in order to save the war effort or to enhance it. But what I protest against is the continuous ignoring of this House in doing that duty which the Constitution has laid upon this House to be done and to side-track the whole thing.

We have found, during this Session, that comparatively trivial pieces of legislation have been brought to us for passage and we are associated with those pieces of legislation which I would call as ordinary matters of day-to-day routine. But where the policy of the country's government is to be changed or to be modified, we have been respected simply by being ignored. I brought this aspect of the question to the notice of the Government early in 1939 when the Defence of India Ordinance was promulgated. I brought to the notice of the House then that the Government ought not to ignore this Legislature. But the Government have begun ignoring this Legislature again. At that time, the Government did make a promise but it was a conditional promise, the condition being that it will bring the Ordinances

Before the Legislature provided they expedited the passing of the legislation which was in the nature of an emergency legislation. We accepted that condition in Simla and in the passing of the Defence of India Act we showed an expedition to which no objection has so far been taken. In one day, the Select Committee was constituted, the next day the Select Committee met, and then within three days, the Select Committee report was presented to the House and the Defence of India Act was passed, if I am not mistaken, within a week. There we demonstrated our willingness to co-operate. What can you do with the suspicion of the bureaucracy?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: What did you do?

Sardar Sant Singh: I know my Honourable friend over there objected at that time too. But today again the same thing happens. What should be done for the distrust that prevails in the ranks of the Executive Councillors? They do not trust Indians. They do not want our co-operation, except on their own terms. They do not want us to participate in the duties which are constitutionally laid partly on this House too.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Is there no distrust on your part?

Sardar Sant Singh: I am very sorry that my Honourable friend has given away the whole case. He does not realise that he has given away the whole case of the Government. If there is distrust on our part and there is, I do not conceal it, let my Honourable friend be satisfied on that point, it is due to Government's act in the country, consistent and persistent repudiating of pledges that it has been giving from time to time. The Government have created and developed this distrust in the country. The Government should be the last to complain of the existence of distrust. Your duty today in this crisis lies in not referring to the existence of that distrust, but in trying to show that you have changed your methods.

We have seen, Sir, that the sight of distress impels human minds. There is distress all over the world. Those supermen of Europe who claimed higher civilisation for themselves are busy today in cutting each others throats and slaughtering each other. At this time when you are seeing distress all over the world, the humanity in you should have awakened you to the full sense and its full height. But it has not awakened in you. You complain that we distrust the administration. Why should we distrust it? Is there no justification? Now, reverse the position. Supposing India has been governing England and India has been repudiating pledges after pledges given in all earnest, hedged in by several conditions. Will there not be distrust engendered on that account? It will be engendered. The duty of the Government at this time is not to refer to that distrust, their duty at this time is to take sincere steps, genuine steps to remove that distrust, so that the war effort may be enhanced. It is not for me to explain why there is distrust. I have not to cleanse my mind, it is the Government who have to cleanse their mind. On that score they cannot complain about it if there is a distrust in India.

There are other Ordinances also. I was referring to an Ordinance that introduced a new principle in the government of this country, and one of the principles which they have transgressed without consulting this House, is the introduction of conscription in certain ranks of Indian society. Why, Sir? Why was it done without consulting this House? That is my complaint.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Skilled workmen.

Sardar Sant Singh: Yes, I know skilled workmen have conscription. I do not want to take up much of the time of the House. If the Government are capable of being impressed, I want to impress upon them that we regard this as a great slur to the Legislature. An attempt is made to throw the Legislature out of the picture and to get everything under their control so that we may not share the responsibility or share power or any voice in the administration of this country. I finish this part of my speech.

The next point is about the abuse of the Defence of India Act and the rules framed thereunder.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Speak of detenus.

Sardar Sant Singh: Detenus will come in their turn. The position is this. When the Defence of India Bill was introduced in this House in 1939, I pressed for an assurance being given in this House on the same lines as the assurance given by His Majesty's Government in England when the Defence of the Realm Act was passing through the Parliament in Great Britain. After a great deal of haggling and bargaining, the Leader of the House sent for the verbatim report of the assurance that was given in Great Britain and then read that out saying that the Government of India gives the same assurance. Now, Sir, may I know even if that borrowed assurance has been honoured in the working of the Defence of India Act and the rules framed thereunder? During the last 2½ years, I have seen religious processions being stopped under the Defence of India Act, I have seen land revenue being realised under the Defence of India rules, I have seen cases under section 493, I.P.C., being tried under the Defence of India rules, I have seen a father being compelled to send his married daughter to the parents of the husband who was employed in a military regiment because the man would not fight unless his wife was with his parents, I have seen criminal courts compelling the father of a girl to restore her to her husband and awarding imprisonment to the father till he agreed to send the girl

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What advantage did you get out of it?

Sardar Sant Singh: I may tell my Honourable friend, that he will get his own turn soon. Let him not worry. The time has come when my Honourable friend might be screwed under the Defence of India Act to do something which he may not like to do. The latest exhibition of the exercise of powers under the Defence of India rules is found in arresting political opponents so that a majority in a Provincial Legislature could be maintained and the Ministry could function. These are the ways of the working of the Defence of India Act and the rules framed thereunder. After the last war, in 1914-18, the Defence of India Act culminated in the introduction of martial law in the Punjab. A committee was soon appointed and its report is known as the Hunter Committee report. In that report the committee came to the conclusion that the provisions of the Defence of India Act have been abused for purposes for which the Defence of India Act was not intended. I referred to that in my speech when the Defence of India Bill was under discussion and my Honourable friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, from the Punjab, got up and told us that the days of Dyers and O'Dwyers were gone never again to return.

We would welcome it if it were so. But in the working of the Defence of India Rules what has been our experience in the Punjab recently? Women and children were assaulted in the main street of Anarkali at Lahore when they were carrying on an agitation against a local measure. What has that to do with the war effort unless, in the legal phraseology, there could be said to be remote connection with it? It may be that you are walking on a path and a company of policemen or soldiers are also walking on it, and you are said to be obstructing the path and arrested under the Defence of India Rules. That is the manner in which your administration is going on and yet my Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, for whom I have got great regard, says that the distrust . . .

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Is the Punjab Government representative of the people of that Province or not.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I think the Honourable Member is devoting too much time to provincial affairs. The Punjab has got its own Assembly and I think the members there are competent to discuss their own affairs. The Honourable Member must leave the provinces alone.

Sardar Sant Singh: Then I come to the actions of this benevolent Central Government. What has happened here in Delhi? Certain Sikhs were arrested under the Goondas Act. The matter went to court and no less an authority than a Tribunal presided over by the Sessions Judge of Delhi found that the Goonda Act had been misapplied in that case and let them off. No sooner were they acquitted than the Criminal Law Amendment Act was applied and they were asked to go out of Delhi for six months. One of them was running lorries and cars here and he had a petrol pump and he had to leave after that. He went to live at Ghaziabad to look after the business. Then the Defence of India Act was applied and he was arrested although he did not do anything in the province. And my information is that the Central Government advised the Provincial Government to arrest this man under the Defence of India Act. This is what the Central Government did. His name is Beant Singh.

Then, Sir, there is the case of Lala Shankar Lal of Delhi. He was arrested and brought to Delhi. I am not going into the merits of this arrest but what justification was there for not allowing him an interview with his wife?

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I learn reliably that Lala Shankar Lal had an interview with his wife recently.

Sardar Sant Singh: Yesterday?

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney: Recently; I cannot give the date.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am glad that after about a dozen letters which I possess at this time and after my protest to the Home Department he has got one interview at any rate.

Then there is another case. A man, during the recent evacuations from Calcutta, came with his wife and children to Amritsar to leave them there. He was a permanent resident of Calcutta, but no sooner did he reach Amritsar than he was arrested then and there under the Defence of India Act. The Bengal Government did not take any action although

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

he was a resident of Bengal, and how the Defence of India Act was applied to this case is still a mystery. My friend, Mr. Joshi, has been advocating the cause of many detenus who for political opinions or political differences fell victims to the Defence of India Act and were deprived of their liberty. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will see that some sort of check is placed on the arbitrary use of the Defence of India Act and the Rules. We do not want to frustrate or even hinder the war effort. The Act was intended and passed by this House for that purpose. But do not strain the terms of the Act to breaking point and bring the war effort as a convenient excuse to suppress the civil liberties of the people of this country. The Penal Code has not yet been expressly repealed by the Defence of India Act; and if any one commits an offence he may be punished in due course of law and with all the safeguards which the law provides. But do not use the Defence of India Act and Rules on mere suspicion and on very remote connection and in matters which have no connection with war effort, because it makes people suspicious and distrustful as my friend Mr. Griffiths says.

Then, Sir, I want to deal with the question of racial discrimination. Racial discrimination is still to be found looming large both in the services as well as in other departments of Government. For the same service done by an Indian he is paid much less than his fellow Anglo-Indian or a European. Why should it be so? When Indians of very high qualifications—Graduates, Masters of Arts, Masters of Science, who have obtained first class diplomas in the University as well as lawyers—start their life with a bare salary of Rs. 60 or Rs. 80 per month, why for the same service—typist or clerk—a man of another community is paid about Rs. 100, Rs. 150 and sometimes Rs. 300 excluding other allowances. What is the purpose for which you are taxing us? You are taxing us in order to meet the requirements of the Defence Services, the needs of defence. This is not a need of defence that where you can get a typist at Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 you should pay Rs. 150 or more. You must save that money and use it for the purpose of strengthening the defences of this country and for the purpose of providing amenities for the troops who defend us and who are sacrificing their lives for our sake. But do not please pay enhanced salaries to persons who use that amount in Astoria, in dances, dinners and what not. This is not a defence effort. (Interruption.) I wonder, Sir, if Mr. Griffiths becomes Minister in charge of Internal Security here, he will use the Defence of India Act

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: I have never gone to Astoria.

