

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THURSDAY, 23rd AUGUST, 1934

Vol. VIII—No. 1

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

The Girls Protection Bill—Withdrawn.

The Untouchability Abolition Bill—Motion not made.

The Hindu Temple Entry Disabilities Removal Bill—Withdrawn.

Statement of Business.

SIMLA : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1934

Price Five Annas.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 23rd August, 1934.

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

THE GIRLS PROTECTION BILL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The House will now resume consideration of the following motion moved by Rai Bahadur Kunwar Raghubir Singh :

" That the Bill to protect Minor Girls be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Honourable the Law Member, the Honourable the Home Member, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. K. C. Neogy, Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan, Sardar Nihal Singh, Goswami M. R. Puri, Sir Hari Singh Gour, Mr. F. E. James and the Mover, with instructions to report within a week, and that the number of members whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Committee shall be five."

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.

The Chair thinks he did not finish his speech on the last occasion.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Non-Muhammadian Rural) : Sir, I uttered one sentence on the previous occasion and I shall try to finish my speech in another sentence, and that is this. When my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, was speaking on the Minor Girls Bill, I, by way of interruption, stated that Mr. Satyamurti had gone back upon his opinion and was no longer a supporter of the Temple Entry Bill. That is an unfortunate misrepresentation of facts, and I owe an apology to Mr. Satyamurti. Mr. Satyamurti was at no time a supporter of the Temple Entry Bill and he has succeeded in making the Congress drop the Bill.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division : Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I have full sympathy with the object which my Honourable friend, the Mover of the Bill, has got in view, but unfortunately, there are some phrases used in the Bill which might be misunderstood by the House. Nobody can deny that there is a custom prevailing in this country by which a man, even when much advanced in age, wants to get married to a young girl. We read in the newspapers a few days ago that a man of 70 years of age wanted to marry a girl of 11 years, and the parents of that girl were willing to give the child in marriage to that old man. If this kind of custom prevails and if the parents are so unscrupulous as to give their little children in marriage to old men, then it is duty of the country to stop this evil at once. What my Honourable friend has meant by using the word " sale " is really the

(1987)

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

marriage which is contracted by the parents getting certain monetary consideration. He does not mean sale as a slave. Slavery is prohibited in this country, and we have got penal provisions by which slavery can be easily dealt with. I think the defect there is at present would have been got over quite easily in the Select Committee had we sufficient time to deal with this Bill. My Honourable friend has rendered great service by bringing to the notice of the Government and the country the great evil that exists today, and I would have supported that this Bill should go to a Select Committee if we had had sufficient time for the purpose. My Honourable friend's services to the country will be remembered and he has been supported by many great authorities, such as Judges of High Courts, in his view but I should ask him to wait till the next Assembly comes. I am sure, he will be returned to this Assembly and he will have then opportunities of coming before the House with a Bill like this. Even if the motion for a Select Committee is accepted, the net result would be that the Committee will never sit at all and the Bill will lapse. I think he will be best advised and he will show generosity by giving the other people a chance of moving their Bills if they so desire, because this is the last non-official day for Bills in this Assembly. My Honourable friend will find a lot of supporters in the next Assembly, and he will save the time of the House by withdrawing this Bill at this juncture.

Rai Bahadur Kunwar Raghubir Singh (Agra Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I thank sincerely the supporters of the Bill as well as those who have opposed it as they evinced great interest in the matter of the betterment of the condition of minor girls. Secondly, the measure provided a lively debate and the star speakers in the House took part and the debate did not lack in humour. I, however, regret that the debate was prolonged inordinately to put off the Temple Entry Bill which was never my intention as was given out in some newspapers. I am a Sanatanist no doubt, but not an obstructionist. So, the talk of conspiracy is meaningless and mischievous. Mr. Sitaramaraju said that girls of over 14 years had not been protected by the Bill, but I may say that a girl over 14 can understand her interest, and, therefore, she does not require any protection. What Manu speaks of is a present and not a sale price. All have said that the principle of the Bill is sound and the object laudable. Mr. Lalchand Navalrai said that Muhammadans take some price in his part of the country, but the overwhelming majority of respectable Muhammadans in the country is in favour of my Bill, as I showed the other day. Social pressure failed to eradicate the evil, and hence the Bill. Otherwise I would not have brought it. We have seen that there are many matters in which society holds strong views, but they cannot carry much further because of the large number of illiterate people. Had the public opinion been sufficiently strong I would not have thought of bringing forward this Bill. Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad read out the opinions of the United Provinces Government. I am surprised that a Nationalist and an Independent should give the Government's opinion, but I may tell him that a Muslim Pir, Maulana Hasan Nizami, and the Chief Justice of our High Court who is also a Muhammadan, have supported the Bill. Sir Nripendra Sircar asked how sale is to be defined. I will say, "giving a daughter

for monetary gain and without considering the welfare of the girl " is sale. Sir Hari Singh Gour in his book, " The Hindu Code ", says :

" Out of eight forms of marriage, all except the Brahma and the Asura forms are said to be obsolete.

This refers to marriages among Hindus under the Mitakshara Law, and they are discredited."

So, Sir, the argument that the Asura form of marriage requires the paying of price for the bride is also untrue. Sir Hari Singh Gour has rightly pointed out that Asura form of marriage is out of use and discredited. I agree with Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar that there are evils in society but we should also try to remove them. It was said that the evil is not very prevalent, but in the United Provinces and that among the Aggarwala community, the Marwaris and in Bihar and Rajputana, the evil is prevalent. He is also in full sympathy. Mr. Jadhav says the motive is very good. Legislation will be able to do it as it is doing with the Sarda Act. Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar says that the evil does not exist in Madras but the Women's Association there is in favour of the Bill. So it does require such a remedy. The Honourable the Home Member said that marriages in this country were based on some pecuniary consideration but this is not true of some marriages as all people are not greedy. Then it was pointed out that the Muslims resent the application of this Bill to them but it is nowhere given in the opinions which have been received. Then it was said that in the case of Christians this Bill was unnecessary but the Cambridge Mission of Delhi supports my Bill, which shows that the Christians also want such a measure. The House has shown full sympathy with the object of the Bill and the opinions show that the motive is laudable. At least I have been able to arouse public opinion in the matter and this august Assembly has shown sympathy, as does the Government also. Hence my purpose is served and I have been shown difficulties to be encountered in its working and I am satisfied that a better framed Bill would better serve the purpose, and, therefore, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my Bill. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Has the Honourable Member the leave of the Assembly to withdraw his motion ?

Honourable Members : Yes, yes.

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

THE UNTOUCHABILITY ABOLITION BILL.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah (Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, on the 1st of February of this year, the House adopted a motion for circulating this Bill to elicit public opinion by the 1st August, 1934. Till today we have received opinions on this Bill from Bengal, Assam, Madras, Delhi, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, Coorg, Bihar and Orissa, and yet opinions have to come from Provinces like Bombay, Central Provinces, United Provinces, Punjab and other Provinces, and, therefore, without complete opinions, I do not think that any useful purpose will be served in my moving my motion today. Moreover, Sir, today being the last non-official day, I do not propose to make my motion today.

THE HINDU TEMPLE ENTRY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I rise to move what is known as the Temple Entry Bill, to remove the disabilities of the so-called depressed classes. Sir, I move :

“ That the Bill to remove the disabilities of the so-called Depressed Classes in regard to entry into Hindu temples be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar, the Honourable Sir Henry Craik, Bhai Parmanand, Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi, Rao Bahadur B. L. Patil and the Mover ”—

I will delete, with your permission, the words “ with instructions to report within a fortnight ” and then I will continue the remaining portion of the motion :

“ and that the number of members whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Committee shall be five.”

Sir, at the time I gave notice of this motion, I did not think that before a fortnight we would be going into the wilderness. Therefore, I recognise the limitations of this motion, for there will be no time even to go to a Select Committee. I recognise that it gives us an opportunity to express our opinion on the subject.

I have already stated that I owed an apology to Mr. Satyamurti, for, while interrupting Mr. Mudaliar, I was not in a position naturally as he was rushing along with his speech to explain myself fully and he would have been at a disadvantage if I had done so. I recognise that Mr. Satyamurti, who was at no time in favour of the Temple Entry Bill, has succeeded in making the Congress drop it. I read the following written statement of Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar in the *Hindu* of Madras, dated the 16th August. The *Hindu* is a very responsible newspaper, and as it is not a mere telegraphic interview, but a written statement, I believe Mr. Rajagopalachariar's statement can be taken as accurate. Mr. Rajagopalachariar is apologising to the public for his betrayal of the cause of the untouchables. As the principal lieutenant of Mahatma Gandhi, his betrayal must be placed on record. He says :

“ The question has been asked by some Sanatanists whether Congress candidates will give an undertaking that Congress will not support any legislative interference with religious observances. Similar questions may be asked on a variety of topics by persons and groups interested in each one of them. That such questions are asked only of the Congress candidates and similar elucidation is not attempted in respect of other parties and independent candidates is a very great compliment paid to the Congress.”

So, says, Srman Rajagopalachari. And, instead of following up the compliment and arousing public opinion on an unpopular measure, here is a great Congress leader who sat *dharna* at our houses with his son-in-law. Devidas Gandhi, who repeatedly called on me at Delhi and said “ We seek joint support for this legislative measure ”,—here is a man who goes back “ like a crab ”, to borrow the language of Shakespeare. Political parties, explains this subtle brain from the South, have distinctive policies on various questions covering a wide field :

“ Not all of them, however, are made into election issues at any one time.”

Sir, this Congress leader is afraid of facing the public opinion which he has roused.

Sir, are the Congress people slaves ?

“They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak.”

According to Milton, “To say and straight unsay argues no liar but a coward traced”. (*Rai Bahadur Kunwar Raghubir Singh* : “Question”.) My friend questions. Not being a Congressman, the epithet does not apply to him. I was quoting Milton. Mr. Rajagopalachari unsays now what he had been saying long before the General Election from every platform in the following words :

“The Congress candidates go to the electorate in this election on well-defined political issues.”

That is to say, they go to the electorate with a view to pandering to the prejudice of the masses whom they have misled, so much so, that they have got themselves into a bog. Lord Willingdon came to their rescue, to take them out of the bog by announcing the dissolution of this Assembly and giving them an opportunity, as a constitutional Viceroy, to return to the sheltered paths of constitutionalism. Therefore, they have run away from their own convictions and are playing every trick to come back to the Legislature with as large a number as possible. Had they gone on with the Temple Entry Bill or the untouchability question, they would have lost many votes, for it is not a popular issue. I said so, though Mahatma Gandhi contradicted me publicly at the time. I said so when Shankaracharya was staying in Malabar in my brother's house at Palghat. My brother came on a deputation to the Viceroy to oppose the Bill. I said : “I know, the reformer is not in a majority in Malabar”. Nowhere else are the reformers in a majority but the reformers believe in persuading the majority to their way of thinking. Then, I said—whatever the result of a referendum the Congress people might have taken in Guruvayur in Malabar might be, I could not for a moment believe that the majority of the temple going people in Malabar were in favour of admitting the untouchables into the temples ; but, I was prepared to fight them, also to argue with them and to persuade them and to make them take an interest in the cause and the case of the untouchables, for, I feel, the untouchables are a part of my community. Sir, if one-third of my community is to remain submerged in exclusion in the name of religion, I feel, as I have always felt and said, that that community has no right to existence. It is with a view to the unification of the Hindu community, it is with a view to building up the greatness of the future of that community on the past of that community, when untouchability was quite unknown as in the Vedic ages, that I have taken up their cause. And now, I find Congressmen, so keen about untouchability yesterday, explaining why they are not taking it up today. Mr. Rajagopalachari has driven the last nail into the coffin of the Temple Entry Bill, as Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, the Raja Sahib of Kollengode or Sir Satya Charan Mukherji would perhaps like to say, representing as they do the various Sanatanist groups of the country.

Sir, Mr. Rajagopalachariar goes on to say that they asked to be returned “on no other issue”, that is to say, not on Temple Entry issue, but merely on a political Anglo-phobia issue, an anti-British issue, because, having traded on public feeling, having tried to give it as much racial antipathy as possible in the name of non-violence, in the name of religion itself, because non-violence was sometimes given a religious

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

bias, having created that atmosphere of distrust in the country, finding that that atmosphere might not help them in the election if they fought it on a bigger, a cleaner and higher issue, namely, the removal of untouchability itself, they side-track the issue, they run away from their conviction :

“They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.”

(Hear, hear.)

Then he, a principal lieutenant of Gandhiji, goes on to say :

“if successful at the polls, they cannot believe they will receive the mandate of the electorate on any other questions”—

That is to say, they are not receiving the mandate of the electorate on the Temple Entry Bill. This man, who came screaming at our doors, begging us for support—these beggars in the cause of the Congress,—who just begged of us to proceed with this Temple Entry Bill, are not only betraying the cause of the untouchables, but they are betraying the principles of the Mahatma himself, for, we know, that Mahatma's fast was directed toward the uplift of the untouchables by giving them concessions in regard to the Communal Award, which the Congress naturally has hesitated to repudiate, and we, therefore, know that that has a direct bearing on the untouchability question, to approach which, to solve which, the Mahatma, the great Mahatma, wanted to tour the country, but today the Congress, who betrayed him first in the betrayal of the Congress boycott of the Councils, have, by seeking to come to the Councils, further betrayed him with the assistance of his own *samandhi*, Rajagopalachariar, and they say that they are not going to proceed with the untouchability question and the Temple Entry Bill without a mandate from the people !

Sir, where is the difference, I ask, between Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar and Sriman Rajagopalachariar ? Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar has always conceded—“take a mandate from the people and then come and legislate”. Sir, he is not a coward ; a great Sanatanist himself, he is willing to face the music. On the contrary, these people, who pillory the Sanatanists up and down the country, forgetting that Sanatan Dharma is eternal truth itself, are behaving in a manner which even the Sanatanists will not appreciate, for Sanatan Dharma is eternal truth and the betrayal of truth is worthy only of untruthful people ! Having betrayed many a principle which would lead us to our national goal, having taken up the case of the untouchables only to save their faces, with no conviction behind them, as we now see, the great Congress leaders, with the exception of Mahatma Gandhi, have said, through Rajagopalachariar, the Organizer-in-Chief of the coming elections on behalf of the Congress :

“It will be open to all Congressmen to have the matter duly considered before it is ever made into an official Congress Bill.”

For this betrayal of the cause of the untouchables, I hope constitutionalists will organize themselves, whether Hindus or Mussalmans. They can agree to differ later on on communal issues, but they will unite and offer a great battle to the Congress and bring that organ of masqueraders down on its knees. Sir, I think here is a betrayal of the cause of the untouchables and the Depressed Classes : and, if I did not believe in this movement before Mahatma Gandhi could take it up or Mr. Rajagopalachariar went from door to door in Delhi, I should not have been here to move this Bill.

Sir, I always felt that the father of the Harijan movement was Swami Vivekananda, whose feet I bear on my head. That great prophet of nationalism which Bengal gave to India and the world, in his great speeches, from Colombo to Almora, called upon the Indian people to get rid of this curse of untouchability which is making the nation an untouchable nation. (Hear, hear.) He said, touring in Malabar, what more silly thing could one find than this? What he witnessed in Malabar was that the poor Pariah was not allowed to walk in the streets, but when he changed his name to some hotch-potch Christian name or Muhammadan name, it was all right. What does the Malabar Hindu do? He says: "Don't touch me, I am holy!" The Swami said in another place: "Their religion is the kitchen, their God is the cooking pot!" Sir, Swami Vivekananda was the real founder of the Harijan movement, and Mahatma Gandhi, with his great energy, has come into that movement. Apparently, he finds it difficult to carry the Congress people with him in matters of social reform. Sir, not having sat at the great Mahatma's feet, in matters either of politics or of social reform, and drawing my inspiration first from the teachings of my own religion and the need of social justice and social reform, and secondly from my experience, bitter experience in Malabar, to which I belong, I propose to proceed with this Bill; and, in so doing, I seek, in the first place, a compromise with the Sanatanists. The latter have nowhere said that they were opposed to considering the temple-entry question; they were opposed to the Temple Entry Bill. For instance, I believe that Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar and Raja Vasudeva Raja, who belong to the Madras Presidency, the latter to Malabar itself, would be willing to build temples for the untouchables, for the untouchables have to be kept within the Hindu fold: you cannot drive them out, as you have tried to drive them out all these ages by excluding them from the community. Sir, if, in spite of all this, all the untouchables have not become Mussalmans or Christians, it is because the untouchables are better Hindus than many of these so-called Hindus themselves. (Hear, hear.) They have clung to the Hindu religion in spite of this disability; they have clung to the Hindu fold in spite of the treatment that we have offered them. There is a film going round the country called "Chandi Das". That film deals with temple entry and if it has any connection with our revered Law Member, Sir Nripendra Sircar, whose life is a sermon on sacrifice and service to the Hindu cause, I can only say that he and Bengal and his talented son responsible for that film have rendered a great service to the cause of the removal of untouchability. (Applause.) The applause all over the country that this film has got is an index of the fact that the cause of the untouchables has the support of the Hindus.

I know, so far as the circulated opinion is concerned, that there is a sharp cleavage. I know that men like Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar and the Raja Sahib of Kollengode and even Sir Satya Charan Mukherji, who is much younger than they, would like to move with the times, but they are not willing to go as fast as I am willing to go. As for Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen, he naturally relies on the *Smritis* with all the accretions of Manu Dharma Shastras. I admit that he is as devoted to his cause as I am devoted to mine. I will not at all question his sincerity, and I am perfectly certain that he too wants the amelioration of the condition of the untouchables and to get them within the Hindu

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

fold. That is an issue on which the Congress people for purposes of political warfare, as is now clearly indicated by their last moment's betrayal, were really trying to divide the Sanatanists from the Sanatanists for the untouchables are part of Sanatana Dharma. After all, what is the Hindu dharma but Sanatana dharma and what are the untouchables but the children of Hinduism? Therefore, we have got to build temples for them. If Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar thinks that the untouchables by entering his temple will pollute his God—I do not think so, because God cannot be polluted,—let him come forward and keep the community of untouchables within the fold and give them a religious uplift, for it is a very unconvincing argument of our friends when they say that the economic uplift will bring in its train the religious uplift and social uplift. Mr. Rajah, who has been economically uplifted, cannot enter the temples of Palghat or Malabar or for that matter Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar's residence or a temple in its neighbourhood. Therefore, what we want is religious uplift and social uplift. I would suggest to the Sanatanists another thing. During the car festival and similar other ceremonial festivals, whether in Raja Bahadur's domain or in the domain of Raja Sir Vasudeva, the untouchables are permitted to mix with the touchables, the highest Brahmins. If that can be so, why not build temples for them in the neighbourhood of your own temple and thus take the wind from the Mahatma's sails and also arrange a joint car festival for both the touchables and the untouchables.

How did Buddha attract people to Buddhism? Not by building temples, but by living his great life. But when Buddha was gone, what did the Buddhists do? They built temples all over the country, and if a census had been taken in those days, there would have been no Hindus, at any rate, there would have been no low class Hindus in Buddhist times. All were Buddhists from the Himalayas to Cape Camorin. There were a handful of Brahmins left in the country, but Buddhism became a powerful religion. Its principal attraction was the temple. Buddha himself had repudiated idolatry and temple worship, but the Buddhists, in order to attract people to their fold, built temples. I need not go through the Buddhist history and I need not go through the historic achievement of Buddhism after Buddha's death when the whole country observed that faith until Shankara came to offer battle to it. And how did Shankara offer battle to it? By following the example of Buddha himself and the Buddhists. He tried to revive the priest-craft just as the Buddhists had done. Buddha did condemn priest-craft. Our Vedas have no place for priest-craft. The priests came into existence and the Brahmin priest, by reviving the Sanskrit learning and *Acharas*, banished Buddhism beyond India though Buddhism today prevails among, and is observed by, a larger number of people than Hinduism. But what did Shankara do? While trying to banish Buddhism from India, he had to copy Buddha's followers in the matter of building temples all over the land, attracting the Hindus back to Hinduism. At the same time, he had to accept Buddhism. That is why he preached Advaita. Shankara's Advaita is nothing but Buddha's unity and oneness of mankind. That is the reason why Hinduism has, from time to time, absorbed people, not even belonging to the Hindu fold to itself. If my statement is challenged, I have authorities to quote when I rise to reply. I must not, however, take much of the time. The

great Ramanuja, by his democratic Hindu faith, embraced by his action people who were not always given the place they ought to be given. Not only that, Ramanuja went further and expressed sympathy with the Depressed Classes. He was a great supporter of the Depressed Classes. Then we had Guru Nanak. He went a step further. He wanted not only to abolish untouchability, but to unite the Hindus and the Muhammadans. Sir, I have done. I should not make my speech long. The whole history of Hinduism, through shining scores of centuries, reveals, as by a flash of lightning, that Hinduism is inclusive and not exclusive. (Voices : "Go on".)

As my Honourable friends want me to go on, I shall make a reference to some of the opinions that have been circulated to deal with which I was almost in distress, because such voluminous publications have never taken place before. In this connection, I must express my gratitude to Lord Willingdon and his Government and all the Members of the Executive Council (Applause), for it is given to this great Viceroy to ascertain the public opinion on a matter which is very important as the public opinion has shown. I admit that there is a cleavage, but where is the world and where is that Utopia whose angelic denizens never differ among themselves? Did not Martin Luther himself have to face odds? Did not Muhammad the Prophet take up arms in the desert of Arabia against idolatry and was not his religion at first observed by himself and his wife and his dutiful servant, and is not his religion today observed by large myriads all over the world? He was a reformer; he was a Prophet; he was a Messenger from God; he was a Prophet of God. Every reformer in this world has to face odds and has to take the consequence for his faith. The Congress people are not reformers; they have only been humbugging the public. They have not only agitated the public mind, but they have also betrayed the Mahatma who will go down in history as a great Prophet of the Harijans. (Cheers.) Mahatma Gandhi could not give a mandate to these politicians aspiring for loaves and fishes and who are trying to shape their views according to the times. These masqueraders are not even good masqueraders. These masqueraders only want to exploit the public. During the last prison-going pilgrimage, they exploited women to the shame of the Indian traditions and being false to those traditions, be it said. They put women in the forefront of their strife, the most unmanly thing to do, and, in order to secure victory at the polls in the coming elections, they, who were willing to exploit the untouchables until yesterday, finding that the cause is not popular, have dropped them. People who have no convictions deserve to be condemned. Let us take up the cause of the untouchables, all those who are opposed to the Congress join together in a manner which will not exploit the cause of untouchables but build them up, and admit them to the streets and admit them to the Brahmin *agraharams*, because they are not admitted to the *agraharams* in Malabar. I ask, why should they not be admitted in the *agraharams* of the Brahmins? In the Raja of Kollengode's compound, a *Cheruma* or a *Nayadi* will not be admitted, but if that *Cheruma* or the *Nayadi* becomes a Moplah, he is automatically admitted. There is a tradition like that established in my mother country of Malabar. I want that we must keep these people within our own fold and be true to our religion, for are all these untouchables not the children of Hinduism or is Hinduism a great religion or is it a great humbug

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

like the Congress politics ? I think Hinduism is a great religion, it is not a mean thing to be shuffled through as we like, it does not depend upon the mechanical manipulation of the muscles of the mouth by way of chanting *mantras*. It does not depend on parroting a few words. Hinduism is being and becoming, it is the manifestation of the temple already in man. Hinduism teaches us that there are three stages for the realisation of God. The first is the ritual stage, the temple going stage, the second is the philosophic stage and the third is the yogic stage, the stage of realisation. The untouchables are children, men with a child-mind. If temples are meant for anybody, they are meant for the untouchables. (Hear, hear.) Let us make our temples attractive to the untouchables or build more attractive temples for them and then the Sanatanists need not fight the Congress people, for the Congress people will have to take up some other subject of exploitation and playing to the gallery. Now, the time has come for all of us to stand by the untouchables in our own way.

I must be referring to the opinions received and as we all know, opinions differ, but I am glad to find that even in the Madras Presidency sympathy is expressed by the Judges of the High Court. Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar, a relation of my first cousin who has married his daughter, a very temple-going man, very orthodox, I thought, would have expressed himself harshly on the Temple Entry Bill of mine. He is not uncharitable. He says, "why go on with it now ? Why not leave it to the reformed Legislatures ?" Therefore, I think, he is a little better than the Congress people. The Congress people say that when their "constituent Assembly" comes into existence, which now exists in the dreamland of Satyamurti and Rajagopalachari, they will then issue an official Congress Bill on Temple Entry. I do not want a constituent Assembly to wreck constitutions, I want a constitution which I am getting, however imperfect it may be, however unsatisfactory it may be, and I am prepared to build a palace of hope for my country on that constitution. Until the day when their "constituent Assembly" comes, I am not going to wait to build a palace of unity in which the touchables and the untouchables can live, and here, I say, the Sanatanists must strengthen my hands and if the Government will agree they must give us a committee to work out a scheme for building temples for the untouchables. I do not want a revenue-committee, I do not want a roving committee, collecting opinions in the country, because the collected opinions are good enough. If the Sanatanists and the Government—we the reformers, if need be, are willing to stand aside—can work out some policy by which they will be able to build temples for the untouchables and in other ways bring about their uplift, at any rate in future, the Congress people will not be able to treat these uneducated people as pawns in their political game. So far as matters of religion and social reform are concerned, it becomes necessary for us to take great caution of seeing that we all combine against our enemies, because the Congressmen are the common enemies of India and of all noble causes in this country, we must see that we all combine against our enemies for the goodness not only of the touchables but for the greatness of the untouchables. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, I was referring to the opinion of Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar, then a Judge of the High Court. He has, I believe, gone back to my

village. Incidentally I may say that he lives in the house which used to belong to my father and in which great *pujas* used to be celebrated and Brahmins used to be fed month after month, and, therefore, it has all the hallowed atmosphere of Sanatanists.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : And you, the faithful son of that great man, you are now doing the very thing which he will be afraid to do and which he will never be willing to do. (Laughter.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : My Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, is very quick in thinking, but not quite careful in retort. My father, I know better and that great man known to the village, known to the district, he had realised God. He always felt the presence of Sri Ram for the last 40 years before I was born. That man about whom I found in the *Roy's Weekly* by one who knew him before I was born, a three column reference to his religious idealism and practice, that man had realised long before his death that the temple of God was within him. Living in the neighbourhood of a great temple for a long time, he never went into that temple for many years. And, he said, that he was in communion with the deity in the temple not for purposes mundane. He said that he had felt the presence of God and we had evidence of it before his death as much as in his life-time. He did not, I must say, speak one word against my duty to my community and my country even though this Temple Entry Bill has been before us for the last two years. I did not hurry to take advantage of his passing away to introduce this Bill. Ten years ago, there was a great temple *satyagraha* campaign in Travancore State. One of my prominent friends, a Christian and a Barrister, had led that campaign and gone to prison. I was then in Allahabad and I announced my departure for Vykom to study the situation on the spot, not necessarily to take part in *satyagraha*. And when I arrived there I found my father also there. He was acting at that time, not as the Raja Bahadur would perhaps act because the Raja Bahadur has more fervour for ritualism, but at the same time he shared the opinion of Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar. He said to me, "Not only no *satyagraha* for you, you must go away from here". I said, "I have a right to persuade my opponents, I have a right to move my friends". He said, "Make a speech, get into a boat and clear out". I made a speech, got into a boat and cleared out. (Laughter.) Eight years after, when he had gone in to further meditation and *tapasya*, when I met him in Palghat, when crowds of Brahmins came to him to appeal to him to reason with me, he left them to discuss with me, and I told my Brahmin friends : "If my religious arguments will not appeal to you, at least my political arguments must appeal to you. You know, the Brahmins have been finished by the non-Brahmins. You know if you walk from one end of the Palghat *aggraharam* to the other, you find on the *pial* of every Brahmin house at least a couple of graduates unemployed and unemployable, because the fiat has gone forth that the non-Brahmins must have preference in Madras". There is a non-Brahmin Government there. And I said, "Though there is not much difference between Brahmins and caste non-Brahmins, these non-Brahmins pretend that the untouchables are a part of them, that the untouchables are a part of their non-Brahmin movement, the Justice movement as they call it. But they are much worse than Brahmins in doing

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

injustice to the untouchables. These temples are built by most of these non-Brahmin wealthy men and let us put the non-Brahmins on their trial. Let the non-Brahmin who is less efficient than the Brahmin, let the non-Brahmin, who on communal grounds has usurped jobs and deprived the Brahmins, hand them over on the same communal grounds of inefficiency to the untouchables". That is what I told the Brahmins and the Brahmins clapped their hands. They were very pleased. I said, "I am not your enemy. I want the boomerang of non-Brahminism to recoil on the non-Brahmins themselves". And then one class of people were satisfied that I, a Brahmin, had a patriotic Brahmin purpose in taking up the cause of the untouchables by carrying the non-Brahmin movement to its logical conclusion of either complete justice or complete inefficiency. And then I said that as a Hindu I had another object. I did not play upon the weakness of the reformer saying that many an untouchable is being converted every week in Ponnani taluk. I did not play upon that. I played upon this fact : if Hinduism has no place for the untouchables, I would ask them to embrace Islam. A man who gets better treatment in some other religion must go to it and must leave his religion. It is because I want to make Hinduism a habitable home for the untouchable that I have taken up this. I told them another thing and that is my whole case. I said, "You know the Moplah riots, you know the ghastly riots that have taken place from time to time. But the Moplahs are mainly drawn from the class of untouchables. They do not have the culture of the Mussalmans of Northern India, but they have better physique and greater courage". And, I said, "If all the untouchables become Moplahs what will happen to you? Already there are riots and the untouchable is not permitted to come to your *agraharam*. A Moplah can enter it, an untouchable cannot; and if all these untouchables become Moplahs, there will only be two communities in Malabar, the Nairs and the Brahmins". The Raja of Kollengode is a Kshatriya but one swallow cannot make a summer. Kshatriyas as a class are fast disappearing from India. And this argument also appealed to them, and I said, "Why not build temples for them". They who were once admirers of Gandhi and used to applaud Rajagopalachari are no longer with them. I told them that God is greater than Gandhi, and true politics and our duty to the community are greater than the Congress planks and platform. They agreed. And, I said, therefore, that from the non-Brahmin point of view, from the point of view of keeping the community together, and also from the point of view of holding aloft the new banner under which Sanatanists, both touchables and untouchables, can join, they should go with me. I said, "I am not a dangerous man, the future will show it".

Sir, I was referring to Justice Anantakrishna Aiyar, but the interruption of Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar naturally necessitated an explanation. I have given that explanation with the respect that is due to the Raja Bahadur, and, if, in the course of my argument, I happened to use any sarcasm, which I believe I have not used, the Raja Bahadur deserves my apology. Sir, here is from Chittoor, a very orthodox Brahmin, Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar, whose views we find at page 347, Paper No. V, opinions Nos. 12-15 :

"As I said in connection with the Sarda Bill, time has been working changes (not inappreciable) in case of social and religious matters here; and if left to time

the intended result would surely follow, without at the same time creating any friction among the people concerned."

Raja Sir Vasudeva Rajah (Madras : Landholders) : That is not supporting your Bill.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I never said that Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar was supporting my Bill. I said that his view is better than the view of the Congress. He is opposed to my Bill, but at the same time, though afraid of creating friction,—I personally believe in creating friction and fuss, because John Bull does not yield without making some fuss—without creating friction, he wants the "*intended result*" "*surely*" "to follow". If that is not supporting the Temple Entry Bill, that is accepting the spirit thereof. He is asking for a little more time which certainly I am willing to grant. When I agreed to circulation, I knew that public opinion will have to be sounded on this matter. I acknowledge there is a great deal of opposition and a handful of reformers must not resort to *satyagraha*, but we have a right at the same time to say that the opinion on our side is much larger than the circulated opinion represents. I have a right to say that young men and middle aged men of 40 are all on the side of the Temple Entry Bill, but they do not, I admit, go to the temple : they are modernists : I admit the majority of the temple goers are against this Bill, and that is why I say that I do not want to force the untouchable into the temple over the corpses of the temple-goer : I do not even want a future *satyagraha* movement to break open the temple doors. I have a right to challenge Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar and other people, who say they are friends of the untouchables, to come into the open instead of merely indulging in rhetoric, instead of merely abusing Gandhi, to prove that they can take the cause of the untouchables in their hands. Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar is prepared that this measure should be taken up in the new reformed Legislatures : he says :

"The present is not the occasion for passing such legislative measures, the reformed Legislatures—in sight—being apparently the more appropriate bodies to deal with such matters."

If I may respectfully submit to my Sanatanist friend, the Raja of

12 NOON.

Kollengode, this is not opposition to the Temple Entry Bill : it is only an advice—do not be a young man in a hurry : do not pass it this Session. The Government and the Opposition have not decided to pass it this Session. He says, "Wait for the reformed Legislatures", and I hope that the Government of India will change their attitude and release provincial councils during the autonomous era from political or bureaucratic bondage. In the present case there has been a bondage because the Government of India absolutely declined our very humble but persistent request that this Temple Entry Bill should be introduced in the Madras Council. It is not we who made it an all-India question. It is they, and if I quoted Madras opinion it is because this is a live issue in Madras : the Government were not prepared to throw the non-Brahmins to the wolves, because the non-Brahmin movement would have been split from brow to chin on the question of temple entry and untouchability. Dr. Subbarayan, himself a great non-Brahmin champion, though not a member of the Justice Party, a champion of the untouchables and the non-Brahmins alike, was the sponsor of this Bill in the Madras Council. He was not a Congress

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

man, he was an ex-Minister : the Government of India made it impossible for us to introduce this Bill in the Madras Council. We did not want to create difficulties for my friend, Pandit Sen, from Bengal ; we do not want to embarrass Sir Satya Charan Mukherjee ; we do not want to embarrass any one outside Madras : we believe in this as a provincial measure and when autonomy comes into existence I hope that the Honourable the Home Member will advise the Government of India to accept Sir C. V. Anantakrishna Aiyar's advice.

I have other supporters in this matter. I have, for instance, Justice Madhavan Nair, a distinguished member of the Nair community from Malabar, a nephew of the late Sir C. Sankaran Nair whose death we have all deeply felt.....

Mr. K. P. Thampan (West Coast and Nilgiris : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : A Madras non-Brahmin !