Sardar Sant Singh: What I say is that those who waste money on these things when all that money is required for the war effort, are they falling within the Defence of India Act? They are. And I will say that the Finance Department should take pretty good care in reducing the salaries of those who are being paid very heavy salaries merely because they happen to belong to a different community. This is a serious grievance of Indians.

Then, in connection with this question of racial discrimination, is the treatment meted out by those who are being employed in the Defence Department to command our troops—I refer to Australia. Recently, I think, it was the Australian Prime Minister who made a speech before the Australian Parliament that Australia shall be maintained for the Whites only. No coloured man will be permitted to go to Australia. My Honourable friend, Mr. Zafar Ali Khan told us a story yesterday that mechanics who were evacuated from Singapore went to Australia for protection

as evacuees, but they were not admitted. Is this the policy that is conducive to that helpful co-operation which probably we all desire? Why not take this question in hand and do something to remove the misunderstandings that are growing particularly in this war time?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As the Honourable Member is not going to finish now, he will continue after Lunch.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Chairman (Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang) in the Chair.

Sardar Sant Singh: I next want to make a few observations on the law of contempt as it prevails in India today. I do not want to go into the details of this law—I wish the Honourable the Law Member had been here—but I will only state this point that two cases have recently occurred and one or two cases occurred some time back, in the Lahore High Court and in the Allahabad High Court, which has drawn public attention to the short-comings of the law of contempt as it prevails now. Some of the Honourable Members must have read the book *Magna Charta* by K. L. Gauba, for which he was held up for contempt of court in the Lahore High Court, and has since been convicted for six months. Without going into the merits of the case, I want to say that the present law of contempt has proved to be a weapon of tyranny in the hands of some of the judges. It is the duty of the Legislature to look into those judgments and come to the conclusion whether such vast powers should be allowed to remain in the High Court, as they possess today. In one case the law of contempt was used for the purpose of getting some cases withdrawn by force which were pending in the Bombay Presidency. There are several instances given in that book *Magna Charta*, which are quoted from the judicial records, where, in my opinion, the power given under the law of contempt has not been used wisely, if not actually abused by the High Courts. I will draw

The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow (Member for Railways and Communications): On a point of order, Sir. Honourable Members are allowed very wide latitude in criticising any acts of the Government during the discussion of this Bill; but the Honourable Member seems to be departing from it and criticising both the law and certain High Courts. I would ask for your ruling on the point.

Mr. Chairman (Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang): I think the Honourable Member should not make any remarks concerning the correctness or otherwise of the decisions of the High Courts.

Sardar Sant Singh: I wanted to make it clear and I have tried to make it clear that I am not going into the merits of those cases. I am not questioning the rightness or otherwise of the convictions given. What I am questioning and what I am entitled to say in this House is that a certain piece of legislation has been interpreted by the High Courts in a manner that it calls forth a change in law.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I submit that that does amount to questioning the correctness of the decisions of a court.

Mr. Chairman (Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang): Certainly that would mean that a High Court has failed to exercise its jurisdiction judicially, and, therefore, the Honourable Member had better refrain from passing any remarks about the High Courts.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I submit this? I think I have failed to explain my position; and I will try once more to assure you that I am abiding by your ruling. I am not questioning the correctness of the judgment of the High Court on the law as it stands today. What I am questioning is whether the vast powers that are given to the High Court today, under the law of contempt as it stands today, should not be curtailed; and I am perfectly within my rights and within the rules governing the conduct of debates in this House to draw attention of the House to. I will be transgressing the rules if I say that the judgments are wrong or not in accordance with the law—I am not saying that. The law as it stands today has been administered—I do not question the right of the judges not to interpret the law as it stands; but what I say is that the law as it stands should be altered; the effect of the law should not be what it is today; and this House, and, particularly the Government, should undertake modification and amendment of the law, so that the powers which are vested in the High Courts today under the present law should be curtailed. That is the point of what I am saying, and I think I am perfectly within my rights when I say that. I do not propose and I have not gone into the merits of the judgment of the High Court. I do not want to do that; the rules do not permit me, and I would not go into that; but those Honourable Members who have read that book must have been influenced to a very great extent that the law of contempt requires to be overhauled in view of some of the rulings of the High Courts. The power vested in the High Courts should be seriously curtailed, so that the liberties of the subject may be protected

Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Nominated Non-Official): Is there a copy of the book in the Library or in the hands of any gentleman here?

Sardar Sant Singh: I think if the Honourable Member tries to get a copy, he will get it; it is proscribed in the Punjab, but not in the Delhi province.

Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan: Where can you get it in the Delhi province.

Sardar Sant Singh: I think he should apply in the right quarters, which he should know better than I do

Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan: Which quarter, please?

Mr. Chairman (Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang): Honourable Members need not carry on a conversation between themselves.

Sardar Sant Singh: Thank you, Sir. I wanted to avoid it.

Next is my appeal to the administration of the Delhi province which I propose to make once more. I am glad the Honourable the Home Member is there. I listened very carefully to his speech and to the reiterations of facts which he disclosed on that unhappy incident about the Sisganj

Gurdwara in November last. I think I am right in pointing out to the administration that the obligation to enhance the respect for law does not lie on one party alone. The executive Government is as much in duty bound to see that the respect for law is enhanced as the people who are governed by that law. The incident which I related the other day, in this House, is not such which would enhance the respect for law. My friend read out large extracts the other day from the communique issued by the Delhi Government and pointed out that minimum force was used, and that nothing was done against the provisions of the law. Sir, these are old repetitions of a formula when the executive does a wrong and wants to justify itself. May I ask the Honourable the Home Member whether he has ever calmly considered over the situation and to say whether it was or it was not a fact that horses' hoofs were used for trampling down women and children engaged in religious worship in a religious congregation? Was it the minimum force that was used? Was it not wrong to employ tear gas to disperse a peaceful congregation engaged in religious worship . . .

The Honourable Mr. M. S. Aney: May I draw the attention of the Honourable Member—not on a point of order, but as a matter of convenience, to the fact that there was a motion on this subject and it was fully discussed in the House, and if he can avoid a repetition of those facts, it would be a convenience to all interests.

Sardar Sant Singh: Sir, I would not repeat the incident again, but I want one thing the Honourable the Home Member to take note of and to tell us what he is prepared to do in the matter, and it is this. Sir, Delhi is the capital town of India. Here those who are put in charge of the administration in the capital town of India should have some sense of responsibility developed in them, they should have some method of doing things which may not be done in the provinces, though there too they ought to be done. My point is that only those public servants who are known for their sobriety and for their broad-mindedness should be posted in Delhi. I can tell my friend, the Honourable the Home Member, that Mr. Kilburn is not one of them. He is not known for sobriety, nor for broad-mindedness. I thought that the administration would do justice and smoothen the feelings of the Sikh community by transferring him from this province. But no such step has so far been taken. I would still appeal to the Honourable the Home Member that Mr. Kilburn's presence in Delhi is a source of heart-burning to every Sikh who is living here, and the only suggestion I can again make to my friend is—please transfer him to some other place, and let Delhi be put in charge of a Superintendent of Police endowed with a broader view, a larger outlook and greater sobriety in manners and methods than Mr. Kilburn. After all, these are war times, and you want people to be attracted towards the administration; you don't want people to curse the administration. And I say it is due to the Sikh community that Mr. Kilburn should be immediately transferred from Delhi . . .

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): He should be transferred to a place where there is no Sikh? Is that your suggestion?

Sardar Sant Singh: I don't say that. My point is that Delhi is the capital of India, and so here we want officers endowed with a greater sense

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

of responsibility and broad-mindedness to be posted in charge of the province than in the provinces where such idiosyncrasies and fantasies can be put up. However, I leave that point there.

Then, my next point is, that the Sikh community is paying much more taxes and making a much larger contribution to the finances of the Central Government than their mere number indicates. We are one per cent. of the population of the whole of India, we are 14 per cent. in the Punjab. If you want me to put up my proposition in a financial way, I shall do so; I am afraid that the proportion of Sikhs in the services of the Central Government is very limited. I have studied the returns furnished to us the other day, returns relating to the percentage of communities employed in the various Departments, and to my utter surprise I find that, with rare exceptions, in all the higher posts and gazetted posts, there is not even a single Sikh

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Because they are all engaged as contractors which pays them better.

Sardar Sant Singh: My friend, Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad, is not here, otherwise he would have taken up your point immediately. The point I am trying to make is this, that the percentages given there as one per cent. two per cent., in some places as 1.5 per cent., but never above 2.5 per cent.; are not at all correct. Some represent a typist Sikh out of so many, and, therefore, they say that Sikhs have got 25 per cent., including Chaprassis, Mechanics and so on and so forth. I don't understand the meaning of these percentages

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Still you are very rich.

Sardar Sant Singh: We are rich in spite of the Government. Therefore, I would draw the attention of the Honourable the Home Member that by mere showing of percentages by giving small posts to Sikhs will not help matters, nor can you do justice by the Sikh community. Sir, the Sikh community is helping the Government in the war effort by organizing the Khalsa Defence League which no other community has done so far. But this is the general complaint among the Sikhs everywhere in the Punjab and outside it that Sikhs are receiving a rebuff so far as the higher posts are concerned in the services of the Government of India.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Especially in the Central P. W. D.?

Sardar Sant Singh: In your absence I referred to you when my friend the Baronet got up and mentioned about the contractors and I said that you had studied this question well. I am sorry you were not present then. Sir, there is a paucity of Sikhs in the higher services of the Central Government. It is no good telling us that the percentages are complete. I would like to know if the Finance Member and the Home Member would find it convenient to compile statistics in a manner which would show the percentages in values and disclose how much money is paid to each community in each Department? That will show whether we are getting one per cent. of our proportionate share or not

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: You know the balance sheet of New Delhi.