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Yes ; but non-Brahmins like other honourable men have fallen out on this issue. (Laughter.) I know Mr. Thampan belongs to the same caste as Justice Madhavan Nair. I know in the Tamil country also opinion is divided. I do not mind Mr. Thampan expressing an opposite opinion ; but I wish that he will come back to this Assembly by defeating the Congress (Laughter) and, if I happen to be in Malabar, I propose to make a few speeches for Mr. Thampan ; notwithstanding the fact that he is opposed to the Temple Entry Bill, I am perfectly certain that he belongs to that class of progressives in Malabar who want to wipe out untouchability. Like so many progressive men in Malabar, I believe Mr. Thampan is not for the continuance of the present form in which untouchability is observed. On the temple entry question, I do not believe he will be so ungenerous as to refuse the building of temples for the untouchables as close as possible to our own temples, so that if, in some future age, the Congress again takes up temple-entry *satyagraha*, we Brahmins can go into the temples of the untouchables and dish the *satyagrahis*. As I was saying, Justice Madhavan Nair is in favour of the principle of the Bill : he says :

" I am in favour of the principle of the Bill. This legislation is permissive in character. Having regard to the conditions prevailing in this country, I doubt very much whether any improvement in social conditions worth having can be introduced without legislation. Government may make rules for preventing riots if riots are apprehended."

In the last sentence I am afraid he has anticipated the argument of our talented Home Member, Sir Henry Craik. I attach a great deal of importance to the opinion of Justice Madhavan Nair : he comes from a very well-known *tharavad* in Malabar ; he comes from Malabar where untouchability obtains in its worst form ; he is a deeply religious man and he is not one who rushes to conclusions ; he thinks carefully ; he has a perfect judicial temperament, the perfect mind that a judge should have ; and after weighing the *pros* and *cons* of things and examining the conditions in Malabar he has expressed this opinion. There are other opinions. I find the Honourable the Home Member ready to take part in the debate, and, therefore, let me conclude with these words.

The other day I made a rather disappointing remark when the Temple Entry Bill was not reached : I thought that it would not be reached this Session. I expressed my protest in a short observation on the floor of this

House. Seeing that I was seething, in his great generosity the Honourable the Law Member walked up to me and I met him half-way : my overburdened heart gave way ; at that time I did not understand that behind me was standing on the floor of this House—not even in the lobby—a journalistic eavesdropper belonging to the Associated Press (Laughter) ; and I now find that he has palmed off a remark, a confidential remark, in a crude manner, to one of the Calcutta Congress dailies, using me as a stick to beat Sir Nripendra Sircar. I cannot claim the same enthusiasm for my community which Sir Nripendra has served for a longer period and at greater sacrifice ; and if this ungentlemanly trick of a newspaper eavesdropper has resulted in a misleading statement and if it has done any harm or misled the public, I am here humbly to apologise to Sir Nripendra Sircar : I apologise for the misrepresentation of an eavesdropper—a curious form of apology ; but I cannot help deeply feeling that journalists should be developing a lack of restraint and attacking responsible Members of the Government and mis-reporting or reporting one sentence in a conversation for the benefit of Congress hooligans who ask for our head on a charger.....

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadan) : You were a journalist once !

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Mr. Das says I was a journalist once : I am a journalist now : once a journalist always a journalist ; but journalists can be gentlemen.....

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal : Landholders) : But once a Swarajist not always a Swarajist ?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Not at all, for Swaraj appears on the horizon ; I cannot be a Swarajist if Swaraj is attained. I consider the White Paper scheme of provincial autonomy gives Swaraj in the provincial sense. (*Cries of "No, no."*) Opinions may differ, but that is my view. I am not satisfied with the scheme at the Centre, and, therefore, I say that the autonomous provinces of the future must have the right of legislating on the Temple Entry Bill. I do not want that this should be in the Central Legislature at all, I do not want that the Government of India should be a Himalayan obstacle in the way of provincial autonomy and in the way of autonomous Provincial Governments. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to remove the disabilities of the so-called Depressed Classes in regard to entry into Hindu temples be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar, the Honourable Sir Henry Craik, Bhaji Parmanand, Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi, Rao Bahadur P. L. Patil and the Mover, and that the number of members whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Committee shall be five."

Raja Sir Vasudeva Rajah : Sir, I rise to oppose the motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, for referring this Bill to Select Committee. I am convinced that a more dangerous and obnoxious Bill than this Temple Entry Bill has never before been brought in any Council and that it deserves a summary rejection. Government have given wide publicity to the Bill and invited opinions from interested people and also from those who were in a position to give valuable and disinterested opinion on the matter. The supporters of the Bill, the Congress organization and also Mr. Gandhi with all his influence carried a propaganda from one

[Raja Sir Vasudeva Rajah.]

end of the land to the other in favour of the Bill. In spite of all this, the reformers have not been able to make any impression on the people in support of the Bill. On the other hand, it has caused acute resentment in the country and opened the eyes of the peace-loving, loyal and law-abiding Sanatanists and others to the dangers to which they are exposed from these so-called reformers. It has awakened thousands of people from their slumber and has spurred them to organise themselves in such a way as was never done by them before. An indirect good that the introduction of the Bill and the neutral attitude that the Government have taken so far in regard to it has been that a very large section of our people have realised how unsafe and dangerous it is to pin their faith in the justice of these reformers of the congress persuasion to protect their material, social and religious rights and how much we have to rely on ourselves to safeguard them. The opinions received by Government from over a hundred thousand individuals, numerous associations, religious heads and Madhathipathies, and last but not least, Provincial Governments are very clear and emphatic and allow of no doubt as to the course this Assembly and the Government should take in dealing with this Bill. It deserves nothing but summary rejection. I was of opinion that the Governor General should not have given permission even to introduce this Bill, but subsequent events have proved that it was as well that permission was given and opinions were taken from a large number of people from all Provinces which go to show the impracticability and dangerous character of the measure. It is impossible for me, in the short time available, to quote individual opinions of associations or the valuable and learned opinions of the great many Madhathipathies. They are all contained in the voluminous volumes of printed opinions, covering hundreds of pages, that have been supplied to Honourable Members. It would, however, be profitable if I quote a few extracts from the opinions received from various Provincial Governments in India based on their inquiry and information.

The Madras Government says :

"In the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council the Bill seeks to make a far-reaching innovation in the matter of Temple worship and is complicated by the fact that law and order are involved as there is every likelihood of breaches of peace and serious faction in villages, or of the temples being abandoned by the caste Hindus. He considers that a matter of this kind should be left to public opinion in the country and that with the growth of the right type of education, the problem will solve itself."

The opinion of the Government of Bombay is put in the following terms :

"It will be seen that the weight of opinion is against the provisions of the Bill. Official opinion is mostly opposed to the Bill, though some officers have advocated an attitude of neutrality on the part of Government. As for non-official opinion, orthodox Hindus who preponderate outside big towns or cities are almost unanimously against the Bill. The reformers and others who claim to speak on behalf of the depressed classes mostly support the Bill, but they are in a very small minority as compared with the orthodox Hindus."

The opinion of the Bengal Government is as follows :

"The Governor in Council is of opinion that the Bill should not be supported by Government for the reason that it aims at no less than the variation, in accordance with popular local choice, of the terms of endowment trusts and in this sense furthers the objects of communism. Moreover, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it is difficult to justify the settlement of the religious matters by any system of local referendum."

The Government of the United Provinces are of the following opinion :

" Speaking generally it may be said that many educated persons and religious reformers have expressed their opinion in favour of the Bill, whilst the orthodox Hindus who form the majority of that community are opposed to its terms. The association of the Depressed Classes in Kumaon, the Doms or Shilpkars, which has been showing activity in regard to the social uplift of its members for some time, looks upon the whole proposal as a political manœuvre to be regarded with distrust and suspicion. Official opinion tends to emphasise the following important arguments against the general policy and provisions of the Bill.

(i) If any serious attempt were made to give practical effect to the provisions of this Bill, it would almost certainly cause disturbances and breaches of the peace.

(ii) The Bill is of such far-reaching importance that it is almost undesirable that it should be dealt with by a legislative body in its last Session."

The Government of the Punjab says :

" The Punjab Government are opposed to legislation which interferes with religious and social customs, especially when, as in this case, it cannot fail to cause grave offence to, and discontent amongst, those whose beliefs it offends and is fraught with danger to the public peace, first, owing to the method of determination proposed and secondly, owing to the disputes which are certain to arise if members of the Depressed Classes attempt to enter particular temples."

Then the Government of Bihar and Orissa give their opinion as follows :

" The opinions received indicate that officials, Indians as well as Europeans, are generally against the Bill. Because they consider that legislation is the wrong way of solving the problem. As regards the opinion of the Local Government, I am to say that one member of the Government recommends that Government should remain neutral and leave the Bill to the vote of the Non-Official Members of the Legislative Assembly; the others are opposed to the Bill. So far as the Local Government are aware, the Depressed Classes in Bihar have no desire that the temples should be thrown open to them. The agitation for temple entry is at the bottom of a political move, and is a bid for the support of the Harijan vote at the next elections. If the Bill were passed into law, its application would produce violent discord within the Hindu community which would almost inevitably lead to rioting and bloodshed."

The Government of Assam says :

" Public opinion in its broadest sense appears to be opposed to the Bill on the ground that the subject is not a fit subject for legislation. The Governor in Council is not in favour of forcing the pace through paper legislation whose only result would probably be an exacerbation of feeling between the upper and exterior castes in the Hindu fold."

Coming to the Central Provinces, the Government says :

" The Bill was widely circulated and in all 800 opinions have been received. Of that number, 540 are opposed to and only 260 are in favour of the Bill. Even the Depressed Classes do not appear to be enamoured of it. In these circumstances the Government finds it impossible to lend its support to it."

As for the North-West Frontier Provinces, the Government of that Province says thus :

" As will be seen, the consensus of opinion, received from Hindu individuals and associations, is opposed to the Bill. I am to say that the Governor in Council, beyond observing that it does not appear to be necessary to inflict the proposed legislation on an unwilling majority of Hindus in this Province, feels that he can offer no useful opinion on the merits of the question."

The Agent to the Governor General and the Chief Commissioner of Baluchistan says :

" The bulk of the Panahayats, who represent the large majority of Hindus in Baluchistan are against it. The view of the Honourable Norman Carter and that of such of the Political Agents as have expressed a personal opinion is that the Bill is highly controversial."

[Raja Sir Vasudeva Rajah.]

The Chief Commissioner of Delhi says :

“ As was to be expected, there is a definite and wide difference of opinion between orthodox leaders and organizations and the reformers. It will create a constant source of friction and future trouble between the supporters of the principle of temple-entry and their opponents. It must not be forgotten that the orthodox are likely to resist what they consider an unwarranted interference in their religious beliefs with the utmost determination.”

The Government of Burma, the Chief Commissioner of Ajmer-Merwara and the Chief Commissioner of Coorg also oppose the Bill after taking note of the public opinion in their Provinces.

From these short extracts I have quoted, it will be abundantly clear that there is not a single Provincial Government or responsible officer of Government that supports this piece of mischievous legislation, but, on the other hand, they have emphatically opposed the Bill. We have, however, not yet been able to find out what the opinion of the Government of India is in regard to this burning question. It is very important that the country should know it. The Government cannot afford to be an unconcerned spectator of a mischievous and dangerous game. The people will misunderstand their silence and lose all their confidence in the Government. Already the present uncertainty of the Government of India's attitude has created distrust in Government in the minds of a large number of people and it is undermining their loyalty and goodwill towards them. They think that Government are placating the Congress people who are really at the bottom of this agitation and betraying the trust that the loyalists have placed in them. This will have very far reaching effects and I would earnestly appeal to Government to disclose their attitude towards this Bill in clear and unmistakable terms. I would remind the Government that, if they remain as passive onlookers or adopt a policy of neutrality, they will lose all their adherents in this country.

After the warning that all the Provincial Governments without exception have given, namely, that the Bill, if it were to become an Act, will lead to serious disturbances of peace, law and order, I do not think that the Government of India can possibly adopt any other attitude than one of stern opposition to the Bill which I trust they will do. I further hope that the present Home Member's term of office, which has only just begun, will be characterised at the end of it as one of peace, prosperity and contentment and not one of religious persecution, hatred and murderous attacks all over the country. I would remind him of the Great Indian Mutiny and the causes that led to it, which will all pale into insignificance when you consider what is likely to happen if firm-rooted and greatly valued religious beliefs are rudely attacked and religious susceptibilities are wounded. May I also remind the Home Member and the other Members of the Government of India of the Great Proclamation of Her Majesty Queen Victoria of revered memory, which is still cherished and will ever be cherished with gratitude by the Indian people, and that, as servants of His Majesty, they are bound to carry out the injunctions contained in that document to the very letter and spirit ?

Finally, Sir, let me also say a word to my Honourable friend, the Mover. If he had any doubt in the matter of public opinion regarding his Bill, it must have been thoroughly dispelled by now after seeing

the various opinions now made available to him as well as to us. I admire his solicitude for the uplift of the Harijan or Depressed Classes, with which we have all every sympathy. If he had confined himself to measures leading to their material prosperity or even to their social and religious uplift on right lines without coming into conflict with what we consider sacred we should have supported him in every way. But, unfortunately, he has gone the wrong way about and overshot his mark and has complicated matters by introducing things seriously affecting our religious practices to which we can never agree. Instead of persisting obstinately in this wild-goose chase, it would be creditable if he, at least, now realises the seriousness of the situation, owns his mistake and withdraws his Bill. Admitting one's mistake is in no way to be deprecated but will command the appreciation of all right thinking people. If, however, he does not choose to do so, I hope every Member of this House will vote against his motion to whatever community he may belong. This is not the place to discuss religious matters, nor is it proper for a mixed body, such as we are, belonging to various religions, to discuss questions affecting one religion.

With these words, I oppose the motion before the House. (Cheers.)

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : Mr. President, the substance of the Bill which is now before the House has full sympathy of every Mussalman all over the world. As Mussalmans, we must sympathise with the object which the Bills aims at. Islam does not recognise untouchability. There is no bar for any Mussalman, having any status in his life, entering our mosques, the Houses of God. In fact, God will not be worthy of being worshipped if His House is polluted by the entry of any human being or any creation of that God Himself. Sir, Islam does not recognise priesthood. There is no priesthood in Islam, is the saying of our Holy Prophet. Not only does Islam recognise that all Mussalmans have an equal status in society, but even non-Mussalmans were not forbidden from entering the mosque of the Holy Prophet himself. We know that some non-Mussalmans came as guests of our Holy Prophet at Medina and they were allowed to stay in the mosque of the Holy Prophet as his own guests, and the next morning, when they were leaving the mosque, some of them had polluted the mosque and there was a great resentment among the Mussalmans, but the Holy Prophet said, "No. Don't feel sorry. They were my guests, and I will clean the mosque with my own hands." Such is the toleration of Islam, and this is the way in which Islam believes in giving equal status to every mankind.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen (Presidency Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Are we going to be governed by Islamic law from today ?

Sir Muhammad Yakub : My Honourable friend need not have been so over-zealous. I do not want anybody to observe any law if he does not believe in it. In fact, if a religion imposes such disabilities upon people of the same persuasion then I shall not wonder if the untouchables themselves enter into the universal fraternity of Islam which would immediately give them equal status with the highest among the Mussalmans. And here I invite all the untouchables, from the floor of this House I extend an invitation to them and I ask them to come into the universal fraternity of Islam in which, without passing any Bill like the one which has been introduced by my Honourable friend over there, they will have no disabilities as regards entering any place of worship or

[Sir Muhammad Yakub.]

mosque. But, Sir, although my sympathy is whole-heartedly with my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, whom I wish to congratulate upon the great speech which he has delivered this morning, whom I wish to congratulate on the toleration which he has shown, the breadth of vision which he has exhibited and the statesmanlike view which he has taken of the matter,—if there were men like Mr. Ranga Iyer, having such breadth of vision, I think the cleavage between the two communities, which is growing wider and wider every day, would have been bridged by this time. Sir, I wish also to congratulate him upon the way in which he has exposed the Congress. While all my sympathy and my moral support is with Mr. Ranga Iyer, I am sorry that my vote in the lobby cannot go with him, because my own idea is, as my Honourable friend, the Raja of Kollengode, has said, that in a mixed House like this it would be a very dangerous thing to pass legislation upon matters touching religion or religious rites of any community in this country. As I said on the occasion when the Sarda Bill was before the House, I want to reiterate the same feelings again on this occasion, and would like to say that it would not be right and it would not be safe for the British Government to support or to make legislation upon any subject touching the religion of any community, whether Hindus, Mussulmans, Christians or Parsis, in this country, without the unanimous consent of the community concerned, and as I find that there is an overwhelming majority of the Hindus who, whether rightly or wrongly, are opposed to this Bill, I do not think it would be right for the Government to be a party for making a legislation in a matter like this. With these remarks, I resume my seat.

Mr. N. B. Gunjal (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : (The Honourable Member spoke in the vernacular.)

(While Mr. Gunjal was speaking in the vernacular.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I am quite willing to answer my Honourable friend's question as to whether I have ever given a single pice to a temple. Sir, a temple in Chittoor, my village, was built by my great grand-father.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City : Non Muhammadan Urban) : He did not say that. What he said was—have you ever given a torn shirt to an untouchable ? (Laughter.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I may not have given a torn shirt to an untouchable, but when I joined the non-co-operation movement, I did give away foreign suits to untouchables.

Mr. B. Das : You gave untouchable suits to untouchables. (Laughter.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I gave away *swadeshi* suits made in foreign style.

(Mr. Gunjal continues in the vernacular.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : On a point of order, Sir. Will I be entitled to answer in Malayalam ?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : If the Honourable Member declares that he does not know sufficient English.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : How, Sir, am I to know what is parliamentary or unparliamentary in what my friend has been saying? I believe the Honourable the President is not able to follow a word of what he has been saying, and I believe the Honourable Member is indulging in statements which, as I understand, are not parliamentary. As we are not in a position to judge, may I suggest that for a moment you, Sir, temporarily vacate the Chair in favour of one who understands the language, like Dr. DeSouza or Sir Cowasji Jehangir. (Laughter.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair expects the Leader of the House will draw the attention of the Chair when there is anything said which is unparliamentary. (Applause.)

(Mr. Gunjal goes on in the vernacular.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : May I ask my Honourable friend whether Tilak was not in favour of building temples for untouchables and whether my Honourable friend, Mr. Gunjal, himself is not in favour of building temples for untouchables?

(Mr. Gunjal goes on in the vernacular.)

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab : Sikh) : The Honourable Member declared just now that he could not understand Mahrathi and still he is putting questions to the speaker.

(Mr. Gunjal goes on in the vernacular.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : My answer is simply this : Tilak said that
 1 P.M. Swaraj was his birthright. He believed in adult franchise and he did not believe in excluding the untouchables. If there is adult franchise, Tilak would not have prevented the cause of untouchables being taken up.

(Mr. Gunjal goes on in the vernacular.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : But Tilak's Gita Rahasya is a sermon on, and interpretation of, the fact that the temple of God is within you and that God in His Greatness cannot be polluted by the approach of the untouchable.

(Mr. Gunjal goes on in the vernacular.)

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. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) in the Chair.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member) : Sir, my intervention at this comparatively early stage of this debate is not due to any desire to shorten the discussion or to deprive other Honourable Members of the opportunity of stating their views. It is due to the fact that Government has decided that it is important that its attitude towards this measure should be made public at an early stage in the debate. I may say that I have received many requests from various quarters of the House to this effect, and to those requests I have naturally given the consideration which they deserve. One such request was contained in the very last

[Sir Henry Craik.]

and moderate speech delivered this morning by my friend, the Raja of Kollengode. But apart altogether from such requests, I think it is essential to remove any impression that Government is hesitating or uncertain in its attitude or that it is assuming that attitude which is colloquially described as sitting on the fence. On a question of such great importance as that now under consideration, regarding which such keen and indeed such passionate interest has been aroused throughout the length and breadth of the country, it is clearly desirable that there should be no doubt or uncertainty about the position of Government, and I trust that before I sit down, I shall have succeeded in stating that position in completely unambiguous terms. The House will, I hope, bear with me patiently if my exposition of the position of the Government and the reasons for the position takes some little time. I think all Honourable Members will admit that, on an issue which has been so widely discussed in the country, the position of Government must be stated fully and that the reasons for it must be explained in detail even if that explanation occupies some time.

Before I come to my main theme, I must digress for one moment to refer to the statement issued by the Honourable the Mover of this Bill to the newspapers on the 16th August. The Honourable Member has explained that that statement was the result of an indiscretion by a gentleman whom he described as a "journalistic eavesdropper". Nevertheless, I think I am entitled to put in a word of personal explanation.....

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : If I may interrupt the Honourable Member : probably he has not understood me correctly. The statement that I issued through the United Press was a statement issued over my signature ; but as soon as the House rose that day and I was disappointed that my Bill was not reached, I had a private conversation on the floor of the House with Sir Nripendra Sircar, and at that time neither he nor I noticed that there was a journalistic eavesdropper standing close by, and he reported that conversation to the Press unauthorised—and only to the Calcutta newspapers—using me as a stick to beat Sir Nripendra Sircar : it was a heart to heart conversation between two Members of the House and the journalist concerned had no business to palm that thing off or inspire some other man to make that statement as the special correspondent of a Calcutta congress daily.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : I quite understand my Honourable friend's position ; but the statement to which I was referring was the one issued over his signature : I have it here : it was published in the *Hindustan Times* of the 19th of this month. It contains a suggestion, possibly nothing stronger than a suggestion, that there had been some arrangement between myself and my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, to prolong the discussion on the Minor Girls Protection Bill in order that my Honourable friend should not have an opportunity of moving the Bill we are discussing today. I can assure my Honourable friend that he is under a complete misconception, and, I am sure, my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, will support me in saying that there was no arrangement of any kind between himself and me.....

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : In view of the Honourable the Home Member's statement, I express my regret both to the Honourable the Home Member and to the Leader of my Party for the misapprehension.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : I am indebted to my Honourable friend. Now, to return to the Bill now under discussion, it will be within the recollection of the House that in a statement issued early in 1933, His Excellency the Governor General made it clear that the grant of sanction to the introduction of this Bill did not in any way commit Government to the acceptance or support of the principles contained in it, and that the Government of India retained a free hand to take, at all later stages, such action in regard to this measure as might, on a full consideration of the circumstances, appear necessary. This position of Government, that they were entirely free to take such attitude in regard to this matter as might appear necessary, was reiterated when the motion for the circulation of the Bill was debated in this House on the 24th of August last year. Since that date, the Bill has been circulated—very widely circulated—and an enormous mass of opinions has been received and reduced to print. These opinions emanate from all Local Governments, from a large body of individual officials, from a large body of private persons and a very large number of bodies and associations interested in this question. As Honourable Members will no doubt have noticed, they cover very nearly 800 pages of print. I have no doubt that many Honourable Members, possibly with more leisure than myself, have been able to make a meticulous and exhaustive study of those opinions. I cannot claim, to be perfectly frank, that my study has been entirely exhaustive, but I have done my best, in the time at my disposal, to make myself acquainted with all the more important opinions on the Bill. After that study, I claim—and, I think, the House will admit the justice of this claim—that no impartial person reading through all these opinions can come to any conclusion except that the overwhelming majority of the interests affected are strongly opposed to this Bill. The Honourable the Mover of this Bill himself admitted that there was considerable cleavage of opinion. That, I think, is a very mild way of putting it. The opposition is not confined to persons who may be described as the representatives of orthodoxy or as the more old-fashioned adherents of the Hindu faith. Far from it. Practically all the major Local Governments, indeed, I think all Local Governments without exception, are unanimous in their condemnation of the measure and of course those Governments are not mainly or entirely composed of orthodox Hindus. Apart from this, in the Province of Bengal alone, I notice that such bodies as the Bar Associations or the Bar Libraries of Alipore, Midnapore and other towns, the British India Association—all condemn the Bill. And those bodies are certainly not composed either entirely or even mainly of orthodox Hindus. Further, Sir, it is clear from the opinions received that the Depressed Classes themselves, in whose interests this measure is ostensibly framed, are by no means enamoured of it. Many of them indeed are definitely, quite definitely, opposed to it, and the best, I think, that can be said of those who are not opposed to it, is that they are lukewarm in their support. I shall revert to this point later. At the moment, I desire to reiterate my point that the great bulk of the opinions received strongly condemn the Bill. Indeed, such support, as it has received, is practically confined to a comparatively small class of what I may call the *intelligentsia* mainly resident in towns, a class which my friend, the Mover, has himself admitted is in the main not a temple-going class at all. And in addition to that section of the *intelligentsia*, the support is confined to a political party which is clearly not unconscious of the possible tactical advantage it may derive from the passage of the Bill, although, I do not of course for the moment desire to throw any doubt on the sincerity of that party's intention towards those people whom this measure is designed to benefit.

[Sir Henry Craik.]

Now, Sir, the conclusion forced on the Government, after a careful study of the opinions received, and after the most anxious consideration of all aspects of the question, is, that it is their clear duty, as indeed it would be the duty of any Government charged with responsibility for the protection of the lives and rights of its citizens, to oppose this Bill.

Before I go in detail into the reasons that have driven Government to this conclusion, I would like to remove two possible sources of misconception as to our attitude. Sir, in the first place, I wish to make it clear beyond all shadow of doubt, that Government are not opposed to any genuine and well-thought-out measure of reform which would have the effect of removing the age-old social or other disabilities from which certain classes suffer, disabilities which, I think, are now universally condemned by the general verdict of civilization and which may indeed be described as a grave reproach on the social or religious system which imposes them. If the decision of Government to oppose this Bill is going to be misrepresented as evidence of Government's indifference to the claims of the Depressed Classes, I need only point to what Government has done in recent years for the betterment of those classes. In Madras, where the problem of social, religious and economic disabilities is, I suppose, more acute than elsewhere, a special department is formed in the Governorship of His Excellency the present Viceroy to protect the interests of those classes, and large sums of money have been spent out of public funds by his Government and by subsequent Governments in improving their economic position by such measures as the acquisition of land for houses and cultivation, by the provision of wells and water supplies, and by the development of a special form of co-operative society. Other Local Governments—I think I can truly say all Local Governments—have paid special attention to the improvement of educational facilities for these classes, partly by supplementing the work done by private societies and agencies, and partly by securing for the children of the Depressed Classes free entry on equal terms with other children into all public institutions. This encouragement is given by way of remission of fees, by the provision of scholarships and so on. In Bombay, for example, a Committee was appointed by Government to examine the position of the Depressed Classes and aboriginal tribes, and the Local Government have publicly announced the action they have taken and the action they propose to take on the Report of that Committee, in order to secure to these people the right of access to all wells, schools, hospitals, dispensaries and other institutions maintained by public funds. In the Central Provinces, an Act has recently been passed laying down that all public places vested in or owned by or maintained by either the Local Government or the local authorities shall not be closed to the use of any person by reason of his caste or creed. Representatives of the Depressed Classes are now, I think, members of all Provincial Legislatures, and both the Government of India and His Majesty's Government have given ample proof of their recognition of the importance of securing adequate representation in the Legislatures of those classes, both in the Provincial Legislatures and in the Central Legislature. It is hardly necessary for me to remind the House of the recent discussions on that point or of the provisions that have been made for the special representation of the Depressed Classes under the Reforms scheme, both in the Central and in Provincial Legislatures. That provision as originally laid down in the Communal

Award has of course been greatly increased as the result of the Poona Pact.

In short, Sir, so far as any action of Government can secure improvement, I think it can fairly be claimed that progress has been rapid during the last few years, and with the increased opportunities that are likely to be given to members of the Depressed Classes themselves in the new constitution, I think I am justified in expressing the hope that progress will be even more rapid in the next few years. That, Sir, is one misconception, but I hope I have been able to remove it.

The second misconception to which I want to refer, and which I am anxious to dissipate, is that the attitude of the opposition to this Bill on the part of the Government which I have announced is dictated by a desire to secure some form of tactical advantage. Critics who are always ready to read into the actions of Government some tortuous motive may argue that we are opposing this Bill because it represents the views of a certain political party, or at any rate of a section of a certain political party, which is generally in opposition to Government, or because the principle of religious and social equality which the Bill enshrines has been for some time past the main pre-occupation of a leader who has been in the past a leader of many forms of opposition to Government. Sir, I should like to say that nothing can be farther from the truth than any such argument. In the first place, as the Honourable the Mover himself has pointed out very forcibly and effectively in his extremely interesting speech, the party to which I have referred has, quite recently, definitely and unambiguously repudiated the suggestion that this Bill should form a plank of its political platform. But even if the Bill were sponsored by the Congress party, I fail to see what tactical advantage Government could possibly secure by explaining at the present time, as I am now doing, that it has decided to oppose the Bill. Indeed, if it were a question of securing a tactical advantage, as I see the position, Government have much more to gain by maintaining silence as to its intentions and views, or by avoiding--it would have been easy for us to avoid--the present opportunity of explaining those views, than by quite frankly declaring them to the House and to the country. In that case, if we had maintained silence, the fate of the Bill might still have been one of uncertainty, and its opponents might still have apprehended that the Congress party, if returned to the Legislature in sufficient numbers, would revive it as one of the main items of their political platform. But, as things are, it seems to me probable that the opposition of Government in today's debate will see the final obsequies of this Bill, at any rate for a considerable time. But that, as I see the situation in the country as a whole, is, from the point of view of Government *vis-a-vis* the Congress party, a tactical disadvantage to Government rather than an advantage.

No, Sir, it is not on any tactical grounds that Government oppose this Bill. Their opposition is founded on deep-seated grounds of principle, because Government have come to the conclusion that the provisions of the Bill are impracticable, that they are essentially inequitable, and that they are likely to lead to serious disorder. Further, we oppose the Bill on the ground that it is contrary to the wishes of the great majority of the people whom it will affect and that it has only the lukewarm support of the people for whose benefit it is ostensibly intended. And lastly, we

[Sir Henry Craik.]

oppose this Bill on the ground that a measure of this magnitude and importance should not be passed, by a legislative body on the verge of its dissolution, at the fag end of its last Session, when even on my Honourable friend's own admission it has no mandate in favour of the Bill from the electorate.

I now propose, Sir, with the permission of the House, to touch briefly on each of these grounds of our opposition. I have said that we regard the Bill as impracticable and as essentially inequitable. Now, what are the actual provisions to which I object? The Bill enacts, to put it quite shortly, that whenever 50 Hindu Voters of the locality in which a temple is situated move a trustee of the temple by a written petition so to do, the trustee is bound to refer to the decision of all Hindu voters of the locality the question whether the temple shall be thrown open to any excluded caste, that is to say, to any caste or class of Hindus which is excluded by reason of a special usage or custom from entering the temple. On such a referendum being made, the decision of the majority of the voters residing in the locality shall be binding on the trustee or trustees of the temple and on all worshippers therein. Now, Sir, to begin with, we all know that it is a well-known trait in human nature to append one's signature to a piece of paper when asked to do so. Signatures to any kind of petition are very easy to obtain, especially in this country, and indeed, as I think I may say, all over the world. I read only the other day the story of an editor of an undergraduates' journal who circulated a petition to all the professors and students in his university, and secured the signatures of five professors and 150 students to a statement binding the signatories within a period of ten days to commit suicide by decapitation. (Laughter.) That shows how easy it will be to obtain signatures of 50 voters to a petition to the trustee of a temple. Apart from that, the first practical difficulty arises in the definition of the word Hindu. No definition, so far as I recollect, is attempted in the Bill, and I defy even my Honourable and learned friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, with all his knowledge of transcendental and other law, to produce within half an hour a definition which will satisfy, I will not say all, but the majority of the sections of this House. The Bill seems to be based on a presumption that all Hindus are a single religious sect, all worshipping the same God and in the same form, and that there are no distinct differences in the ritual and services between temple and temple. Such a presumption is, of course, entirely opposed to the facts as we know them. So far as one can see, the right to decide on the question of throwing a temple open or not would rest on a heterogeneous electorate based, mark you, on a property qualification, and professing possibly at least half a dozen different forms of faith, many of them, quite possibly most of them, not being believers in any form of temple worship. Let me quote in this connection from one opinion,—this is the only quotation with which I will weary the House I hope,—received from a gentleman in Madras. I do not know the gentleman, his name does not convey anything to me, but it struck me on reading his opinion that it was concise and to the point. As regards the assumption that all Hindus are one religious sect worshipping the same God, he observes :

“It is well-known even to Europeans and Muhammadans resident in this country that in the conception of God there is a sharp division into Sakti, Siva and Vishnu for purposes of image worship. There is again the philosophical division

into Dwaitins, Advaitins, and Vasishta Dwaitins. These differences which not infrequently result in active hostility between the adherents of the different schools are so great that the one will not even step into the temple of the other even if invited."

Then he goes on to picture the sort of thing that might happen in, say, a large town in which there are several temples of various sects. The House will excuse me if I find some little difficulty in pronouncing some of these names which all belong to South India. He says :

"To illustrate this, let us presume that in a certain municipal area there is one temple dedicated to Vishnu, one to Anjaneya, one to 3 P.M. Ramanuja, one to Vedanta Desikar, one to Manavalammuni, one to Siva and one to Gangamma. If the bulk of the voters is Saivite in persuasion, they will in all probability out of spite vote for the entry of the excluded castes into the Vishnu temple, but not into that of Siva. Similarly if the Vadagalais predominate, entry into the Manavalammuni temple will be voted, whereas the Vadagalai temple of Vedanta Desikar will be immune. Where again Brahman and anti-Brahman feelings run high, the temple most held in veneration by the Brahmin sect may be voted and thrown open for entry by the excluded castes."

Then, again, he points out :

"A large number of migratory Harijans with the help of a small minority of small sweetmeat shop-keepers, etc., spring up in an area for just the minimum period to qualify for voting, and after the ward election they are taken over to the next ward where election is to come off."

The morality in Madras elections seems to be very low.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : It is even worse than that.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : He adds :

"A large number of migratory Harijans with the help of a small minority of Hindu voters favourable to their cause can manage to secure enough votes to qualify for admission into any temple against the desire of the majority who may not be in favour of the proposal."

I do not want to multiply quotations in this sense, though there are almost innumerable other opinions very much to the same effect. I think I have said enough to show that it is most unlikely that the majority of the Hindu voters in a municipal or other area will be able to arrive at an impartial decision on the merits of the facts of each individual temple. On the contrary, Sir, their decision will almost inevitably, it seems to me, reflect the clash of rival local factions or the play of individual enmity or spite.

This is a most serious and basic difficulty inherent in the Bill, but an even more grave inequity in the Bill seems to me to be the fact that it gives to a purely local congregation the right to decide on the question of access to, and in practice, I have no doubt also, on the question of the form of worship in temples of all-India interest. For example, as the Government of the United Provinces have pointed out, the definition of temple covers such centres of pilgrimage as Ajodhya, Muttra, Benares, Badrinath and Kedarnath. There are, of course, many other temples, and I have in my mind more especially the great shrines in the South of India, to which pilgrims resort from all over the sub-continent. In the case of such temples, it seems to me wholly inequitable, in fact I think it is even ludicrous, that a comparatively small body of local inhabitants should be the persons to decide whether members of the Depressed Classes

[Sir Henry Craik.]

are to be allowed to enter them or not. The United Provinces Government observe :

“ It is absurd to suggest that the residents in the District Board area of Garhwal should have the final voice on the question of whether the great temple of Badrinath is to be thrown open to untouchables, and it is equally absurd that the fate of the temples at Muttra or Ajodhya should lie in the hands of residents of those two municipal areas.”