Sardar Sant Singh: We will prepare a balance sheet of Aligarh, as well. Sir, it is no good giving an eyewash and telling the public that the community has got so much percentage when a few typists, mechanics and ordinary clerks are employed. I hope the Honourable the Home Member as well as the Honourable the Finance Member will look into this matter.

I shall now deal with a pure question of finance which my Honourable friend wanted me to take up, and that is this. It deals with the defence budget. I only ask for information on that point. The Honourable the Finance Member told us in his speech that the actual cost of the defence services amounts to something like 400 crores, though India pays about a quarter of that amount. I just want to know, how this money is spent. Are we paying for our troops sent overseas, and if we are paying for our troops sent overseas which are probably much less in number than the troops which are kept in India, how is it that the cost of those troops who are in India in greater numbers than those who are sent overseas, comes to much less than in the case of those sent overseas. The next point is about the equipment and munition which we are supplying to the troops overseas. Is it or is it not a charge upon Indian revenues?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: No.

Sardar Sant Singh: I thought so, that it is not a charge. I am glad to hear it from the Honourable Member. How is that money realised and from whom? Is it from His Majesty's Government or from those in whose country the troops are placed? The third point which I want to know is this. Troops sent overseas—I am deliberately avoiding the figures concerning them—troops sent overseas are regarded as defending the outlying borders of India. Are they not defending similarly the frontiers of, say, Egypt, the frontiers of, say, Great Britain itself, because they are all involved in defending the Empire today. And what proportion is being shared by His Majesty's Government in the cost of these troops? I will request him to kindly explain when he gets up to make a reply.

An Honourable Member: He has given one-fourth and three-fourths.

Sardar Sant Singh: Lastly, Sir, I will finish by submitting this. The peril is nearing India, that is common ground between us and those who are in power today. May I appeal to those who are in charge of power today to change their policy and try all methods by which the trust of the people is regained and rehabilitated in the executive Government of this country?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Mr. Chairman, when I came down to this House this morning it was not my intention to take part in this debate, and even now, I propose to confine my remarks briefly to two points. I have, in fact, been called to my feet by the speech, and particularly, the first part of the speech of my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh,—a speech which, with the greatest respect, I must characterise as having been definitely unhelpful in view of the forthcoming visit to this country of Sir Stafford Cripps. It was a speech, the first part of which was imbued with suspicion and impregnated through and through with a desire to hark back to the past. It was full of charges about racial

[Mr. P. J. Griffiths.]

discrimination and allegations that what had been done should not have been done, and what had been omitted should have been done. He began by talking of equality, he went on to the subject of minorities, and then he came to the question of coercion. I want to suggest to him that every one of those words, every one of those thoughts suggests disunity rather than unity, and that at this particular juncture of Indian history

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: May I remind the Honourable Member that Sir Stafford Cripps is coming?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: If the Honourable Member will have patience to hear me, he will see how I suggest we should approach the subject of Sir Stafford's visit. Every one of those ideas suggests disunity. I want to impress upon this House that the one thing which we need particularly to emphasise in this country above everything else at this moment, is the possibility of building up unity. To every problem now I personally apply three tests. I ask whether a particular solution is likely to help in the war effort. I ask whether it is likely to help in preserving the peace of India internally, and I ask, thirdly, whether it is likely to lead towards self-government for this country. I would ask my Honourable friend to apply these three tests to the speech which he has just made and then to say if he possibly can, that that speech in any way contributes to any one of those three major objects.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I make a personal explanation, Sir? My Honourable friend has asked me that question. I may assure him that if he keeps his bureaucratic traditions behind and begins to bring a calm judgment to his mind, he will find that these are the things which can help war effort, and not what he is going to talk.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: If my Honourable friend thinks that dwelling on differences in real life is a practical method of achieving unity, he has been brought up in a school of experience very different from that to which most of us are accustomed. And I do suggest to him, if we want to achieve unity at this moment, by far the best way of doing it is to stop talking about factors that make for disunity. Let me remind Honourable Members of the appeal made by Mr. Winston Churchill in connection with the visit of Sir Stafford Cripps in which he hopes that "no words will be spoken or debates held here or in India which would add to the burden which he has assumed in his mission". Every one of us here wants to see India united, to see India self-governing, to see India strong to repel the possible invader. We can achieve that unity and achieve that strength if we will avoid recrimination and avoid bickering. My Honourable friend, Sardar Sahib, spoke of mistrust, and he said that the mistrust which exists between Government and the people is "your fault". I do not know whether he meant the fault of the Government or the fault of the British, but it was somebody's fault. I would suggest to him that the lesson of history is that when there is mistrust there has nearly always been blame attaching to both sides. And in the matter of mistrust between Government and the people, I am fully prepared to admit that the British have had their share. They have some responsibility

for that mistrust, and my Honourable friend himself will also admit that he and his community and the people of this country have also borne their part in bringing about that mistrust.

An Honourable Member: They had no power.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Whosoever's fault that mistrust may have been, it is a luxury which we cannot afford now. I for my part am willing to put aside that mistrust, and my appeal to Honourable Members today is that they for their part will put aside that mistrust. I can assure my friend, on behalf of my community that, if we had lingering amongst us any remnants of mistrust, we put those aside now. We welcome the forthcoming visit of Sir Stafford Cripps in a spirit of open mindedness and determination to help him to find a solution.

Sardar Sant Singh: I welcome that statement.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: I am sure you do and that is why I made the appeal to you. It is not only a question of putting aside that mistrust.
 3 P.M. If this mission is to have a chance of success, let us go even further, and for the next few weeks, let us try to put aside every topic which can reasonably be described as bitterly controversial. We have got rather into the habit in these days of thinking in terms of differences, how the interests of the European are different from the interests of the Indian, how the view point of the Muslim is different from the view point of the Hindu and often the view point of the Sikh. Differences do exist, but my appeal to every Member of this House today is, let us for the time being stop thinking about those differences. They will not cease to exist, I do not mean that. Let us stop being obsessed with them and sit down rather to think exactly how much we have in common and I am satisfied that we shall find that what we have in common between us is a good enough basis, given determination and good will, on which to build a new self-governing India, free from these dissensions which have been disfiguring India for some years past. We can achieve unity if we are determined to do it and if we achieve unity Sir Stafford Cripps will at least have a chance. I take it that every Member of this House rejoiced when he heard that Sir Stafford Cripps was coming on this mission to India, for his record is at least a guarantee of the sincerity of the British Government in its intention of giving India self-government and it is a guarantee that ability and integrity in the discharge of the task will not be lacking. But not even Sir Stafford Cripps, with all his record behind him, can achieve anything at all, unless we first put ourselves in such a frame of mind that unity is possible between us.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Mahtta (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Including the bureaucrat.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: Yes, including myself and including you. I am trying to include us all in one common condemnation and one common determination to do better in the future. We have reached a stage in our history today when we dare not allow Sir Stafford Cripps' mission to fail. Failure of that mission may mean things far more serious than can be foreseen or described. As far as my community is concerned, we will do nothing whatsoever by word or deed or statement in the Press to lessen

[Mr. P. J. Griffiths.]

the chances of success. We will allow no rancorous thoughts about the past, no prejudice or arrogance in any way to diminish the prospects of a happy settlement of the Indian political issue and I ask everybody here to join us in a self-denying ordinance, an ordinance of restraint and determination that every word that we say between now and the visit of Sir Stafford Cripps shall be directed towards the one end of achieving unity in this country and putting this country in a condition to stand against the enemy without the gates. The object of this restraint will be exactly the same as the objects which have been set forth by His Excellency the Viceroy in inaugurating the national war front. I believe my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, was half jesting when he saw some sinister motive in the inauguration of this front.

Sardar Sant Singh: I never said that. My friend misunderstood me. I only wanted to get an explanation of this one sentence in that statement and nothing more. The statement said: "You will be invited during the next few weeks to enrol yourselves in the national war front". I only wanted an explanation of that. I never questioned it and there is nothing sinister in what I said.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: I can possibly assist the Sardar Sahib in understanding what was meant by that sentence. It has no connection with any conscription or any kind of elaborate mechanism for carrying on the war. It is purely and simply a campaign to re-enforce and mobilise public opinion. It is first and foremost, in the words of the Viceroy himself, a call to action for everyone of us, a call to close the ranks and stand shoulder to shoulder against an aggressor whose conduct in the peaceful countries which he has overrun brands him as barbarous and pitiless. It is an attempt to build up morale, to keep up the courage of each one of us in this country, be he an Indian or European, in facing the dangers that are not far ahead.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: Why don't you say Englishman, instead of European? Germans are Europeans, Italians are Europeans.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: My friend has put me in a quandary. I see the force of his objection yet I cannot possibly say "Englishman", because I am a Welshman.

Sardar Sant Singh: Please say "Briton".

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: If I say "Briton", I may be accused of being ancient. I fully accept the spirit of my Honourable friend's correction. The front aims at instilling determination in the face of danger. Some of us in this House have some experience of the sickening sound of the explosion of a bomb and the rattle of the machine gun and we know that when these two sounds are heard even the stoutest heart may quail unless that heart is enforced by some inner principle. This national war front aims at providing the inner principle by which all our hearts may be enforced in times of danger—the principle of unity, of readiness to sacrifice, one for all, and of resistance to a common danger. Those are objects which can appeal and do appeal to every one of us in this House irrespective of political affiliations or philosophical views. They are objects which call on each one to give of his best in this time of danger. Not only will

he give of his best but he will so try to spread this national war front movement that other people will be encouraged by our example also to give of their best. Let us remember at this time that the eyes of the world are directed towards India; our position in the world of the future and the respect which we shall command amongst the nations depend very largely on our bearing in the months that lie ahead of us. Let us so bear ourselves that India will earn glory, that the place of India in the respect of the world will stand higher at the end of the war than it did at the beginning. Let us so frame and fashion our thoughts that we shall echo those words uttered the other day by Madame Chiang-Kai-Shek. "The spirit of new China is one for all and all for one. We are united by suffering and victory will crown our efforts". Let us so frame and fashion our thoughts that we shall be able to say that "the spirit of the new India"—and when I say new India I mean the India that embraces British, Indians and every other community living within its coasts—"is one for all and all for one. We are united by suffering and victory will crown our efforts". It is in this spirit that I want to make my appeal to every Honourable Member of this House, irrespective of his political views to join with me in saying that we will be united. We will achieve that unity by suffering if necessary but we will be united. Having achieved that unity, we shall have the strength by virtue of which victory will crown our efforts.

Babu Kallash Behari Lal (Bhagalpur, Purnea and the Sonthal Parganas: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I stand to oppose this Finance Bill and, in doing so, I want to place some facts before the Government to consider, so that they may frame their policy in the future in such a way that it may not be said that they have blundered at the opportune moment. It has been the practice, it has, I may say, almost become the fashion to say—let us forgive and forget as we are now in a dangerous time. It sounds very well to say—Forgive and Forget—in such a moment. But before we think of "Forgive and Forget", we should remember one thing, that even though we forgive and forget the past, at least we should remember what we are going to do in the future. Unless we do that, there will be no meaning in saying that we must forgive and forget and we should try to do something in a haphazard way, because we are in danger. It is always said that we should get rid of any mistrust, and Mr. Griffiths has made the same appeal to us just now. Even if we get ourselves rid of mistrust, how are we going to do things in the future? That is the problem before us. We are informed that Sir Stafford Cripps is coming to visit our country with a mission over which even this House is not today united, because we have been hearing whispers from certain Benches, although we do not know what is in store for us, that we are not all united. I have given my thoughts to this problem of India. Although up till now this Government and most other people were treating this subject as a sort of a plaything, they are now confronted with the reality. It was quite an easy thing for the Government to follow the policy of divide-and-rule all this while. Even, now, when they are on the eve of making some announcement, and God alone knows whether it is in the interest of the people of this country or for their own purpose, they are following the same principle. But hoping that it is surely for the best of us all, we believe that there is some amount of sincerity now in making such an announcement. But we cannot yet know definitely as to how we are going to fare by this announcement.

[Babu Kailash Behari Lal.]

The policy which has been the mainstay of this foreign Government in this country was that at every stage they followed the principle of divide-and-rule. Now that division has assumed such proportions that, though a thing of their own making, they are now perplexed how to manage the situation. They might now be trying to retrace their steps, but they have now reached such a stage that unless they think constructively and unless they retrace their steps in such a thorough way, they cannot now undo the mischief they have done throughout their stay in this country. If I may be excused of saying this, I may tell them at once that it will not pay them to pose as an injured and innocent man as they are at present behaving, because whenever they are confronted with the national demand, the offer of 8th August is thrown at the face of this nation. It is all good to say that there is no unity in this land and that there is no compromise or pact of any kind amongst the people of this country; but may I ask, what the Government themselves have done in this direction? Was it not their duty to see that, during their long stay in this land, they ought to have at least tried to evolve a nation although they believed that the people were so hopelessly divided communally and otherwise? But what have they done? Instead of attempting anything to do away with these divisions, they have done just the reverse. It cannot be said that the British people were so simple and childlike and were so devoid of commonsense that they did not know what to do, or they did not think it proper to help the people to give up their differences or the differences that existed in this country were of such a nature that if they were encroached in any way, the division would still become more acute. They were not such a simple people; they knew all these things. As a matter of fact, people who are destined by God to rule other people know how to rule over them. And they knew it. Even then, they did not do anything to remove these differences; rather they acted otherwise. It may be that the people of this country were not so much politically-minded. Had they been politically-minded from the very beginning, there would not have been this spectacle of so many divisions in this country. But instead of trying sincerely and honestly to do away with those differences, they deliberately helped those differences. It is a historical fact. They cannot suppress it and they cannot go against it. They cannot say that they are so simple and so innocent that they did not know these things at all. They knew this thing and every act of theirs was prompted by this policy.

Sir, I read an elementary book on politics in my B.A. course which was written by some German author. He had written that when one nation wants to rule over another nation, it emphasises over the points of differences in season and out of season. Can we not infer from that what can be the meaning of Muhammadan and non-Muhammadan constituencies? Where is the word "Hindu"? Why was not the word "Hindu" used? Why was the word "Muhammadan" emphasised so prominently in season and out of season. When I mention this, I do not mean to say anything against my Muhammadan brethren. I have not the least intention to say anything against them. My Muhammadan friends should not take these remarks amiss. Surely, the word "Muhammadan" is very much dear to my Muhammadan friends and they cannot be blamed for that. But I ask my British friends, what

is the policy underlying it? They cannot say that they are so innocent and so childlike that they cannot understand the implications of all these things. When I did put a question in this very House some time back and asked the meaning of Hindu water and Muhammadan water at the railway stations, I was laughed at. But there cannot be any water with Muhammadan tenets made soluble in it or Hindu tenets made soluble in it. There cannot be such water on God's earth. But still these things are done by those people who are said to be imbued with a political sense. But I believe there have been attempts by our rulers also in this direction.

When I was the Chairman of the Bhagalpur District Board, a Government servant proposed to me that there should not be any holidays for the Mussalmans at the time of the Dassehra or other Hindu festivals, and there should not be any holidays for the Hindus at the time of the Muharram and other Muhammadan festivals. I said that these festivals have become national festivals, and all persons, irrespective of caste or creed, should take part in them. So, it ought to have been the duty of the Government not to make these festivals communal festivals. I have already said, our rulers are not so simple. They are political people, and they have come to rule over this country. They could rise to their best sense of politics if they wanted to further the cause of this country and they could have made such a lot of improvement. So, even in these minor things I cannot exhaust the vocabulary. The Government have utilised the position in such a way that they have created divisions. One other example, I may quote. Even in the census, we are asked to declare our castes. With every census the castes increase hundredfold. Nobody even among the Hindus want that caste should be so much encouraged. I may narrate to the House how the rules are utilised to promote these caste divisions. In 1930, when the Congress was going to launch Satyagraha in Bihar, the Bihar Provincial Congress Committee printed forms in which particulars about names, fathers' names, castes were asked for. I opposed the column of "caste", and I urged there was no necessity. Anyhow, the President ruled that it was necessary, and so it was retained, and it was made optional for anybody to write if he liked. A few days after that, the President had to get some property transferred, because it was in his name, and, before offering Satyagraha, he wanted it to be transferred. In the transfer deed, he forgot to mention his caste and the Registrar said: "You have omitted to write your caste." I reminded him of my argument against the inclusion of the column, caste, in the Satyagraha form and about his over-ruling me. Then he wrote in a fit of enthusiasm, "Bihari Hindu". But the Registrar said that would not do, because he had Government circulars to the effect that particular castes like "Rajput, Brahman, Kayasth, etc.," should be mentioned. I submit, Sir, here I am "Kailash Behari Lal", or there is "Rajendra Prasad" if these names cannot be distinguished by father's name or place of residence, because there are ten persons of the same name in the same caste in the same village, how does caste help in bringing out the distinction? But here caste is emphasised. I do not know whether there is any secret code for the administration of this country in such matters. The people have been made so much conscious of these small things that they would not care for the interest of the nation. They would care more for the small community to which they belong. Now, Sir, things have come to such a pass that every

[Babu Kailash Behari Lal.]

caste or every community based on a religious group would claim to be not a part of the nation, but a nation by itself. Of course, this is deplorable. This ought to have been seen long before by our rulers who claim to be a political people. It is not a thing of a day's making. It has been in the making for some time past.

Sir, we know the history of Pakistan. Our Muslim brothers claim to call themselves a nation. They were before long only a religious group, a religious community, and now they have become a nation. Naturally as a nation, they claim a homeland which now even our masters, the British rulers, shirk and shiver in their shoulders that this thing has happened unexpectedly. Attempts are being made to explain what this Pakistan means. Yesterday my Honourable friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, tried to explain that Pakistan does not mean anything but the right of the majority to enjoy this majority right in those provinces where they are in a majority. God knows what this distinction means. I have got a pamphlet in my hands written by Mr. C. Rahmat Ali, Founder President, Pakistan National Movement, which does not define Pakistan in the same way as my Honourable friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, described. This book is called: "The Millat of Islam and the Menace of 'Indianism'." I think this pamphlet might have been sent to other Honourable Members also.

Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad: We know nothing about the author of this pamphlet, and so we are not responsible for its contents. He is not known to anybody in this House.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: He is a Muslim gentleman. Surely, you do not suggest that this pamphlet was got up by the Hindu Mahasabha. The author blames not only the people of this country, but he blames even the Government for overlooking the claims of the Muslims. What is the fundamental creed of this movement? The author of this pamphlet says:

"What is the 'fundamental creed' of the Movement? It is that we are Muslim, not Hindu; Pakistani, not Hindustani, and Asian, not 'Indian'; that, in retrospect, the 'India of today' is the 'South Asia of yesterday', but in prospect, the sphere of the individual solidarity of several nations of tomorrow; that, at present, 'India' is the arbitrary name of the British Empire in South Asia, but, in future, it will be the natural designation of 'Indianism', confined to its national home in India proper (Hindustan); that as this Empire is composed of several countries of south Asia, of which India (Hindustan) is only a minor unit, no system of government, whether inspired by the Gladstonian soul of British imperialism or by the Gandhian spirit of Indian nationalism, or by grasping capitalism of both, can ever succeed unless it recognises and guarantees, the distinct nationhood of the nations living therein; and finally, that in so far as we are concerned, we will accept only that political solution which is based upon the aforesaid eternal verities—verities which inspire the "Creed of the Movement" and ensure the sovereign status of Pakistan, of Bengal and of Usmanistan".