To take another example. I understand that magnificent buildings have been erected and endowed in Calcutta—in places like Kalighat—by Marwaris from Jodhpur, from Bikaner, from Jaipur and other places in the north of India. None of those who have founded or endowed those temples would appear in the voters' lists, and it can hardly be seriously contended that a few hundred voters of the local board of Alipore should be allowed to decide what persons can worship in the Kalighat temple, which is resorted to by pilgrims from the whole of British India and from many Indian States.

Further, Sir, the Bill seems to me inequitable, in that it must constitute in many cases a serious invasion of what is in essence a private right or trust. Many of these temples have been founded and endowed by devout Hindus for the benefit of a particular caste or sub-section of their community. Many owe their continued existence to the generosity of benefactors who have restored them, possibly from a state of decay, and who devote a large proportion of their private means and leisure to their maintenance and embellishment. Among my own circle of friends and acquaintances, I can think of many gentlemen, who, on retirement from active life either in the service of Government or in the practice of some profession, spend a large part of their leisure and have devoted a substantial portion of their savings for such purposes. Men like this look upon the temples to which they have devoted their money and their care as a sacred trust, and I am convinced that they will resist any infringement, any invasion of their trust to the last ditch. They would bitterly resent being compelled to accept radical innovation such as this Bill provides. You may condemn such men as intolerant, as dogmatic, narrow-minded, even if you like selfish, but you must admit the sincerity of their beliefs and you must admit the reality of the sacrifices they have made. And yet you are seriously proposing rudely to disturb the conditions, to the establishment and preservation of which such men have devoted their labour and their wealth. Such ruthless disregard of private rights and sentiments can surely not be justified even under the most democratic principles without an explicit mandate from the majority of those who will be affected by it.

I think, Sir, I have said enough in justification of our position that this Bill is in essence inequitable, but an even more serious objection from the point of view of Government is that we are advised by the practically unanimous reports of Local Governments that it is certain or at any rate likely to give rise to grave disorder. The Bihar and Orissa Government, for example, say that if the Bill were passed into law, its application would produce violent discord within the Hindu community which must almost inevitably lead to rioting and bloodshed.

Mr. GAYA PRASAD SINGH (Muzaffarpur and Champaran : Non-Muhammadan) : The Bihar Government is putting it too high.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : I am only quoting what the Government of Bihar and Orissa say. The Madras Government said that there is every likelihood of breaches of the peace and serious factions in villages or of the temples being abandoned by the caste Hindus altogether. That is to say, the caste Hindus will either surrender without a struggle or he will fight. The Punjab Government characterises the Bill as "fraught with danger to the public peace". I may explain that I was not a member of the Punjab Government when this opinion was framed. The Bombay Government said :

"that this Bill will create dissensions among the Hindu community culminating perhaps in frequent breaches of the public peace."

The Government of the United Provinces say :

"that if any serious attempt were made to give practical effect to the Bill, it would almost certainly cause disturbances and breaches of the peace."

One of the District Magistrates in that Province has drawn a vivid picture of the sort of situation that might be expected to arise. He has pointed out that the police may be engaged in stopping a riot in one temple because low-caste worshippers attempted to assert a right of entry given them by local option ; whilst an adjoining temple might be the scene of a riot because the vote had been adverse to the Depressed Classes. It is difficult to conceive a position more embarrassing or indeed more farcical than that. In the face of these opinions, on the probability of disorders and breaches of the peace, I do not see how any Government could do otherwise than oppose a measure which, it is advised from all quarters, would result in disturbances and bloodshed. Any Government, that did not do all within its power to prevent a measure, certain to have such consequences or likely to have such consequences, from passing into law, would be failing in its primary duty. It is not enough to say, as Mr. Justice Madhavan Nair, who was cited with approval by the Honourable the Mover this morning, said, that :

"Government may make rules for preventing riots if riots are apprehended."

(Laughter.)

Sir, I do not think it necessary to develop the point that the Bill is disliked by the majority of those whose interests it affects, that is, by the majority of the Hindu community as a whole, and certainly by the vast majority of those who believe in temple worship. But I have alluded to the fact that the Bill has been received by the Depressed Classes themselves with a certain amount of opposition and, at the best, with very lukewarm support, and I should like to say a few words in corroboration of that view. In Delhi, for example, twenty-one opinions were received from individuals or bodies representing the Depressed Classes, and all were against the Bill. The Central Provinces Government reports that the Depressed Classes do not appear to be enamoured of it. The Bihar and Orissa Government states that the Depressed Classes have no desire that the temples should be thrown open to them, and that the agitation in favour of their entry is regarded merely as a bait for the support of the Harijans at the next elections. In Assam a somewhat different view is taken, namely, that "though the Depressed Classes naturally support the Bill, it can hardly be said that even among them there is any active public opinion that demands it". No definite opinion is expressed on this point by the Madras or Bengal Governments, but the Government of the Punjab have gone into the question in some detail,

[Sir Henry Craik.]

They report that the Punjab *Ad Dharam* Federation, which, I believe, is the most representative body of opinion in the Province, have pointed out that the Depressed Classes do not worship idols at all, and that, therefore, far from being encouraged to go into caste Hindu temples, they think the caste Hindu temples should be boycotted by them. The Federation went on to point out that the Depressed Classes have no desire to be mistaken for Hindus,—and this is rather a striking opinion,—nor have they any wish to go to Hindu temples until the Hindus are prepared to treat them with equality in all respects. That, Sir, is the opinion of what I understand is a genuinely representative body, but a smaller and perhaps a more insignificant body is that of the Balmiki Sabha of Simla, which I understand represents the sweepers' community. They, likewise, state that they have no desire to enter the temples of the high-caste Hindus as they already have temples of their own. Similarly, the Bombay Government state that the Depressed Classes themselves have not shown any zeal in the matter and some of them are even opposed to the Bill. The United Provinces Government express a similar view :

“ The depressed classes ”,

they say,

“ are generally apathetic, though some of them are definitely opposed to the Bill.”

The all-India Dhobi Panchayat, for example, is one of those in opposition to the Bill. The Association of the Depressed Classes in Kumaon, the Doms or Shilpkars, which has been showing some activity in regard to the social uplift of its members for some time past, is reported to look upon the proposed legislation as a political manoeuvre to be regarded with distrust and suspicion.

So much for the views of those who would be affected, should this Bill become law. My final argument against the Bill is that it is not the kind of measure that should be passed by a legislative body whose term is drawing to an end, during its final Session, especially when even the supporters of the Bill do not claim that they have any clear mandate from their constituents in its favour. That, Sir, is an argument which hardly seems to me to need developing.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I am very reluctant to interrupt the Honourable the Home Member, but as Madras opinion cannot be lightly brushed aside, I would invite him to page 353 giving the opinion of the President of the Madras Depressed Classes Society which wholly supports this Bill.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : I never suggested that there was no support at all from Depressed Classes ; I suggested that, as a whole, they were either in opposition or lukewarm. I would say this to my Honourable friend, the Mover, and to other eager reformers of his way of thinking, that, much as I respect their ideals and much as I sympathise with the objects for which they are working, I do think that in the case of a change or innovation such as that now under consideration, a change which will so intimately affect the daily lives of millions of our fellow subjects, it is surely better to attempt to attain your end by methods of persuasion, by the gradual education and development of public opinion, both in this country and abroad, in your favour, rather than by endeavouring to force on the country at a single blow a measure

against which the country has recorded so clear and unmistakable a verdict of disapproval. (Hear, hear.) Sir, as a leading article which I read yesterday said :

“ It has to be borne in mind that, in a country like India, social legislation is a matter demanding extreme delicacy and great discretion. The zeal animating social reformers is praiseworthy. But if it is permitted to run away with the necessary discretion, it will defeat its own purpose. An irritating law is a bad law ; and it can scarcely be denied that this type of legislation does irritate large classes of people.”

Finally, Sir, I venture to commend to my friend what seems to me a very wise maxim of a very wise man, Bacon. He observed :

“ It were good that men in their innovations should follow the example of TIME itself, which, indeed innovateth greatly, but quietly, and by degrees scarce to be perceived.”

Sir, I appeal to my Honourable friend that, after the expressions of opinion which his Bill has received today, he will think fit to withdraw it. (Applause.)

Mr. B. Das : Sir, I wish to make the position of men like myself inside this Legislature and in the country clear about this Temple Entry Bill. Mahatma Gandhi, during his famous Harijan march in Orissa, made it clear to the world what his attitude was towards the temple entry by the Harijans. He declared that as long as there is one high caste Hindu opposed to the entry of the untouchables to the temples he would himself not enter any of the temples nor will he ask the caste Hindus to admit Harijans in their temples. Sir, that is the view which is held by respectable and reasonable people all over India. I was very sorry to hear my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, a very old Congressman and a very old Congress comrade of mine, both on the Congress platforms and on the floor of this House, to have flung mud at the Congress. Sir, I heard with deep humiliation his speech and I can only say : “ Father, forgive him for he knows not what he says ”. Sir, when we have before us the views of the father of this Harijan movement with regard to temple entry, it is futile for us to discuss the question on the floor of this House. Although my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, is the father of this Bill on the floor of this House, he has only lent half-hearted support to it relying more on his cousin who is a Justice of the Madras High Court. So, whatever we discuss today on the floor of this House is mere academic discussion. The Assembly, as it is constituted, cannot record a verdict, and, besides, Mahatma Gandhi does not want to divide the caste Hindus and the Harijans nor does he want to see that they should fight with each other. When he was asked to visit that great temple of Jagannath in the town of Puri, he did not visit it. I am sure Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, before he translates himself to the other world, must visit that temple once so that he may attain his salvation.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I have already visited it.

Mr. B. Das : Probably Lord Jagannath will guide you to the path of truth and righteousness, if you visit that temple once more. So, Sir, Mahatma Gandhi did not visit the temple of Jagannath. Sir, I will only speak of my own Province of Orissa. Sir, Lord Jagannath is known as the *Patita Pavan*, which means the purifier of all the fallen ones. Before Lord Jagannath there is no caste and no creed. Although the

[Mr. B. Das.]

high caste Brahmins, the so-called priest-craft, have made the Jagannath temple a *sanctum sanctorum*, yet there are days when, irrespective of caste and creed, any Hindu, any untouchable, can visit and approach the golden throne of Lord Jagannath.

Sir, the Honourable the Home Member quoted the opinion of the Government of Bihar and Orissa in support of his opposition to this Bill. But he forgot to see the implications and he could not see what was agitating the mind of that Government.

Mr. N. R. Gunjal : Did Mahatma Gandhi go to the temple of Jagannath ?

Mr. B. Das : Mahatma Gandhi did not want to go there as long as the heart of the caste Hindus is not purified and as long as they do not recognise the Harijans as their brothers and do not welcome them in the temple of Jagannath. Sir, I was referring to the view of the Government of Bihar and Orissa. Sir, the Government of Bihar and Orissa is known as the Harijan Government—the depressed Government among the Provincial Governments in India because their views are always depressed. This is what they say :

“ So far as the Local Government are aware the Depressed Classes in Bihar have no desire that the temples should be thrown open to them. The agitation for temple entry has at the bottom a political move and is a bid for the support of the Harijan vote at the next elections.”

Sir, I belong to this Province and I do not know if there are even a hundred Harijans in the Province of Bihar and Orissa who command votes either for the local Council or for the Assembly. How can the Harijan votes be won over at the next elections is a mystery to me and to say that the Depressed Classes do not want admission to the temples is a myth. Sir, I had the privilege of joining on three or four occasions that great march on foot which Mahatma Gandhi did from the Puri town to the town of Balasore in Orissa. Mahatma Gandhi found out that that was the right way of approaching the hearts of the people and the soul of the millions and millions of masses, whether they are depressed or high caste Brahmins like my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur. Mahatma Gandhi found out that the right way to approach the hearts of the people was to identify himself in the mode of living with the people, and, therefore, he gave up motor cars and railway travelling and he walked on the high roads and met there hundreds of thousands of people and had heart-to-heart contact with them.

An Honourable Member : “ What about Chaitanya ? ”

Mr. B. Das : I know that Orissa lost her freedom and Empire through the religious preaching of a Bengalee Brahmin named Chaitanya, who, I understand, was the son of an Oriya Brahmin. Sir, we are all Harijans in India. The Raja Bahadur may take pride in the fact that he is a Brahmin by birth but he is a Harijan when he visits the abode of the Honourable the Home Member. We are all Harijans before the Government of India, which carry out the white man's burden. So, it is no use our quarrelling here on the floor of this House and thinking that we are high caste Hindus and others are Depressed Classes. Sir, Mr. Ranga Iyer made a mis-statement that the great Brahmin Shankracharya of Malabar tried to imitate the Buddhist religion by multiplying the temples all over

India. It was the other way about. I wish there were no Brahmins in priest-craft not only in India but all over the Universe. It was the Brahmin priests.....

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen : They will be done.

Mr. B. Das : My Honourable friend, Pandit Sen, is equally a non-Brahmin like myself. (*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :* "No.") He need not take pride in the fact that Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar will dine with him at the same table or even in the same room. Raja Bahadur will do nothing of the kind.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen : You do not know the implication of the word "non-Brahmin". There are other twice-born castes than Brahmins.

Mr. B. Das : My Honourable friend has interpreted literally. But what I mean by priest-craft is the Brahmin priest-craft as well as the non-Brahmin priests. It is these priests, in order that they might protect their own emoluments, in order that they might be drones on society, went to build barriers of caste. When the Aryan conquerors came, a few adopted the profession of priest-craft and the Aryans divided themselves into three sacred castes. I belong to the Kshatriya caste, though I have fallen from the true ideals of Kshatriya, having been forced to live by my brain and pen. What is my Honourable friend, Pandit Sen? He is a Vaidya. When these Aryans came, the Brahmin priests among them found an easy way of eking out their livelihood by living upon other castes. The Aryans tried to differentiate the original inhabitants of India, namely the Dravidians, the great nation that ruled India with their culture and civilisation which goes back to 100,000 years. In this way the Aryans differentiated the original inhabitants, and those who opposed them they called them untouchables. We find that these Brahmin priests combined together and fought against the Buddhists and after they were vanquished they called them the untouchables. A large number of untouchables are known as Namasudras or Chandalas in Bengal, they are nothing but high class Buddhists and it is these Brahmin priests of Bengal that condemned them to the class of Namasudras. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, who is himself a Brahmin, probably an equally good Brahmin like my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, ought to have admitted the sins of his own community who have brought about the state of Hindu society to this condition that a large multitude of people are today debarred from worshipping God in a common temple. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. S. C. Sen (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce : Indian Commerce) : But is God situate in one temple?

Mr. B. Das : I am not discussing here the oneness of God or the doctrines of the Brahmo religion. I am talking of temple entry. If my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, is a Hindu, he knows there are thousands of temples built by ordinary common priests, so that they could earn their livelihood out of those temples. What the nation want and what a large number of people who believe in idolatry and idol worship want is that these temples should be thrown open to all the Hindus who believe in idol worship. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable the Home Member to the view of a Judge of the Patna High Court, Justice Macpherson, and he says at page 181 :

"Temple entry is mainly, if not entirely, a question for Hindus and on the reports of views of the Bar Association, a preponderating opinion of the highly

[Mr. B. Das.]

English educated would seem to be in favour. The procedure laid down is perhaps open to criticism."

I want the House to note the next sentence,—

"One point, however, I lay stress upon both as a Judge and as a Member of the public,"

I am glad this Englishman identifies himself as a Member of the public,—

"if there is to be legislation, it should not be on the eye-wash lines of the Sarda Act but a serious Statute, not one to bring the whole Statute Book into contempt."

I am not here to say that this House should legislate for temple entry.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair, which was then occupied by Mr. K. C. Neogy, one of the Panel of Chairman.]

I stand by what Mahatma Gandhi has said and what has been accepted by the intelligentsia of the country. Speaking as a Congressman, who has been so from 1919, not as a Congress leader, I do not pose that I am a leader in this House or outside this House.....

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Are you a Congressman?

Mr. B. Das : Yes, I am.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : Then why are you here?

Mr. B. Das : My Honourable friend, the Home Member, has not understood what a Congressman is. Any man who pays a subscription of four annas and signs and accepts the Congress creed is a Congressman.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : But I thought he had also got to wear khaddar habitually.

Mr. B. Das : Sir, I am not here to bandy words with the Honourable the Home Member, but if I ask him, "Are you a good Christian" and if I again interject "Do you always follow Christian virtues and Christian doctrines", he may say, "No". Even so, I may not be a Congressman in the sense that I do not carry out every programme of the Congress, but all the same I am a Congressman.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik : It comes to this then that the Honourable Member is a Congressman, but not a good Congressman. (Laughter.)

Mr. B. Das : It is for others to judge whether I am a good Congressman, or not. I am not to judge my own action. But I am a Congressman all the same. For us the problem is at rest now. We hope that the caste Hindus will realise the gravity of the position in the country, the untouchable position in which they are placed in the country, politically and socially, by the rule of a foreign Government that rules India. If they are themselves untouchables politically and socially in the eyes of Government, then they ought to have sympathy with those whom they have deliberately kept out of the fold of Hinduism and of the great Hindu community. I am sure my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, will soon speak on this debate. I do want him to

reply to the appeal of Sir Muhammad Yakub, namely when he called upon the Depressed Classes, whom the Hindus do not admit socially and economically to the Hindu fold, to embrace Muslim faith, what is the remedy that the Raja Bahadur has got for that? The only remedy is that we should realise that we are all the sons of one God. We are all Hindus. All the privileges are not meant for the few Brahmins that exploit the caste Hindus and Depressed Classes. It is they who brought down the degradation of Hindu society and brought down the ruin of this sacred Bharatvarsha so that for 2,000 years we are under foreign rule. If my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, speaks, let him talk why India came under foreign grip. It is because of the distinction created by the Brahmins, they tried to differentiate between caste and caste and tried to shut out a very large population—the Dravidian population and other population that were the original inhabitants of India—and condemned them to a state of untouchability.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria (Bombay Northern Division : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : Where do you take your history from?