Of course, I welcome that my Honourable friends should denounce this pamphlet and its author. I would rather wish that the whole principle of it is denounced. But I have quoted this as I apprehend that this has been growing gradually and slowly

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Why is this idea growing? Have you ever thought of that. Diagnose that first?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: This thought has been growing, because it has been fed on some wrong ideas. Whatever might be the grievance, and whatever might be the tyranny of a brother against another brother, that cannot lead the one to say that the father of the two brothers is not common, nor that the mother of the two is common. Whatever the grievances may be, whatever may be the grievances of the Muslims against the Hindus, the Muslims have begun to say "India is not our motherland".

Some Honourable Members (from the Muslim League Benches): No, no. We never said that.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I welcome that denial. I am merely basing my argument on this pamphlet. The thoughts of the Muslims are advancing by leaps and bounds, from a religious community they now claim to be a separate nation. The Muslims want to parcel out a portion of Hindustan. They do not want to call themselves residents of Hindustan! God knows what ideas they have got in their minds. I only hope that the day will come when you will denounce this Pakistan altogether, sooner or later.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: I may point out that we are not going to denounce the Pakistan at all. That is our creed. Pakistan means that Muslims are a nation and as a nation they want the North West corner of India and also the North-East corner of India to be their homeland.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I am afraid you have denounced in part some of your ideas, although you are not prepared to denounce Pakistan, and the fun of the thing is that most of you do not know even in your own minds what Pakistan means. I find there is so much confusion in your own minds.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman (Patna Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): What does the Honourable Member understand by Pakistan?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: As I read this book, all kinds of ideas are conjured up as regards Pakistan, the ideas are growing by leaps and bounds. I cannot fix what Pakistan means. But I can say that Pakistan means that certain portions of Hindustan, in which the Muslims form a majority, should be carved out into a homeland for the Muslims. I am not concerned so much for the well-being of the Pakistan of your imagination. I say this thing has come out of your imagination and it is surely detrimental to the well-being of the national growth of this country. If I am wrong, it is better. I would rather welcome the day when you denounce it as we denounce it today. You must form part and parcel of the same nation to which we all belong.

My Honourable friend, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan, asked me whether we have thought it as to why it has come about. I have, of course, thought how this difference has come. It has come in a clumsy and unhappy way and now one section even disclaim their country and their nationhood. And I am blaming this Government for having helped this situation, because it is not a question of material grievance when this or that wrong has been done to one community. Such wrongs are bound to remain so long as people live in this world. Today you talk of

[Babu Kailash Behari Lal.]

grievances among Hindus and Mussalmans; tomorrow, if power is given to Mussalmans, there will be grievances among Shiah and Sunnis. So if all people belong to one religion, there will be grievances among different families. So grievances will remain, but for that you should not dis-integrate the nation in such a way. That can be remedied if we go to the root cause. The whole trouble has been brought about by the policy that Government have followed in this country. They have even tried to destroy history. They have written history in such a way that students of the same stock, sitting on the same benches and reading the same books, form different ideas. For instance, they write about the Muhammadan invasion of India. There has been Moghul invasion and Pathan invasion, Persian invasion and Arab invasion,—but no Muhammadan invasion. Mahmud of Ghazni and Mohammad Ghori were Afghans and Chengiz Khan and Babar were Moghuls, Mir Kasim was an Arab, and so on. So history would have been properly written if the nationality had been mentioned and students of any religion might have learnt that these were invaders and not their forefathers.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Has the Honourable Member read Bhai Parmanand's History of India? If he has not, he must try and get it. He will find a remedy in that book.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: History has been spoiled in that way in order to create different impressions in the minds of different people. They belong to the same stock and their forefathers were the same with the only difference that some of them adopted Islam and others followed the ancient religions of India. With that they did not change their race or nationality. But now even well educated persons, even Honourable Members of this House talk as if their forefathers ruled India for 700 years. It was the Mughals, Pathans or Persians who ruled this country, and they did as much injury to your forefathers as they did to those of the Hindus. Nadir Shah shed as much of Muslim blood in Delhi as Hindu blood; but when a drama was played in the Patna College by the students, in which Nadir Shah was shown as a villain, there was a riot over that. You can thus understand how the mind works. These people were foreigners. Of course, they settled down here and they became one with the people; but that was a different thing just as there are so many Christians from Europe who have settled here. They are ruling over this country, but by no stretch of imagination the Indian Christians can say that Queen Victoria was their great grandmother or King George V was their grandfather. No Tom, Dick or Harry who has been converted into Christianity from the stock of the people of this country will say that. It is simply absurd to make that suggestion. And the Mussalmans of this country should take it as an insult if any one suggested that these invaders were their forefathers. And it is in this way that the minds of the people have been poisoned and they have begun to think in separate terms about each other. This has been deliberately emphasised and given importance by our rulers. Let our rulers put their hands on their hearts and say whether they have not followed this policy of bifurcating the people. They can even now retrace their steps and declare once for all that they have changed their policy; otherwise no amount of tinkering and patchwork will do now.

Even in political and constitutional matters I charge this Government with having been insincere. For instance, the present Act of 1935, which is now being worked out on the basis of Federation has been brought into existence not to satisfy the demand of the people but to create one more mischief. Throughout that Act you find attempts made to sow the seeds of mischief that may bear fruit in course of time and may disrupt the country still further. India did not require a copy of Europe in the matter of Federation. We had before our eyes the history of Europe which consists of so many small nations like our provinces in dimension and importance; and what a sad spectacle Europe is presenting today! They attempted through the League of Nations to form a Federation but they failed; it burst like a bubble, and there is no hope even for the future. Knowing all this, how could they suggest a Federation composed of the provinces with so much of importance of the component units and with an attempt to weaken the power of the Central Government? So long as India is in their hands they do not want to weaken the Central authority. But they have sown the seeds of mischief, so that if at all the provinces grow strong they may fight against each other. India required a unitary system of Government in which provinces should have sufficient opportunity to develop and grow but at the same time to remain under one strong Central Government. But what do we find even in the cry of Pakistan? It would mean disintegrating the Central power just as you are attempting to do. And the helplessness of the League of Nations which we are seeing today that is to be repeated in India in the course of time.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): What about the United States?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I do not know. I have not made a special study of the United States. But, if at all there is, it is a misnomer.

So, even now this Government has time to beware. If they do not beware of the danger they have already created then if the situation develops itself, they should thank themselves and not the people of this country. If today they are confronted with a difficult situation, they should not bring up 8th August offer before the country and say: "Here it is. We are honest. You are all guilty. Patch up your quarrel and we are going to give you." This sort of argument will not do. They should go deep into the mischief they have done and they should now retrace their steps. However, the question suggested by my Honourable friend, Sir Yamin Khan, was as to what is the remedy I suggest.

Of course what I am placing before this House look revolutionary at first sight, but it is not so revolutionary if you think over it and if our rulers might have thought over it some years before. I am going to suggest that in order to do away with this evil, you must first conceive the idea of one nation and you should call it by one name. You cannot have different names for calling the nationals of one country. So what can be that one name. It will be, surely, astonishing for you to hear it for the first time but you should hold yourself in patience, and I am going to tell you that it is not at all objectionable. The one name should be that by which even the Mussalmans of this country are called in America, even in Arabia where they go for performing Haj, and that is the word 'Hindu'. They are called Hindus even outside India.

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: They are called Hindi Mussalmans.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: There are Japanese Mussalmans; there are *Chhni* Mussalmans. Similarly, there should be Hindu Mussalmans.

Of course, some friends suggested to me why not Hindustani Mussalmans. The mischief will remain. Psychologically people have been made to think of Hindus and Mussalmans as two equals and separate entities. That is to be demolished and the Muslims are to be accommodated in the Hindu nation and placed along with other religions under the Hindu nation. Hindu is a nation. Hindu is a term that never indicates religion; even as regards the Hindus they could make it clear what they are in the habit of saying Hindu Dharma—there is no such thing as Hindu Dharma

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: The word used in Arabia is not Hindu Muslim but Hindi Muslim.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: All right; that makes little difference. My friend, Sir Yamin Khan, says it is Hindu Muslim

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: The expression used in Arabia is Hindus and Hindi.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: If the Honourable Member will allow me to interrupt—let me make it clear that in Arabia they call us Hindu Muslims and in Palestine and Syria they call us Hindi Muslims.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: So there is no such thing as Hindu religion

An Honourable Member: Why not Hindustanis?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I was saying that if you adopt the common word Hindustani then the mischief remains, that has been created till now. I want to see that the mischief is undone and there should not be any Hindu religious community. There is no such thing as a Hindu religion. I have given a challenge to most of my Hindu friends even to say if there is any set of tenets which they can lay down as saying this constitutes the Hindu religion. There are hundreds of religions in the Hindu nation. Why not two more, Islam and Christianity? There will be no harm done; the Hindus should disabuse their minds of any idea.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chatterpadhyaya (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Make them two *avatars*.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: They may not take Christ or Muhammad as *avatars*; but they can very well accommodate so many religious preachers of the world. Religions in any part of the world are not the property of that particular part of the world. They belong to the world at large and they can be accepted in any part of the world. So there is no harm if the Muslims and Christians are also included in the word "Hindus"

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: How will you term the Sindhis, because in the old scripts, the terms "Hindi" and "Sindhi" are the two brothers?

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sindhis are Hindus.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: So if the tinge of religion is taken away from the word Hindu, then the word Hindu remains altogether a term denoting a nation, and there can be no objection on anybody's part residing in this country to call himself, a Hindu. Then, Muslim, Christian, Jain, Buddhist, Vaishnava, Shakta, Sikh are all reduced to one common level, and then the whole trouble goes away. There will not be any question of compromise or pact or agreement, as has been suggested till now, because compromise, pact and agreement all suppose the existence of parties; so long as parties remain, there will be a tendency for disintegration and separation, and unless you go to the root cause—of course it cannot be done in a day—but there must be that idea in the minds of those persons who are in authority to set the matter aright, to take the people to the right road and to make of us one common nation. No attempt has been made in the past by the present power to see that the people of this country form one nation. Rather the work that has been achieved by nationalists like Akbar the great has been undone in subsequent years. Our rulers would say that they have not created Muslims or other communities in this country—they were in existence before they came . . .

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: That is also defective history which you have read.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: Even up till 1857, when there was this so-called Sepoy Mutiny, when the people of this country rebelled, they seated Bahadur Shah on the throne, although he was a Muslim by religion, and most of the mutineers were Hindus. It never entered their minds that they were going to make a person sit on the throne who was a Muslim by religion.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: The difficulty is this, that in the case of Muslims it is given in the Holy Book, the Koran: "Hova Sammakumul Muslimin", which, rendered into plain English, means:

"He has called you Muslim"

and now are we to follow the commandments of God, or of you?

Mr. Chairman (Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang): The Honourable Member is attending too much to interruption all round; he had better go on with his speech.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: Our rulers cannot say that the process of nation-building or national fusion did not exist in this country when they took over charge of this country; and if they had any real sincerity in them they would have rather developed on that rather than increased the differences. Since 1857, it is not even one hundred years. But today, not to speak of the Hindus remaining under Muslim rule or the Muslims remaining under the Hindu rule, they are now proposing that they would not remain within one nation; and this is the situation with which our rulers are now confronted; and but for the fact that they are now confronted with a life and death struggle, they would not have even come with the suggestion that now let us forget and forgive the past and build for a brighter future. You may give credit for the intention; and it is no use crying over spilt milk; let us now think that all these suggestions come out of the heart—to forget and forgive and build up a better future. But if they do not still go on the right path, then no amount of diplomatic

[Babu Kailash Behari Lal.]

words and trying to skip over realities will help them out of this situation. They have created the situation with which they are now confronted, and even if up to the last moment they do not retrace their steps, if they do not take to the right key, they will not be able to solve the problem.

My suggestion in this respect will be that they should now give up their idea of dividing India religion-wise. There should be, as they have adopted in Europe and other parts of the world, a division on territorial lines and they should never recognise any other division. There is still time for that. I remember when I put a question even on small matters of looking to the interests of people in certain provinces under a certain territorial jurisdiction, the Honourable Member in charge of Railways said in answer: "Government do not recognise distribution of services in railway on provincial basis." I may remind Sir Andrew Clow that it was he who gave this answer on the floor of this House. It was surely heart-rending to me, and I still pin my faith that a day will come when those who are in authority will realise that territorial recognition is the only basis for building up a nation elsewhere in the world and that will be recognised in India.

But even till now they do not seem to be at all repentant even to express that their recognition of the division of India on a religious basis was wrong. What will be the consequence if they recognise such things on a religious basis? There will be more and more clamour from all the communities inhabiting this vast continent of India to recognise every one of them on a religious basis. Sir, it is not a question of clamour from the different community, but it is a question of encouraging the different communities to make such a clamour to recognise them on a religious basis. The beginning has been made, unfortunately by the authorities higher up. Now the excuse is always made that the clamour is coming from below. I want that the authorities should search their hearts and find out from where the real mischief has begun, whether it has begun from people below who have become the game, or from people above in authority who have introduced this game. If the authorities higher up, directly or indirectly, were a party for introducing this game, then it is time that they retraced their steps and recognised the healthy principle of building up and evolving a nation in this country on a territorial basis.....

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: What do you mean by territorial basis?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: India means it is a home for all Indians residing in all the provinces, but the existence of provinces also will remain. India is a very great country, and so it is said to be a sub-continent. So there must be provinces which have common affinity, a common language, customs and manners. On this basis there are bound to be small divisions, such as we find even in Europe, but they are in no sense better than the provinces of India. So territorial divisions should be recognised and they should be controlled with a sense of reasonableness so that the disintegration of the country may not be helped or encouraged. I don't suggest that though the provinces have got differences in customs, manners, language and other things, they should be helped to develop independently of each other so as to create a situation similar to the one with which Europe is faced today. That should be wisely controlled, and provinces should be given adequate scope to develop according to their own line, but they should remain in the common sub-continent of India.

Sir, I have given my suggestion in regard to this matter and food for reflection for my friends in this House as well as to the Government, so that in time they may retrace their steps and set right the mischief they have already done in order that in future all may feel alike for the evolution of a common nation. Unless that feeling is created, unless some effective steps are taken to bring about such a feeling, there will be no hope for this country.

Then, Sir, I come to some of the wrongs that this Government has done in the matter of administration, because it has become customary to point out of such defects when considering the Finance Bill. The first to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government is in regard to their military policy they have pursued in this country. I have been saying this for a long time that this Government has blundered in regard to their military policy, in listening to the advice of others or believing in their wisdom and creating martial and non-martial classes. Now, I am sure Government must be repenting as to why they created such classes as martial and non-martial. When they recruited untrained men and expected them to do justice to their duties, it was not their fault if they could not discharge their duties satisfactorily, and they cannot be blamed. It was the fault of the Government, because they created these martial and non-martial classes and prevented all classes of people from getting into the army. Government ought to have foreseen that a time might come as it has come now, when they might be compelled to draw upon the other classes also for enlistment in the army. There would have been absolutely no harm if other classes also had been encouraged to join the army in peace time and given them training. The so-called non-martial classes were all discarded in those days, and now recruitment is made from those very classes, and it must be said to their credit that some of them are giving a good account of themselves, and if others are not fulfilling the expectations formed of them, they are not to blame, and for that the responsibility is of the powers that be, as they had divided the people into martial and non-martial classes. Sir, even to day in the midst of this war that policy is still pursued. My friend, Mr. Deshmukh, put a question the other day in this House and some reply was given to it, but I have not seen it. It has been contradicted by Dr. Syed Mahmood, the ex-Minister of the Bihar Government. Mr. Deshmukh asked whether there was any correspondence on the question of military training to youths of Bihar, and the reply given to that question was not very clear or it was evasive, at least it indicated that the Central Government was not so much at fault. To that reply a contradiction has been issued by Dr. Syed Mahmood of Bihar. It has been published, and Dr. Syed Mahmood has clearly said that the reply of the Central Government was such that the Bihar Government could not possibly start giving military training to youths in that province; that the Central Government wanted to keep control of military affairs including military training in their own hands or something like that. So it is clear that even in the midst of this great war, the Government are so suspicious of the people that they would not like to impart military training to youths who are non-martial according to Government.

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

The Government should question themselves whether they are right in asking the people to forgive and forget the past, because every day shows the past of the coming morrow, and if you go on committing blunders and

[Babu Kailash Behari Lal.]

saying at the same time 'forget and forgive the past', there will be no end to it. Sir, it is nothing short of hypocrisy for Government to ask the people to forgive and forget the past.

Then, Sir, there are certain central subjects, the working of which in the provinces has caused grave injustice to the people. It is really very painful to mention it, but I feel it is our duty to point out to the Government that such small pin-pricks, such small injustices create a wrong-impression in the minds of the public, it brings about a feeling of hatred against the authority, and it even ends in doing permanent harm to the people themselves. I am not going to give facts and figures about all those things, but I might mention here that the working of the Income-tax Department in particular, the working of the Postal Department, of the Railway Department and also Customs, which are all Central subjects, in the provinces is most unsatisfactory. Of course, in the Postal Department we saw some circulars, to which reference was made by Sir Gurunath Bewoor when he was Director General of Post Offices. He wanted to establish some systematic and just principle, but whether he was allowed to work out that principle or not, he knows it best. Sir, when I had occasion to represent matters to him, he ended the reply by saying that he had some phobia, he wanted to introduce some provincial feeling.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: Some provincial phobia?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: Bengali phobia

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I have forgotten the phobia.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: In any case it is a phobia.

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: I leave it at that. The phobia has caught hold of my friend to such an extent that he remembers it even today. I am placing it before him even to day. Whatever be the phobia, we are concerned with the justice of the thing, we are concerned that they should deal out justice to the people of the locality, because if you bring out a circular telling people that you want to govern them on a wholesome principle with due regard to the claims of the people of the places where recruitment is made, it will not satisfy them if the principle remains only on paper, and it is neither here nor there. It must be translated into practice, and those who are in authority should see that they are not hood-winked by their subordinates and that the people of the soil get real justice. My Honourable friend, Sir Andrew Clow, said that he did not recognise the distribution of services on a provincial basis. That means that he recognises some basis by which the people of one province are totally neglected.