Mr. B. Das : I did not get it from Persia in any case.

Sir, that is my appeal to the Hindus at large, and if my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, divides this House, I will whole-heartedly vote with him, because I am for the emancipation of the Depressed Classes. But if Mr. Ranga Iyer does not want to divide the House, I am not going to challenge a division because I stand by the dictum of Mahatma Gandhi, and, I hope, the hearts of the high caste Hindus will be purified and ennobled so that they will see the Light of God, and, if they see the Light of God, that Light should not be denied to those who today are known as the Depressed Classes.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Sir, may I ask one question? Is Mr. Das aware, when he quoted the dictum of Mahatma Gandhi, that Mr. Gandhi had stated that if votes are taken on this motion neither Muslims nor Christians but only Hindus should take part in the voting?

Mr. B. Das : Yes, Sir, I am aware of that.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : Sir, it is my duty, before I proceed to submit to the House the few observations that I intend making, to most heartily congratulate Government on the most sensible view that they have taken upon the question, a view which is founded not upon prejudice, not upon sentiment, not upon any tactical advantage that they wanted to obtain by taking this attitude, but a well considered, a carefully thought out opinion, based upon the mass of opinions that have been submitted to them by every responsible person, commencing from the Local Governments right up to their own officers, both European and Indian. Sir, I was afraid, I can frankly confess, that, after all, the Government of India, in view of the fact that this is the last day of the Session, might somehow or other not be in a position,—I do not say they wanted to shirk it,—but they might not be in a position to give expression to their views and we shall all separate from this place without exactly knowing what, after all, is the attitude of the one Government that counted with reference to this Bill. Fortunately, God has enabled us to have this Bill for discussion on the floor of this House, thanks greatly to the courtesy of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer; because, I have no objection to tell you that if he said that he

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

was not going to move the Bill, no power on earth, not even the President in his Chair, could have compelled him to move it.

Sir, the whole of Sanatanist India and in fact the whole population of India with the exception probably of that minor fraction,—and even they should be thankful,—in fact the entire population of India should be thankful to Mr. Ranga Iyer for having given us this opportunity to draw out from the Government of India their attitude regarding this matter; an attitude which, I assure them, would reassure the entire Hindu community, probably with the exception of a few persons, with regard to the real attitude of the Government of India in matters of this sort and thus restore the faith which, I say without fear of contradiction, Government have been fast losing in consequence of the manner in which they have been allowing one irreligious legislation after another to come up before this House. Sir, in their own interest, in the interest of the peace and good Government of India and in the interest of the stability of the British Government, of which I am a great believer, I say they must restore that faith and confidence. I do not believe in that slogan of foreign Government and all that sort of thing. No Government is foreign and no Government is indigenous. Sir, we have had a little foretaste of indigenous Government in Madras which gentlemen here may not know. My friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, depicted one portion of it and it and my Honourable friend, the Home Member, read an opinion which has come very handy that in the case of a dispute between Vadagalais and Thengalis, the Thengalis would out of spite instigate the voters to vote for the entry of the Depressed Classes,—I do not like the word “Harijan”, I will say presently why,—into the Vadaigalai temple and *vice versa*. Sir, that opinion is not imaginary and I will tell you exactly what happened. In my own native place of Mannargudi in the Tanjore district, there is a very big tank which covers an area of nearly a square mile and a half. It was not built by any of these gentlemen but by the old Rajas of Tanjore. All round the banks of that tank, on the four sides, only Brahmmins reside. It is supposed to be the holiest tank in that locality and consequently a large number of people including non-Brahmmins go and have baths there on holy and sacred occasions. Now, Sir, this tank is supplied by means of a channel from another tank which is ten miles ahead. As soon as the channel enters the municipal limit it bifurcates. One channel gets into this tank, another channel gets into the other quarters of the town in order to supply the tanks of that place. Now, Sir, what did the people do? Notwithstanding the fact that there was a floating festival connected with the temple which is to take place there, the municipality of Mannargudi, consisting mostly of non-Brahmmins, passed a resolution that this tank should not be supplied with water until the entire number of tanks in the locality were supplied. And why? Because it is mostly used by Brahmmins. If you want a certified copy of that resolution I will produce it; I have got it in Hyderabad.

Mr. B. Rajaram Pandian (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : How many Brahmmins are there in Mannargudi?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I am sorry I have not got the number at present, but I have noted the question and I will give an answer to my Honourable friend in due course.

Sir, I was talking of the position. Perhaps my friend will understand it before he jumps up again. The reason of the resolution was that the tank is surrounded by Brahmin houses who from morning till evening draw water there, and the Brahmins should not be given that water ! That is the reason ; and I was making it as a point to show that the prejudice, the feeling and the passion that would be roused, if such a thing is put to vote, is not imaginary. The gentlemen who gave the opinion exactly understood the position ; and that is a sort of indigenous Government where your own people have manned the local bodies and your own people have manned all the grades of administration right up to the top. Go to Madras for a little while, say that you are a Brahmin and see what difficulty arises. And, after all, what did Brahmins do ? Thousands of years ago a gentleman of the name of Manu, who was not even a Brahmin, instituted the Dharma-Shastra and they have all burnt the Dharma-Shastras and yet the Brahmin lives. That, Sir, is the condition of an indigenous Government. If this is the real condition of the Government that is going to be established in consequence of the White Paper or any other proposal, God save us from that indigenous Government. That, Sir, is my position. I do not say that the British Government is a very good Government ; I have my own grievances and if you want me to recite them I will take 48 hours to do that without sleeping. (Laughter.) But you must take the entire position into consideration and say which Government is good, not because it is manned by white people, not because it is manned by black people, or brown or all other shades of colour, but the real achievement of the Government. After all, there is a great deal of draw-back in the British Government. However, I am not discussing that point : I think I have made my position clear.

Mr. S. G. Jog (Berar Representative) : Perhaps you find it awkward !

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I do not know how my friend, Mr. Jog, says that it is awkward : it is absolutely not awkward to me at all. I am under the British Government under their iron heel so far as my land is concerned : I have had administrative experience in the foremost Indian State : I have had experience of many other States where my friends and relations are living. It is absolutely no inconvenience to me at all to refer to it : no Government can be conducted upon the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. There ought to be trouble and of course we have got to take into consideration the comparative trouble ; and, consequently, I have no illusions in regard to this matter. But that is not the point just now. I thank the Government of India for having taken this bold and courageous step and announced to the world that they are not going to tolerate this piece of legislation, practically universally condemned. But I have got a little complaint. My friend, Mr. Jog, said, it would be inconvenient for me. But no inconvenience ever affected me, nor, I hope, will it affect me hereafter. I carefully followed the various headings under which the Honourable the Home Member said that the Government of India was going to oppose this Bill ; but I was waiting for him to declare that this Bill, being opposed to the religious beliefs and considerations of the majority of the Hindus, the Government are bound by the Royal Proclamation, commencing from the Proclamation of Queen Victoria, that they should not put any one to trouble because of

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

his belief and "that on pain of our serious displeasure none of those who are in service under us shall interfere with the modes of worship of our Hindu subjects". That was a solemn injunction laid upon these servants of the British Indian Government by Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, and it is upon that that we base our opposition and my Honourable friend, the Home Member, did not say that as one of the reasons, whereas I had expected he would do so.....

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : May I just interrupt the Honourable Raja Bahadur : from the Queen's Proclamation a sort of religious neutrality, I think, is expected on the part of the Government and, I thought, he would be grateful to the Honourable the Home Member for violating that neutrality in favour of the Raja Bahadur.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : The Honourable the Home Member did not do anything of the sort. My complaint is, that in addition to the considerations which as a political Government, as a political institution, it cannot take a risk against which its subordinate governments warned it, I say, in addition to that, it ought to have given prominence to the one position which almost all the Local Governments have stated, namely, that it is a question of religion and that it is dangerous for the Government of India to allow this Bill to be proceeded with. They shut out the alternative that the Government should remain neutral ; but, on the contrary, they should actively oppose it : the Punjab Government say : " If, however, the danger occurs "—mark the word—" that this Bill should be proceeded with,"—in their opinion it is a positive danger—why ?—because you must not interfere with religion. That, I submit, is my complaint against the Government of India that they did not say that this being a religious subject, the Government ought not to interfere and allow this mixed Legislature to declare as to what shall be my religion or my faith or whether I am right or wrong in holding that faith.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : The Government have correctly interpreted the Queen's Proclamation.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : That is just what I say : Government have correctly interpreted the Proclamation, but men who have not got the abstruse knowledge of my friend, Mr. Jadhav, probably because I have never been inside a Provincial Cabinet, cannot know that without referring to the Proclamation or to the principles contained in that long speech made by the Honourable the Home Member, it could be deduced : that is my objection. Barring that, I do not want to mar a good situation. I say I voice the indebtedness of the entire community for this bold stand. Another matter is this : I must congratulate His Excellency Lord Willingdon. I share with my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, in the congratulations that he humbly offered to that exalted personage for this reason : I have no objection to tell you that, before sanction to introduce this Bill was accorded, I went all the way down to Calcutta and I tried to induce His Excellency not to give sanction to this Bill. He gave me a two hours' interview within a few hours of his arrival there and I was very satisfied : I thought I was entirely successful ; but, early in January, a bomb was thrown at my head and when I saw the Government communiqué at that time, I was very angry, I assure you. I thought

His Excellency was not going to sanction it and that he made a great mistake in doing so. Later, on further consideration and after the result that we have now seen of this reference for public opinion, far from being angry with him, I am greatly obliged to him ; and I tender my thanks, on behalf of the whole community, because in the course of conversation with him I told him that the great majority of the community was behind me and he said : " Very well, my dear friend, if that is so, why do you not go and prove it ? " Although I was quite ready to prove it, I thought that my *ipse dixit* was quite sufficient ; but it was not. Now, today, standing on the floor of this House, I am thankful to him for having given the country this opportunity of expressing its opinion unmistakably against the wicked principles underlying this Bill—they are not my words, they are the words of judicial officers and executive officers holding the position of Commissioners of Divisions : I think it is a mischievous and wicked Bill which has been brought forward here on the floor of this House, a piece of legislative impertinence as one of the officers said.

I was going to refer to the statement made by Mr. Rajagopalachariar, but as that has been done by my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, it has taken the wind out of my sails completely. But I am not sorry for it : there is only one thing I will allude to and that is this : my Honourable friend, Mr. Das, quoted some speech of Mr. Gandhi, and, he said, so long as there is one Hindu against it, so long he will not have this Bill passed or he will not ask any untouchable to enter a temple. Is that true ? Mr. Gandhi has been making experiments with truth. Day after day, week after week, a recital of his experiments with truth we have read in the newspapers. What is the truth ? Mr. Rajagopalachariar, his lieutenant, his close relation, because he has given his daughter in marriage to Mr. Gandhi's son, what does he write to me along with other Hindu members of this Legislature just before we met for this Session ? Mr. Gandhi does not want the Muhammadan votes ; he does not want the Christian votes ; he does not want anybody else's votes, but if the Hindu Members of the Assembly would agree to his principle, he has no objection to this Bill being tightened so far as the conditions are concerned. I shall give my reply. Place in juxtaposition the gentleman who is opposing me in my constituency, who made his first election speech the other day. A question was put to him immediately that I went to my constituency in which, I believe, I have some little influence. Of course, this gentleman came not to create any trouble in the place. I wrote to my constituency asking them not to create any trouble in the meeting, but only to put my rival candidate three questions, namely—" What is your attitude regarding the Temple Entry Bill ; what is your attitude regarding the anti-religious legislation ; what is your attitude regarding the socialistic attitude of the Congress " ? I wanted the meeting to put these three questions to my friend, Dr. Rajan, he is a good friend of mine, he is a good man, he has treated me sometimes, although he became angry with me latterly.....

Mr. B. V. Jadhav : On a point of order, Sir. Is the Honourable Member making an electioneering speech or is he speaking on the Temple Entry Bill ?

4 P.M.

An Honourable Member : Kindly speak up.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : Very well, Sir, the fact of the matter is, those questions were put to him. I am now talking of Mr.

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

Gandhi who has been praised to the skies. The greatest sin that my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, committed was when he talked of a gentleman who is Gandhi's lieutenant. Now, this other gentleman said :

“ Even Gandhi had realised that the country was not ripe for allowing Harijans into temples.”

He concluded by saying that they would do nothing which was not supported by public opinion. I want to put a direct question to Mr. B. Das who was very angry, because Mr. Gandhi was attacked in this House. Now my question is,—did or did not Mr. Gandhi know at the time when he allowed his lieutenant, his henchman, the man who is behind the temple entry question,—that Mr. Gandhi will be quite satisfied if the Hindu Members were agreeable, or at least a majority of them were agreeable, to vote for the proposition ? That shows that though Mr. Gandhi was satisfied that the public was not behind him, why did Mr. Gandhi make this experiment of getting the Hindu Members of this House to get a vote by a trick, shall I say ? Why did he attempt to do it ? And yet, Mr. B. Das is very angry with us, because we have attacked Mr. Gandhi. Sir, I have got to refer to Mr. Gandhi because of his close connection with the temple entry question. He has got certain qualities which our Shastras lay down as the highest qualities to be possessed by any human being. If he had confined himself to those qualities, if he had exercised his intellect and used his energies in the sphere to which his qualities relate, he would today have been, not what he unfortunately aspired to become and never succeeded, actually the leader of one phase of Indian opinion. Unfortunately, he began to attack our idols, whether they are good or bad. So far as we can work our memory back, we never allowed even the greatest and most cruel invaders to lay their hands upon our idols, and if any one were to attempt to lay his hands upon our temples or idols, that would be the last time when he can have any influence in this world so far as India is concerned. That has been the experience of this country, and the latest example of that is Mr. Gandhi who, out of his great enthusiasm for the Depressed Classes, thought that the only way in which he could improve their condition was to defy our idols. Well, Sir, our idols do not speak, but they have acted in a way that, where three years ago none of us had any chance on public platforms, whenever we might go, today his procession is followed by black flags, shattering of the wind screens of cars, followed by police, because some of his own followers attacked Mr. Gandhi, I believe, an unfortunate man by the name Lal Nath.....

Mr. B. Das : But that attack on Pandit Lal Nath was not made by friends of Harijans, but by his own followers.

[At this stage, the Honourable the Law Member rose to address the House.]

Mr. Chairman (Mr. K. C. Neogy) : The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : Sir, I have not finished.

Mr. Chairman (Mr. K. C. Neogy) : The Chair thought the Honourable Member had finished.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : No, Sir. I shall now leave Mr. Gandhi alone, because I do not want to take up the time of the House.

I only wish to remind my friend about the bomb incident in Poona. Now, who was the witness? Mr. Bhopatkar. The bomb fell somewhere near Mr. Gandhi, and Mr. Bhopatkar was hurt.....

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : How is this all relevant?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I shall show you how it is relevant. At the place where Mr. Gandhi was going to be presented with an address, poor Mr. Bhopatkar had to suffer,—I do not know for whose fault, because the bomb burst in his presence, and all those little things which contained in the bomb entered his system, and he was suffering.....

Mr. S. C. Mitra : How are all these matters relevant to the discussion.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : This matter is relevant in this way, because Mr. Gandhi has been extolled to the skies, and I know that he is the man behind this movement,—there is no question about it at all—and I want to satisfy this House, and, through this House, the public at large, that the man who instigated this Bill, who created all this trouble in the country, is a man with such a record, and, therefore, the public could judge of him upon the acts and facts that have actually occurred.

Sir, my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, put me a question whether these things could not be solved by allowing free entry of Depressed Classes into the temples.....

An Honourable Member : They are Harijans, they are not Depressed Classes.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : Yes, I am also a Harijan, my friend Mr. Ghuznavi is a Harijan, the Home Member is a Harijan, every man whom God likes is a Harijan. Does God dislike me? We are all God's children, and I claim that God likes me more than all these gentlemen. Sir, a little learning is a dangerous thing. Soor Das, the great poet of Gujerat, in his various songs, has referred not to the Depressed Classes, but to the entire human creation as Harijans. Unfortunately, I do not remember those verses, somebody gave me a list of them, but there he refers to the entire human race as Harijans in order to exhort them to walk in God's ways. Now, Mr. Gandhi, who is a great believer in these songs and *bhajans*, had, I suppose, at some time or other, got these things by heart and then he thought it was a very nice thing to give a new appellation to his clients, and, thereby, he expected to raise himself in the estimation of the people. Unfortunately, Sir, he did not reckon with a friend over there in Madras of the name of Rao Saheb or Rao Bahadur,—I do not know,—Srinivasan,—who is a member of the Depressed Class. He was a co-adjutor of Mr. Gandhi in South Africa. He wrote an open letter to Mr. Gandhi on the occasion of his visit to Madras, and said that they were all awfully disgusted with Mr. Gandhi's ways :

"Our people do not care for these things. For God's sake, don't call us by this name."

That is what happened, and that is why I do not want to call them Harijans because they themselves do not want it.