I come to another thing, and that is about the road fund. The principle on which the road fund is being distributed to the provinces is not a just one, because when I was a member of the Road Committee, I tried to bring up this matter and fought hard to have it revised. The principle is that the provinces get their quota according to the petrol they consume. I tried to bring home the injustice of that thing, and I want to place before the House how that principle is working in actual practice. The point is that Bombay, Calcutta and Madras are big cities where people from

neighbouring provinces also go and make use of petrol. Big cities like Madras, Calcutta and Bombay cannot be said to be like towns where only the people of the province concerned live. People from other provinces go there and the other provinces have got a right to share in the profit that those cities get. In this way the provinces which have the good fortune of having Madras, Bombay or Calcutta, get a much larger share, so much so that there is a large surplus accumulated for those provinces because all the roads are not being developed in the cities particularly. After all, the road fund is utilised for developing roads in the interior of the province. Unequal distribution of the road fund leads to the unequal development of roads in the provinces because the share of Bombay goes to the Bombay province, the share of Calcutta goes to the Bengal province, the share of Madras goes to the Madras province. These being big cities, there is more share to those provinces, but the provinces have similar conditions throughout. There is no meaning in giving ten lakhs to Bombay, two lakhs to Bihar, or one lakh to the Central Provinces because.....

Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai Laljee: Is Bombay also Hindi?

Babu Kailash Behari Lal: There is no question of Hindi. Why do you make a distinction in the matter of equal and just distribution of the road fund? This principle should be revised and the matter should be brought up before the House in the form of a Resolution as was done on the last occasion.

Another thing that I want to place before the Government is about a broadcasting station for Bihar. I do not know how far they have progressed, but I saw in the papers that there has been some progress. Up till now, whenever the question was brought up, the Government used to give some evasive reply, that perhaps the Bihar province is served by the station at Lucknow, or the station at Calcutta, or the one in Delhi, and they have not taken into consideration how far a province is profitted or gains if a broadcasting station is established there. I do not want to embarrass the Government, but their programmes are so unequal that in some provinces they are having two or three stations, in other provinces there is not even one. They should look into this matter. With these words I resume my seat.

Sir Henry Richardson (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I am going to talk on the Finance Bill, and I am going to take a few minutes only. The other day when I spoke in the general discussion I made my speech very early on, and the Honourable the Finance Member, although he took some notes of my points,—I think they got blocked out in the subsequent discussion that took place, and, unfortunately, I did not get any reply from him, which I know was an oversight. So, today I tried to time my speech in the middle of things hoping that he will retain the slip on which he will now write one or two points from what I am going to say. Perhaps, I have gained something by his not replying at that time, because I see from the amendments which have been given notice of to clauses 8 and 10 of the Bill, he has answered two of my questions, and I am very grateful for the consideration which has been given in meeting those two points and I have nothing further to say on them.

There are really only two points left. One is regarding the repayment by the Central Government of a portion of the excess profits tax, and

[Sir Henry Richardson.]

it is to be subject to such conditions as the Central Government may hereafter determine. Sir, the Post-war Reconstruction Committee is undoubtedly a very good source from which to enquire regarding what those conditions should be, but I think that it is a matter which requires far wider application, and I hope that the Honourable the Finance Member will take an opportunity of enquiring from all sources who may be interested regarding the imposition of these conditions and as to what they should be. Certainly, there is time for further consideration to be given if the amendment is passed, because it will give us until the 1st July next, which is very much better than the thirty days originally laid down. The other point is regarding the fact that the Government's contribution will be a taxable receipt of the year in which it has been paid and I made the suggestion that the Honourable the Finance Member might say now that the rates of taxation which would be levied on this Government contribution, when it was paid over, would not be higher than those contained in the Budget now before us. I realise, since making that suggestion, that there are certain difficulties in that the assesses' tax depends on the scale in which their income happens to land them but if there can be any means whereby the Finance Member with all his experts who are sitting behind him can make that rule apply in some form or other, so that assesses do know what tax they may be liable for and can calculate accordingly what sort of a gamble this is, it would, I think, very much assist them in coming to a decision on what after all may involve a considerable amount of money, especially in the case of companies that have been paying and may still pay very large excess profits. Also I think that it may help the Honourable Member in the object which he has in mind in getting bigger sums from companies and other assesses affected than may otherwise be the case if they are left in doubt. It is a point that my constituents have brought up and it is obvious that they have it in mind and these two points, namely, the conditions which are not known at the present moment and the tax which is also unknown at the present moment, are the two factors which do make the suggestion rather a gamble. Therefore, I hope that when the Honourable Member replies he will put a red mark against these items and will give me some indication as to what these questions involve. That is all I have to say.

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj (Nominated Non-Official) : Mr. President, it looks as if very few in this House even today realise that the war is on and that it is very near India. Otherwise we should not have had to listen for hours and hours to speeches on Hinduism, Pakistan and the like and particularly I feel, without meaning to attack the claims of the Muslim League for the establishment of Pakistan, that now, more than ever, they should use all their strength, all their energy and all their enthusiasm to defend what will in future become the homelands of Pakistan, because we see already that Japan, if she continues to be successful, will take one limb of the Pakistan, should Assam and Bengal for instance fall into her hands and on the other side if the threatened move of the Germans through Turkey ever takes place, the other limb of Pakistan will also go away. I should, therefore, naturally, expect my Muslim friends to shed their blood in the first place to preserve those homelands, those portions of territory in India which may later become the homelands of Pakistan. If I am not presumptuous I may also turn towards the Congress and those

who are inclined to the view that India must have independence here and now and say that even independence will be a false cry at the present juncture, because we know perfectly well that it is very difficult to defend any independence that we may be able to get, even with the willing consent of the British Government or even of the authorities here. I really feel that the time has come for all of us, as Mr. Griffiths has pointed out, including the Government and the members of the Government, to see that every effort is made on our side to preserve our country from the impending attacks. What makes the problem even more difficult and what causes anxiety in the minds of those who are really interested in the welfare of India are some of the things that have been taking place outside India. For instance, Sir, we are dealing with uncertain factors like the French fleet. We do not know the disposition of the French fleet. The incident that happened in Turkey about the throwing of a bomb outside the Chancellery where Von Papen was residing and the subsequent action of the Turkish Government in arresting a Russian. Then there is the ministerial crisis in Persia and also the constitutional trouble in Egypt and, lastly, the announcement that we read in the papers about Madagascar. These things make me feel that India is being more and more threatened with danger from both sides. That being so, Sir, I wish Honorable Members of this House really consider the question of how best to co-operate with such bad people as the Britishers and with an ancient and worn out Government like the Government of India to ward off this danger. There is no other alternative, I say, except to throw our lot with these people and carry on the defence as best as we can. It is from that point of view that I want to talk on the Finance Bill.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: You have called them a bad people.

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj: Personally, I think they are bad, so far as I am concerned. At a time like this, we feel that we must get on with them as long as the war lasts and see that we put forth our best efforts which might in the end prove to be effective, so far as the forces of aggression go. I find that when people talk of Parliamentary systems and democracies in times such as these, how unreal they are. Even democracies which have enjoyed freedom and which have enjoyed wealth and which have enjoyed empires find it extremely difficult to cope with the Axis powers. At any rate, they find that they are too late in the fight. There is one aspect of the war efforts that are being made by England, America and the other Allies, to which I should like to draw the attention of the House. When the war was first started in 1939 and 1940 the equipment that England then had was not enough at that time to defeat Germany, and the war was then confined just to a part of the continent of Europe. When in the next year they advanced in the matter of preparations and when they increased the war potentials, unfortunately the war was carried on to two continents. Now they find that their material equipment, in spite of speeding up, is not enough to cope with the situation. They will very soon find that the war will spread to both the Hemispheres. In that case, they will find that the preparations have been inadequate all the more, in spite of all the efforts that the United States is now making to cope with the situation. That is the unfortunate position we are in so far as the Axis aggression is concerned.

At the same time, there is a new wonder so far as the success of Japan is concerned. It is a matter, no doubt, of surprise to the Westerners themselves, but it is a matter even of greater surprise to the Asiatics

[Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj.]

themselves. Now, the people in India all admire and wonder at the remarkable successes that have attended the Japanese. No doubt, the military experts and strategists and the apologists of the Allies say that Japan was treacherous in its attacks and it had taken the Allies by surprise and that is the reason why it has succeeded so far. But I personally do not believe in a thing like that. It is, indeed, bad propaganda according to me because, in my opinion, a defence is a defence against all kinds of contingencies. A defence must be a defence against both a friend and a foe. Treachery can exist only between friends and can never exist between persons who are either enemies or potential enemies. That being the position, I am prepared to admit that Japan concentrated its efforts and had organised itself and had worked for a number of years to get what she wanted. She got what she wanted. In the meantime, our Allies were sleeping and had given themselves up to pleasure and probably to profit making. Viewing the situation from this line and also having regard to the forces that are gathering in increasing strength against India, I desire to examine for myself as to how far the Government of India are strong enough to cope with the situation or at least are modern enough to tackle the problem. I personally feel that having regard to their ways, having regard to their traditions and having regard also to its lack of experience, the Government of India, as they exist at present, are not so strong as to stop an enemy of India from taking possession of our country. But I do believe that it can be so re-constructed as to make it possible to move with the modern times and to fight the enemy. It is not for us, especially as Sir Stafford Cripps is coming over to India, even to suggest the possible ways in which the Government of India can be re-constructed. I believe his object in coming over to this country is not merely to solve the constitutional deadlock to the best of his ability but also, as I can read between the lines, and even if the first thing should fail, to re-construct the Government of India in such a way as to be strong enough to meet the crisis.

We have willingly and with a knowledge of the dangers that face us voted all the demands which the Government wanted and we also voted them on the basis of war. But in many a direction, as was pointed out in certain cases like the Supply Department and other Departments, I think, there is a considerable wastage and I am anxious to see that such a wastage does not recur in the Departments.