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

There are two matters upon which I must speak before I go further. So far as economic uplift and other co-ordinated uplift of the Depressed Classes are concerned, I am entirely at one, and will even proceed further than what the Honourable the Home Member has said. I do not speak the language of exaggeration, I am not for winning a dialectical victory, but I shall state, as shortly as possible, what I have been doing in my village, and if anybody has any doubts—well, my Honourable friend, Mr. Rajah, when he was more favourable to me...

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah (Nominated Non-Official) : What makes my Honourable friend to think that I am not favourable to him now ?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I am glad. I thought that he had some spite against me because I was a Brahmin.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : You are looking through your own glasses !

Mr. B. V. Jadhav : Will you welcome him to your house if he goes over there ?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I have already answered that question once, and I have been through a lot of fire because of the straight answer I gave, and I decline to answer the question now. I was on the question of the uplift of the Depressed Classes. In the Tanjore district and in the Trichinopoly district I have got lands in four villages, and I challenge any of these gentlemen to come over there to my villages and see whether the Harijans... (*An Honourable Member* : "Hullo, Harijans." ?) (Laughter.)... Depressed Classes. What can I do ? The environments are such that sometimes you are led into using expressions which you do not actually believe in. That is human nature. I say, I wanted you to see whether we have not done already what Government say they have done to these Depressed Classes. Separate wells have been dug, separate and better residences for them have been given. Where they had been living in bogs and swamps, they are living now in much better residences, they have been provided with practically every convenience that we can supply. Don't think that we are rolling in wealth. Come to the villages and see. We are as much depressed as they are, the landowners are more depressed than the Depressed Classes themselves. Well, to the extent of our resources I have done, and most of my fellow *mirasdars* have done. But, of course, we do not shout, we do not go, nobody presents us with addresses when we come out, no festoons, no garlands, no entertainments, no tea parties, and no music. (*An Honourable Member* : "No purses !") Purses ? Who is going to give us purses ? They are ready to take money from us ; don't you think of purses ; purses are reserved for somebody else. So far as economic uplift is concerned, we have been doing, we have absolutely no objection to do all in our power to help these classes to come up. But, Sir, that is quite different from giving them equality in our religion as we understand it. As the Honourable the Home Member said, call us all sorts of names, there are only two names that can be given, obscurantist and reactionary. Add that to the list that the Honourable the Home Member gave, and call me by any name. I prefer to be called all sorts of names and I prefer to be in the religion with the beliefs that have afforded solace to my ancestors from the

beginning of time and that is affording solace to the teeming millions of this land, and not all the abuses that could be showered on my head, and not all the abuses that could find a place in any dictionary, or even in the New Oxford Dictionary, will induce me to change that faith. And, Sir, what is the result? Do you understand Hinduism? Do you understand the real tenet of it? So far as these Depressed Classes are concerned, they say there is a passage of the Puranas which says that when the sages went to Parasura for knowing what *Dharma* should be followed in this *Yuga*, Parasura understood the whole thing. He took a dip in the sacred river and immediately got up and said, "Sudra Sadhu". One fortunate man in the *Kaliyuga* is the Sudra. A more fortunate man is the Depressed Class, because he has not got to perform any ceremony. He has not got to keep any fasts; all that he has got to do is to pronounce the name of God and that has as much effect as the most difficult penance that you can ever make. That, Sir, is what is contained in the *Shastras*, and there is no good saying that you have not been given the *Mantra Diksha*, therefore, you are in any way inferior.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadian) : Do the *Shastras* regard the Sudras as superior to Brahmins?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : There is no question. That is just like my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, the modern Manu of India. (Laughter.) My Honourable friend does not know a word of Sanskrit. He does not know what is stated in the *Shastras*. He has read fourth-rate English translations of Hindu law books, and an unsophisticated community has enriched him by buying by thousands his book on Hindu Code. Whoever looked at the Hindu Code to see whether it was the correct Hindu law or not? Sir Hari Singh Gour, K.C.S.I., L.L.D., Ph.D., etc., etc., (Laughter)

Mr. Chairman (Mr. K. C. Neogy) : We have had enough of personalities; the Honourable Member would do well to come back to the Bill.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : The question was put whether under the Hindu law the Sudras are superior to the Brahmins, and I am first removing the fallacy contained in the major premise, and now I shall proceed to show, in the minor premise, not as stated by me, but as stated by Mr. Gandhi, the modern prophet of Hinduism, in his reply to Dr. Ambedkar, that there is no such thing as inferiority or superiority in the Hindu religion. Each class by itself is superior; each class by itself is inferior. Each in the Hindu religion has got a specific duty to perform, and as long as he performs that duty, that caste is the highest caste among the Hindus. It is men like Sir Hari Singh Gour who have instilled into the minds of these unsophisticated people that there is a superiority and an inferiority. We have divided it, rightly or wrongly, long before you or most of us were born,—that this is the system that should obtain in the Hindu society. This is their sociological division, and this is a division which has extorted the admiration of impartial philosophers, the latest of whom is Nietzsche, who in describing the division of society laid down by Manu said that the last word regarding sociological division has been stated by Manu and there is nothing to improve upon it. Sir, I was on the question of the uplift of the Depressed Classes. The next point that I want to come to is the challenge made to me about the building of tem-

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

ples for the Depressed Classes. I do not know if it is well-known here that the Depressed Classes have got their own forms of worship, their own temples, and they in their temples do not want that they should be interfered with, nor in their worship. I may tell you exactly what happens in the villages. There are various village deities for whom there are temples and everybody is bound to contribute both to the building of the temple when it is under repair and to contribute to the expenses connected with the festival. The way we go about building the temples is that all the labourers contribute their labour by either providing bricks or putting them up and raising a wall, and those of us who cannot do that sort of thing pay money. If Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, will go to the villages he will find that each village has got various temples, one for Mariamman, the small-pox deity, Ayanar temple, that is supposed to be the guardian deity of the village, one for Pidari, and for so many other Gods and Goddesses in gradation. Now, Sir, the custom in the South Indian villages at least is this. Before you start cultivation you must perform the annual festival of these Gods and Goddesses, otherwise, it is believed that the wrath of these Gods and Goddesses is visited upon the people. There is cholera, there is small-pox, there is anthrax amongst the cattle or there is some other calamity which is supposed to be brought about by the wrath of these Gods and Goddesses. Then, Sir, I have got to contribute along with the meanest villagers for the expenses of these festivals. I am not aware of the conditions in other parts of the country. Therefore, I submit that the temples exist there already, and, if you want more temples, we shall do all in our power to construct those temples and help them, if that is their idea, but, Sir, I make bold to say that this agitation is mostly engineered by persons who have themselves no faith in the temples, who themselves do not go to the temples and see the idols.

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

Consequently this is the objection which we have got. I had originally intended to deal with the mass of opinions, but I have no time, and, therefore, I shall not trouble the House with them but I will refer to only one thing. On the last occasion when I was speaking on the Untouchability Bill, I referred to the story of Saint Nandanar, regarding whom the Honourable gentleman in charge of that Bill made certain statements. I accepted all those statements and I only added as a rider that he was allowed to come into the temple after passing over a heap of fire. Up jumped my friend. He said that all this is the work of the cunning and wily Brahmin and that there is no such record anywhere at all, and it is you, not me personally, you the Brahmins, who have concocted this story and not all my pathetic appeal to him that this appears in the archaeological records would induce my friend to withdraw that unfortunate expression he used against the Brahmin. Now, Sir, how does retribution work. There is a gentleman who is the District Judge of Cuddalore. He is not a Brahmin. His name is Mr. Ratnavelu Pillai. This is what he says about the specific statement of the Honourable Member :

"As in other countries, there have been religious reformers in India also. That accounts for the 63 Nayanmars, etc. Nandanar, the Panchama Saint who is said to have attained salvation in Chidambaram, is one of such examples. He wanted to see Nataraja, the dancing figure of Siva and, by His grace, got the permission of his hard taskmaster and was waiting outside the temple premises. He did not get entrance into the temple of Sri Nataraja as a Panchama as the speech of

Mr. M. C. Rajah would suggest, but on the other hand, according to the Puranam by his prayer to Nataraja, Nataraja appeared in the dreams of the Dikshitar, mentioned to them that his *bhakta* (devotee) was waiting outside the temple in a corner of the town and enjoined them to get him purified and bring him before his presence and that accordingly Nandanar went through an ordeal of fire and emerged as a Brahmin with all the appearance of a Dikshitar and that he was then taken to the presence of Sri Nataraja."

Now, Sir, I may be absolutely wrong in my contentions. So far as this is concerned, here is an authority, a gentleman of the position of a District Judge, a non-Brahmin. This is how he justifies it.

Sir, I have not much time left. There is one thing which I want to say with regard to the judges of the High Court. I have got a complaint against them, those judges of the High Court who had given their opinion. Now, one of them has considered the question from the stand-point of the Honourable the Home Member. As the highest exponents of the law in the land, was it or was it not their duty to find out how the civil rights connected with these temples were disturbed by this Bill, how temples built for the benefit of one community would be allowed to be dissipated and desecrated, if the original object of the founders is not fulfilled. At least the judges of the High Court would be expected to consider that position, whereas they have been led away by the very skilful manner in which the Bill is drafted, especially the provision regarding the alleged disability of the Depressed Classes. Most of them have been led away by it, and, lastly, I have got a complaint against those Muhammadan gentleman from the Judges of the High Court downwards, who say that they are in agreement with the Bill. On the contrary, the European judges of the High Court said that this is a matter for the Hindu community and they are not concerned. In the same way, if they did not want to discuss it, they should have said 'This is a matter which concerns the Hindu community. We are not going to give any opinion'. How will these Muhammadan gentleman like it if I interfere with their precepts and lay down what their Muhammadan religion should be, just as my friend, Sir Muhammad Yakub, did unfortunately. Sir Muhammad Yakub spoke of my religion contemptuously when he said that he did not like untouchability should form part of the religion. Shall I repeat to him the same thing. Now, I would not do it because I have not got the time.

An Honourable Member : Are you afraid of Ghuznavi ?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : No, I am not afraid of Ghuznavi. Sir Muhammad Yakub extended an invitation to all and sundry to embrace Islam in order to have this universal equality. I will give you one instance. In Hyderabad, there is a strong Shia community and a strong Sunni community. The Sunnis have their own mosques and the Shias have got their own mosques. I am addressing Sir Muhammad Yakub. Unfortunately he is not here. Would you believe it that the Shias and the Sunnis recognise the same Prophet, who recognise the same God whose Prophet Muhammad was—the Shias are not allowed to go and enter the Sunni mosques in order to say their prayers and *vice versa*.

An Honourable Member : That is not true.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I am going to tell you what happened in Hyderabad. There is a Sunni masjid in which three Shias went in. I suppose, in order to create a disturbance. Now, Sir, I believe, the practice of the Shia Muhammadans and the Sunni Muhammadans differ.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Would the Honourable Member now conclude his speech and give a chance to other speakers ?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : That is why I am anxious to finish my speech. I have got here 800 pages and I have got here materials which can engage me for three days. I am very sorry that it is suggested that I was taking up the time of other gentlemen, when I find that a gentleman like Sir Muhammad Yakub attacking my religion and calling all and sundry to become Muhammadans and I think it is my duty to show that this trouble obtains also in the Muhammadan religion, before Sir Muhammad Yakub asks all and sundry to enter the Islamic faith. I have only got a few facts to say upon this matter. Sir, it seems, I do not know, I speak subject to correction from my Honourable friends, it seems, the Sunni Muhammadans in saying their prayers hold their hands like that, and that the Shia people drop down their hands like that, I do not know which, I am not sure, but it is no good saying no, because it was I who practically drafted the *farman* referred to, in order to prevent this sort of thing. Now, whatever it is, there were signs of disturbance, words resulted in blows and blows resulted in bloodshed, that was reported to the late Nizam and he intervened, and, consequently, he issued a *farman*, which I had the honour of helping in drafting under instructions from the most learned Maulvis with long *daris* (Laughter), and, in that I said that no Shia is to enter a Sunni mosque unless he wishes to conform to the practices of that mosque and *vice versa*. That, Sir, is the difficulty, and as I promised that I would not speak much longer, I will not speak about the idolatry of the Muhammadans at the Kaaba. Sir, we, after all, all have got our beliefs, we all have got our different predilections and idiosyncracies. It is no good trying to attack each other. Sir, I think the Government are perfectly well-advised in opposing this Bill, and I do hope that this Bill will never again see the light of the day in this world. (Applause.)

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member) : Sir, (Loud Applause), at five minutes past four, I got up under the misapprehension that the Raja Bahadur, having taken his seat, had finished. It is now half past four and I should not take up the time of this House for more than a few minutes. Sir, I want to say that, so far as the attitude of the Government and the reasons which have compelled the Government to adopt it are concerned, I have nothing to add to or subtract from what my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, who is in charge of the Bill, has so very clearly explained to this House. Sir, I remember that in speaking on a question like this, I fulfil a rather complex character. I happen to be a caste Hindu by birth, but, I am sure, some of my Sanatanist friends on the other side will say that, by my deeds or probably by my misdeeds, I am qualified to be a *harijan*. Sir, if that is my position, I feel I am in a place of advantage in being able to appreciate the view-point of both. Sir, within the limited time at my disposal, I do not desire to go into this question at any length whatsoever, but I can assure Honourable Members that, so far as the merits of this question are concerned, namely, as to whether something should not be conceded in order to preserve unity in the community, in order to prevent the growing internecine strife which has divided the community into two parts, in that matter the Mover has my sympathy. On the question of legislation, I would remind my Honourable friend,

Mr. B. Das, who, I counted, mentioned the name of Mr. Gandhi 37 times in eleven minutes, that what he has said about the correct position is this ; this is a quotation from his book " The Hindu Swaraj ", by Mr. Gandhi :

" That the decisions of a majority could never be binding on the minority and that all social legislation was the result of the initiative taken by the minorities to convince and convert the majority and, in the long run, when they succeed, the minority becomes a majority and the social legislation follows."

I say, Sir, every word of this is correct, namely, that this is not a matter to be brought up and disposed of on the floor of this House. This is a matter for the Hindu community. They must have sense in them to come to some kind of arrangement, some adjustment by which this strife can be ended. Surely it is not right that legislation, in a religious matter which is opposed by the majority of the community, should be forced down their throats by the votes of a few persons assembled here. (Hear, hear.) Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, also stated that the caste Hindus' heart has not been touched. I admit that. If their heart had been touched, and I wish it had been touched, then we would not have found this volume of opposition to the proposed measure. But would my Honourable friend look a little deeper and answer the question whether the heart of any community has been touched ? What I am referring to is this. As between the untouchables—I am not using the expression in any derogatory sense but just to describe them—in spite of the tremendous campaign which is going on, in spite of the preaching of Mr. Gandhi, has their heart been touched in the matter of untouchability as between the different classes of untouchables ? Do they still, between themselves, observe untouchability ? Has even the fringe of that matter been touched by Mahatma Gandhi's teachings for the last few years ? Sir, I cannot speak of other Provinces, but, in my Province, at the present moment, in spite of all the preaching about untouchability, as between the different sections of the untouchables, they observe untouchability as rigorously, as severely as any high-caste Brahmin ; and if I can give this House an instance of what has happened very recently when one of the temples was thrown open to the Harijans in a spectacular manner, only recently at Jorhat in Assam,—when some of the reformist Hindus—Brahmins and Kayasthas—had assembled there to receive the untouchables, the matter went on smoothly for some time, but when the lowest caste arrived, the people who left that temple in disgust were *not* the high-caste Brahmins and Kayasthas, but other sections of untouchables ! I am pointing this out only for the purpose of showing that the hearts of many people of many other castes have got to be touched. This is a matter which can only be dealt with when popular opinion has changed : and, when that popular opinion has changed, and the vast preponderating mass of the Hindus want social legislation, then surely that legislation cannot be retarded or obstructed by a microscopic minority. But that is not the situation here. The sentiments which have grown up amongst our people as the result of age-long customs and practices go down deep and cannot be put out of the flesh easily. A sporadic attempt, a violent attack spread over a few months cannot uproot what has been implanted in the minds of the different castes and different communities as the result of what has been happening for the last few centuries. Therefore, Sir, I say to my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das,

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

that it is necessary that popular opinion should change before any legislation should be effected. I am only trying to point out that the time chosen now for this legislation is premature ; there has been no change of heart worth mentioning, and it is no good setting up an attack against caste Hindus as if they alone are adamant, obdurate and bigoted and as if the hearts of all other sections have been changed. Sir, I am not trying to provoke anybody ; I am not trying to blame anybody, but I desire to point out that this is a matter which must require patience and skilful handling. In any attempt which is made to ameliorate the condition of the Depressed Classes, I have always supported them with my fullest co-operation and not by mere lip sympathy. Whatever attempt may be made outside this House for coming to any adjustment or causing—if I may use that hackneyed phrase once again—any change in the heart and the mind of our people, it will have my fullest co-operation, but, I do submit that the floor of this House is not suited for deciding this question. I would like to remind both the parties (because I do not want to take up a partizan attitude on this question), that a victory won on the floor of this House is of little consequence. It will increase the acrimony and the bitterness which now exist and the passions which have been aroused will only be augmented and intensified. I do hope, therefore, that the Honourable the Mover of the Bill will realise that he has discharged his duty. He owes a duty to his society, to his constituents and to himself and he has discharged that duty by having this Bill discussed in this Honourable House before all of us, but having done that, I would beg of him to realise that, having regard to the opposition with which it is being met and having regard to the fact that the vast mass of the community which is going to be affected are violently opposed to this measure, I would beg of him to withdraw this Bill. (Applause.)