This brings me to consider the question of the propaganda efforts of the Government. I, personally, feel, without meaning any disrespect or casting any aspersion on the administration of the Member in charge of Information and Broadcasting, that the propaganda that is done in India is somewhat primitive and elementary. I was rather surprised that in India, for instance, it is said that Marshal Goering has been put into the Concentration Camp. Two or three days later we find Marshal Goering going to Turkey and having a Conference there with the German and Turkish Ambassadors there. Again, in the case of Singapore it was said on the very day on which it had fallen that it was still holding out. I am merely saying what I can remember without being able to quote extracts. We often hear many things from the British Broadcasting station which are suppressed by the All-India Broadcasting station here. Things like these give rise to suspicion in the minds of people who can think for themselves. I think it is a thing which ought to be immediately looked into and rectified. That is a matter which relates, I believe, to the

counter-propaganda. Even in the matter of propaganda, certain things do not and cannot appeal to Indians. For instance, I will mention the example of V for Victory. We find everywhere that V stands for Victory. I am sure the Government know and Honourable Members in this House know that a good percentage of the population of India does not know even the letter V and they cannot possibly understand what is meant by V for Victory. On the other hand, wherever this letter V is written, it has unfortunately given room for some mischief-making. We do not know who they are; probably they are students. They have written in certain places the Tamil or the Sanskrit equivalent words which start with the sound of V. For instance I was surprised to see on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway and in some of the electric trains where the letter V was written that some persons had written that V stands for *Vinasakale*, which brings about a kind of defeatist mentality. It gives rise to a very bad counter-propaganda by the enemies when it is done by those who are not interested in the welfare of Indians or the Allies. So that, I honestly feel that the Information Department, or whichever is the Department that is concerned, should immediately convene a conference as to how best to carry on this propaganda as a war effort and also as a counter-propaganda. So far as India is concerned, I am a great believer that it is much better for war efforts that a greater amount of truth is said than suppressed.

My next point also refers to war. I shall again point out, I have already once before said in this House that this war effort ought not to be made entirely a matter for the Britisher and the Britisher alone. I do not know how far you have taken it to heart, but I feel it very sincerely that Japan is laying the foundation or at least is introducing the germs of a particular kind of hatred which I am afraid, if it takes shape will be the basis of the next great war, and God forbid that there should be another war, but if war should be the normal feature of the world, I sincerely feel that the next great war would be fought on the colour basis and Japan is already laying the foundation for that because we find, wherever Japan goes, she says "drive the white devil away" and this gives the impression that she likes the brown and the other devils or angels or whatever she might call them. But in any case, I want that the Government of India should do propaganda to counteract that. In two ways the Government of India can help us. In the first place, as has been pointed out by my Honourable friend, Sir Vithal Narayan Chandavarkar, the English people must give up a bit of their uppishness and I would also advise that their Anglo-Indian wards should similarly give up their uppishness. We find it a common sight in any cabaret show or in the cinemas or pictures that people, particularly the Britishers, feel as if they have nothing whatsoever to do in common with Indians so far as the war is concerned. I find the Britisher struts in his uniform, it does not matter where he came from and he wants to create a great impression on poor Indians. Well, Sir, it is really this kind of thing that really goes down and affects the mentality of people who cannot think for themselves. It does not matter; it is natural.

An Honourable Member: Where do you find this? In Madras?

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj: Why, all over India. You can find it right in the train or as I said anywhere. Somehow that kind of feeling is there and it is a tragedy that it should persist. I hope the Government of India

[**Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj:**]

will do something to remove this feeling, particularly at a time when Japan is carrying on this kind of campaign. One can imagine to oneself as to how a campaign of the kind which Japan is carrying on can get hold of minds which are unfortunately thwarted by experiences like these. That is all I have to say with regard to the propaganda aspect of the war.

Now, Sir, I do not desire to refer to many matters which are all important. The time at my disposal is short. The subject of constitutional reforms and the arrival of Sir Stafford Cripps was referred to. In my own interest, I mean in the interest of my own community, I want to remove the impression that we do not know our rights or that even if we know, we do not care to fight for our rights. On this point, I wish to express a few words with your permission. Sir, for some time past, it is my unfortunate experience as also the experience of many Honourable Members and it has also been the experience of the leaders of my community, that whenever statements—and there have been quite a storm of statements relating to constitutional reforms in India—whenever statements were made there has been omission of any reference whatever to the part or the lot that our community should have in any constitutional reform. This is the case not only with any particular political party but also with the Government; whether it is the Muslim League, or whether it is the Congress or whether it is the non-Party Conference

An Honourable Member: The Hindu Mahasabha.

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj: Or the Hindu Mahasabha, which has no connection with us, or the Government of India or even His Majesty's British Government, all have dropped any reference whatsoever to our community. Indeed they do not make any mention of our existence at all.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Mr. Churchill has done that.

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj: I shall come to that point. There is a method of expressing it. So much so, we suspect that there is a conspiracy of silence resorted to by all the parties to push our case entirely into the background. They think, being helpless, being poor, not having a platform, nor like the Muslim League having a flag, nor a scheme like the Pakistan, that we can be transferred from the slavery of one set of people to the slavery of another. I do not want to refer in very harsh or unhappy terms to the conduct of most of these leaders and parties. It is also very natural that if I am sleeping, if we are sleeping, others must take advantage of our lethargy and, naturally, they will try to get the best of what they can for themselves. We have had this experience before when the Communal Award was settled by His Majesty's Government when Indians were not able to settle things amongst themselves. What happened in that Communal Award? There was the grant of separate electorates for our community. A certain number of seats were allotted to us which were so plainly not near the proportion or the number of seats that we were entitled to get on the population basis. All kinds of arguments were trotted out. It was said, you do not get the right type of men to fill the Legislatures. Sir, without meaning any insult to any Honourable Member of this House, I have to see a House which consists all of experienced people, all eloquent men. I think it is invariably the

other way about. Arguments like that were brought out and our numbers were reduced. So we feel that such things should not be repeated and I would request the Government of India, particularly as it is constituted at the present day having on its body a number of Indians who were prominent politicians and know the conditions that actually exist in India, to keep this in mind if they come into contact with Sir Stafford Cripps or if otherwise they have to advise His Excellency the Viceroy or His Majesty's Government. There is another feeling which worries me with regard to Sir Stafford Cripps. When he came out last time to India he came as a man who was not probably recognised by the British Government or by the British Parliament or even by his own party,—I think Major Attlee disowned him in those days,—and he was in a minority of one. And when he came out to India, I am sure he was shadowed by the special police and the C.I.D. of the Government of India. I do not know if he was a guest at Viceregal Lodge then; but, unfortunately, when he toured round India he forgot that there was in existence some people called the depressed classes and that there are a few of them who can talk to him in English and express their ideas. He never came in contact with the depressed classes. I believe he just saw one or two persons in the Congress Party and went away.

An Honourable Member: Did your community take any notice of him?

Rao Sahib N. Sivaraj: That is a different matter : I am merely stating facts. Now he comes back to this country and he deserves to come in the capacity in which he does come at the present moment after his great success in Russia. But whatever the reputation of Sir Stafford Cripps may be, I do not want to belittle him in the least. This unfortunate country has been the grave of many a reputation. I hope that Sir Stafford Cripps will succeed, to the satisfaction of all and bring about a settlement which will please everybody. While I honestly felt that we should not at all refer to this constitutional question, I was obliged to do so in the interest of my community, and I hope my Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, will not take it amiss if I refer to it on this occasion. We on our part will not do anything, will not exaggerate our claims or over-state our case so as to put any obstacle in the way of any settlement which is likely to be attained by Sir Stafford Cripps.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Sir, I am sorry to say that the admonition which the Honourable the Finance Member gave at the outset of the opening of the debate on the Finance Bill was not conceived in a happy strain. He expressed the wish that Government being very busy with war there should be as short speeches as possible. Perhaps what has followed since then has not been according to his expectations; but I venture to put to him a suggestion that the King's Government must be carried on even when there is a war; the Finance Bill is the only occasion when the Members of the Legislature get an opportunity of reviewing the entire administration and the financial and political side of the country's affairs. And it is on that account that Members are allowed to give full expression to their views at the risk of some inconvenience to permanent officials. I am sure the Honourable Member knows that Mr. Winston Churchill has much greater war work than the Honourable the Finance Member can possibly have. Still Mr. Churchill has again and again maintained that they were

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

sure to succeed because they were a free country having free institutions, where democracy expresses itself even in the gravest time of danger, and that, therefore, he never stifled Parliamentary criticism or Parliamentary activities. I do not say that the Honourable the Finance Member had any such intention, and if he had the intention I am sure that was not fulfilled by what has followed in the last two days. Members perhaps want also to indulge in many repetitions because they know that on this occasion at least they can escape the displeasure of the Chair. That seems to be behind the long speeches that have been made, but their length should not perturb permanent officials who are giving a trial to democratic institutions in this country. I do not wish to make any point of it except to tell him that I have no intention of making a speech of an hour and 25 minutes. I do not want to beat any record, the record for the length of a speech was broken by one Member, and that for the brevity of speech was broken by another Member; I hope to keep a golden mean.

At this time, Sir, I wish to tell the House that I am speaking with a feeling of indescribable sadness, because to me all discussions on other matters besides the war are mostly wide of the mark. To me the war is the one engrossing thing which must hush all controversy and we must present to the world a scene of united India determined to beat out the Japs. I am going to develop my appeal at the end of my speech, but in the meantime,—as I cannot conclude today,—I shall take up one or two points so that today's business may be over.

The first point that I wish to make is what I requested the Finance Member on the general discussion of the budget. On page 20 of the Memorandum the net revenue is stated to be 144 crores and the cost of collection is stated to be 4 crores. If the revenue was gross it would be 148 crores; and still in paragraph 29 of his speech he has stated the revenue to be 140 crores. I am sure there is some explanation and I am sure in his reply he will explain what has to me been a slight discrepancy. The same applies to the question of deficit and I hope the Finance Member will clarify the point when he gets up to give his reply.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member may continue his speech tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 13th March, 1942.