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : Sir, at the outset, let me assure my Honourable friend, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, that I have great regard for him, not only for his learning, but also for his age. Moreover, he is a Vaishnavaita like myself, and let me also tell him that it is stated in Tirumalay that even a Brahmin versed in Vedas and Shastras, if he thinks or speaks low of his devotee, to whatever caste he may belong, instantly becomes a *pulaya*. The punishment meted out to a Brahmin, however learned he may be, for questioning the caste of a Vaishnavaita, however low he may be in birth, is the same as the punishment meted out to him for questioning the substance with which the idol in the temple is made of. Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar has said that God likes everybody. He said that God likes him and Mr. Ghuznavi and I suppose God likes me also.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I never denied that, but Mahatma Gandhi has said that he likes you alone. Therefore, I named other persons whom He also likes. What I said was that the question put to me was an impertinent question.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : If God likes us also, then why deny us entrance into His House ? Let me answer him from the Vaishnavaita sacred books. Shri Ramanuja, nearly 900 years ago, called the Depressed Classes Tirukulathars, men belonging to the Holy caste. Do you deny that also ?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : No. But it refers to the Tirukulathar of that particular locality and not to the entire 30 millions. If you read the history of Ramanuja you will know whom he called the Tirukulathar. I am glad the Honourable Member has reminded me of it. I should have gone into that question in greater detail.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair would suggest that the Honourable Member, Mr. Rajah, must go on with his speech.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : I am answering some of the points that he has raised, and that is why I said in connection with Nandanar that the Brahmins give different interpretations to the sacred texts as it suits them. In the interests of the peace and order of the Hindu community and in the interests of the stability of the Hindu society, I want my revered friend, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, to make himself bold and courageous to hug the Depressed Classes.

Sir, this morning, three speakers made three appeals to the House. My friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, in his speech appealed to the Sanatanists to build separate temples for the Depressed Classes. Sir, let me tell my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, that the Depressed Classes do not want separate temples for themselves just as they do not want separate electorates.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : May I just ask whether the Honourable Member is speaking for the Depressed Classes, especially the community known as *ezhavas* who are the hierarchy among the Depressed Classes in Malabar?

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : No, Sir ; I am speaking for the Depressed Classes in general. Moreover, the idea of the Depressed Classes is that they want to enter these temples as an integral part of the Hindu society. I come next to my Honourable friend, the Raja of Kollengode. He appealed to the Government to be neutral in this matter. I welcome that appeal. If only the Government remains neutral, I am sure all the temples will be open to the depressed classes tomorrow. I then come to my friend, Sir Maulvi Muhammad Yakub, who made a welcome appeal to the Depressed Classes to embrace Islam. I am thankful to him for that appeal. We have also considered that question and my friends are of opinion that we should fight to the last to get the entry into the Hindu temples. Next I come to the Honourable the Home Member. Sir, I am very thankful to him for his frank and straightforward reply. I recognise, and my community also recognises, that in the face of voluminous opinion against the Bill, it is not possible for any Government to support a measure of this kind. Moreover, the Honourable the Home Member has mentioned some of the facilities offered to the Depressed Classes in the various Provinces of India. Sir, I have on many occasions, on the floor of this House, thanked the Government for their beneficent activities as regards the Depressed Classes and let me also take this opportunity to say that the elevation of the Depressed Classes in India is due more to His Excellency Lord Willingdon than to any official in India. It was in 1919, when His Excellency was the Governor of Madras, that he inaugurated a Special Department, called the Department of the Protector of the Depressed Classes, which was meant for the amelioration of the condition of the Depressed Classes in that Province. Since that time, that Department had been doing marvellous work. In this

[Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah.]

connection, I should also like to thank the European Christian Missionaries who have taken up this work. They were the first and the foremost in the field and they were the pioneers in the amelioration work for the Depressed Classes in India. Sir, we are thankful to Government for giving us civic and political privileges and I sincerely hope that the Government will continue to do even greater things for us.

Sir, Mr. Ranga Iyer suggested that there should be a combined car festival in various localities. But, may I inform my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, that without the help of the Depressed Classes the car festivals cannot take place.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : I was referring to the car festival that takes place in Palghat.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : I am referring to the car festival that takes place throughout India. It is a device, I think, made by the so-called high caste Hindus to allow these Depressed Classes to pull the ropes of the car because they are not strong enough to pull the car themselves. Moreover, it is said that a Brahmin who pulls the rope along with the Depressed Classes should not and ought not to bathe when he goes home because there is no pollution there.

An Honourable Member : Brahmins do not pull the car.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : They do and they do touch the rope.

Now, Sir, coming to the merits of the Bill, I should like to make a few observations. Sir, all adverse comments are based on the assumption that the Bill threw open the temples to the Depressed Classes. Nothing of the kind is proposed to be adopted in this Bill. The Bill only makes a provision for a machinery to find out the wishes of the people in the matter. The Bill does not interfere with religion at all. If, in any locality, the caste Hindu worshippers come to believe that they could open the temples to the Depressed Classes, then the Bill enables them to do so. It is merely a Temple Entry Local Option Bill. It is argued by my Honourable friend, the Rajah Bahadur, that by admitting the Depressed Classes into temples the purity of the idol will be defiled and polluted.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : That is the opinion from which I quoted.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : If temples are spiritual power houses and places of purity and sanctity, then they cannot be polluted by the presence of the Depressed Classes. On the other hand by being allowed to come to the presence of God, the Depressed Classes will be purified and spiritualised. (Hear, hear.) If the idea that purity is one which will be affected be correct, then such a powerless purity is not worth anything at all. When Saint Tiruppanalwar was taken to Srirangan temple, the idol was not considered to have been polluted. When the Muhammadan Princess died at the feet of the idol at Malekot, the idol was not considered to have been polluted. As a matter of fact, an image of her was made and installed under the feet of the idol of Ramapriya for daily worship as Tulukka Nachiar (Muhammadan Goddess Consort). A similar idol for this goddess is in the Srirangam temple. Sir, temples are the home of God and in God's home nobody

could be treated as an untouchable, since God is the common Father of all. (Hear, hear.) The Hindu temples play a most important part in the life of the masses. Among the Hindus there is more devotion to God than in any other people, and, in the lower classes especially, the devotion is stronger than in the higher classes. Though this devotion may be blind, yet it is powerful. Temple worship as an institution came into existence for the purpose of providing for the community as a whole a mode of approach to the Supreme, suitable to the understanding of the unintellectual and unphilosophically minded. To men of higher understanding going to a temple is absolutely of no value; as my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, himself had said. When these go to a temple and discharge a function connected with it, they do so for the benefit of the community as a whole. So, I ask, why keep out the real men for whom all this is intended and enacted? Why then rob the lowly among you of what is their due by right of true benefit? Is temple worship not the worship of the Almighty God? Did the God of the Universe disclose His form only for some specified classes to the exclusion of others? Is there no room for real worship on the part of these simple devotees? Are there not innumerable instances where such prohibitions have not been put into practice? Many of the Saints of South India have been originally persons of the Depressed Classes and have been admitted into the temple and the idols of some of them are now being worshipped by the most orthodox Brahmin. I tell you, Sir, to decline wholesale spiritual food to the poor innocent people is a great crime against God and Humanity for which you shall have to answer before the Lord Who makes no distinction between the members of His creation. You say that the campaign should be diverted towards the removal of their economic disabilities. Yes, that is true. The question of temple entry is only one of the many items in the campaign for the eradication of the curse of untouchability. What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul? Sir, his economic uplift depends solely on the elevation of the social or caste status. The economic part of the problem had to deal with the effects of this evil which are showing themselves solely by reason of the custom of untouchability. If untouchability is corrected, the economic uplift would follow. The opening of temples to the Depressed Classes will give a new life and a new hope to them. You call them unclean. Their unclean habits are entirely due to you, as you keep them away and give them unclean quarters and not give them light, water, enough to drink and bathe. You are the sinners. You have degraded them and then have the audacity to use their very degradation against their rise. Not contented with your past unrighteous actions, you have now the audacity to say that they are not anxious for the reforms. In judging a community and its aspirations you should realise that it speaks through the most enlightened of its members. Sir, in this connection my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, has quoted some opinion from one Mr. Ratnavelu Pillai who, he says, holds the position of a District Judge. Equally eminent men of the same standing have given quite contrary opinions. Does he accept those opinions also?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : I was not speaking of my own opinion. I was only quoting his opinion about Nandanar.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : I am not giving way.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar : Then why do you put questions ?

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : I am not at all asking for answers from my Honourable friend. I am simply meeting the points raised by my Honourable friend. I hope he will not be excited. Another thing I wish to say is that my Honourable friend just now said that the Depressed Classes think that their going into the Hindu temples will upset their whole family life and so on. He also said that the Depressed Classes say that they would be visited by diseases if they enter a Hindu Temple. Sir, this reminds me of a story which I am sure you, Sir, also know. In a village there was a Depressed Class man who was serving under a zamindar. The wife of this Depressed Class man gave birth to a son and his father christened the child as "Perumal", meaning God. Then one day the zamindar went to the village and heard the father of the boy calling his son as "Perumal". The zamindar was taken aback. He asked the Depressed Class man as to what he meant by calling his boy as "Perumal". He said : "You, fellow, give your son some other name. If you call him 'Perumal' the wrath of God will be on you and the boy will die tomorrow. So call him by some other name, such as black or white or mud or clay or anything else". The Depressed Class man was an intelligent fellow and next day he called his son 'Peria Perumal' meaning Great God. Next day when the zamindar went to that village to see his Depressed Class servant, he was non-plussed to find that his son was called 'Peria Perumal'. Similarly, my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, says that if the Depressed Classes go to a temple they will be infested with all sorts of diseases. Sir, I have got very little time now and so I cannot narrate at this late hour all the anecdotes that I have got in my possession. I am very sorry to say that these so-called Sanatanists do not know these people. One who had moved with these untouchables in their cheris, mohallas and slums would have found in them dissatisfaction of their lot rankling in their hearts, a really burning desire and an unquenchable thirst for their amelioration—their education, economic advance and the satisfaction of their spiritual hunger. In this connection, with reference to the quotation which my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, gave from Mr. Ratnavelu Pillai's opinion, let me also tell the Raja Bahadur that a great seer, the Saint Ramanuja, nearly 900 years ago, hugged the Depressed Classes. Sri Ramanuja's heart surged with love and compassion for these unfortunate people. Ramanuja devoted himself entirely to the service of the Lord by serving man, His own Image and has always been a friend of the poor, the needy and the helpless and genuinely interested in the redemption of all the down-trodden. It was he that first worked for the amelioration of their condition and it was he that first wanted to take them into his fold. Sir, these episodes are somewhat worthy of note. Ramanuja specially warned his disciples against pride of caste, pride of wealth and pride of learning as the three great dangers for the unwary to fall into perdition. When Ramanuja was old and weak, he used to lean on somebody's shoulders and walk into the river for his daily ablutions. While going to the bath he used to lean on one of his Brahmin disciples but while returning after his bath he would walk leaning on the shoulder of one of his Depressed Class disciples. The orthodox people were greatly incensed at this practice. They said he may lean on this low caste man before bath but why should he lean on him after bath. Ramanuja said, "I lean on this

low-born person when returning after ablutions because this is the way to wash off my pride of birth which I cannot remove by ablution with water.

Sir, how different from the superstitions of his present day followers ! It is an irony of history that among those who claim to represent Sri Ramanuja's authority and to follow the creed of Ramanuja are some of the stoutest opponents to the movement which he initiated 900 years ago.....

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair does not mind sitting a little longer today as this is the last day, but the Chair would advise the Honourable Member to finish his speech as soon as possible.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah : Very good, Sir. This one episode is enough. I have many with me. Raja Bahadur being a Vaishnavite he must know them. We have been witnessing, Sir, during the past few months a tidal wave on the surface of Hindu life, Sanatanists holding meetings throughout the country vehemently opposing this measure, to thwart and defeat the legitimate demands of a vast majority of their fellow caste-men. Sir, I welcome this unrest among the Sanatanists. It is a part of the plan of the world that some kind of unrest should be the precursor of everything that is most useful and beneficent. Just call to mind how the setting in of the rains which are needful for the support of every form of life and of all that makes natural life enjoyable is always preceded by storm or other forms of atmospheric disturbance. I cherish indeed the hope that it may be instrumental in making India what the God of all the nations intends it to become. The fact that a cause is righteous does not guarantee its immediate success. All history testifies to this. The final triumph of good causes is for the most part long delayed. Even should our path immediately before us be marked not only by delay but by disaster for a time, I am quite confident that our cause will conquer in the end. I trust that it will conquer in our own hands, but even if it does not, yet in worthier hands than ours hereafter.

I shall conclude by telling this House the chief ground on which my confidence is based. "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." Observe that this promise to the meek is not of some mystical possession in the clouds, it is not even the Kingdom of Heaven. That also may be theirs, but what the saying tells of is the inheritance, the possession, the rule and the guardianship of this familiar earth. Sir, man looketh on the countenance, but God looketh on the heart. Lincoln, when he overheard a woman in the crowd exclaim, "Why, what a common looking fellow he is !", retorted, "God likes common looking fellows or he would not have made so many of them !".

Sir, the greatest religion is the religion of love. That is the be-all and end-all of all Vaishnavism, that is the creed of Shaivites too. Disinterested service to one's fellowmen is the essence of the message of Madhava to mankind. You probably remember, Sir, the story of Abu Ben Adhem. He awoke one night from a deep dream of peace and saw within his room the beautiful vision of an angel writing something in a book of gold. When asked what she was writing, the angel replied, "The names of those who love the Lord". "And is mine one !" asked

[Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah.]

Abu. "Nay, not so", said the angel. "Then write me down as one that loves his fellow men" said Abu. The angel wrote and departed. When next night she returned and showed the names of those whom the love of God had blessed, lo ! Abu Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

Sir, in conclusion, let me remind this House that the first efforts of the man who means to build a tower is directed not upward but downward. He digs out deep foundations before he puts a single stone or brick upon brick. If he acted otherwise he could never have a tower to show. That is what we have done now and I hope on a future occasion a measure of this kind will be passed.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Sir, I congratulate my Honourable friend, Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, on the courageous stand that he has taken for the Depressed Classes. That is the best answer that can be given to the speech of the Honourable the Home Member, who took, in the course of his closely reasoned and highly interesting speech, the trouble of quoting more Governments than one that the Depressed Classes were not enthusiastic about this Bill. It will be very difficult for caste Hindus to fight the battle of the Depressed Classes. The Home Member was perfectly right when he said that there has not been sufficient enthusiasm among the Depressed Classes. I hope Rao Bahadur Rajah who can speak with greater authority than I on the question of the Depressed Classes all over India will devote his attention with greater interest and greater enthusiasm to the cause, so that, if this Bill were to come before this House even for an academic discussion, the Honourable the Home Member may be in a position to say that what he thought was true then has changed now a new situation has arisen. Sir, at present I believe with the Home Member that sufficient fire has not been kindled among the hearths as well as in the hearts of the Depressed Classes, and there is no use standing on the floor of the House for Rao Bahadur Rajah to say to you what happens all over India. I cannot speak except for Malabar and I have no ambition of working outside Malabar after a fairly long all-India career. He talked of the "blessed" who "are the meek". I would rather remind him that blessed are they who have a will and I congratulate Rao Bahadur Rajah on having shown to us that he has a will. I hope his will will become infectious, and if it becomes infectious, they who have a will will also have their way.

Now, coming to my friend, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, I am very glad he took up the cudgels against Sir Muhammad Yakub, not because I agree with him, but because I was very glad to find that the Raja Bahadur was not happy that the proselytising Muslim should snatch away the children of Hinduism. I do not blame Sir Muhammad Yakub at all. If I were a Muslim, I would carry on a tearing, raging, campaign in the country and annex all the children of Hinduism who are called Depressed Classes to Islam. Then a future Muslim leader would say that they must have half the total representation in the services instead of one-third ; and it is for the Hindus who say that their rights are not properly recognised, who say that their claims are ignored, who complain that Government are becoming more and more pro-Muslim, to see to it that this asperion of inferiority that they have cast upon the Depressed Classes in actual practice is removed.

That badge of inferiority to which the Honourable the Law Member referred in his beautiful and impressive speech has got to be removed. I

was pleased to listen to the advice of the Honourable the Law Member. I am quite willing to follow that advice which the Honourable the Home Member and my friend the Raja Sahib of Kollengode had already given and that advice is this : when the Hindu community is ablaze, when the opposition is uncompromising, there is no use forcing a piece of legislation like this through the House, even if there was a chance for it. At present, I am sure the Honourable the Home Member is not going to accept the dictum of the Mahatma that Christians and Muslims should not take part in this discussion, much less when the voting takes place. The Honourable the Home Member will be perfectly entitled, if I press it to a division, to vote against my Bill ; he is not going to be guided in this matter by Mahatma Gandhi's dictum as his speech has made clear, and, therefore, the Congress people, instead of issuing mandates to us, will have to take a mandate from the people when their Constituent Assembly comes into existence. Meantime, I think, we Hindus who want to keep the untouchables within the fold will also have to show to them that they are one of us.

Sir, I congratulate Mr. Gunjal on his very strong speech. I cannot accuse Mr. Gunjal of less sincerity than myself : I think probably he said he was more sincere. I am prepared to grant that in the hope, as he believes, that the untouchables should remain within the Hindu fold he will devise some better plan if my plan is bad and keep them within the fold.

Mr. Das quoted Justice Macpherson and that quotation gives a point of contact between the Honourable the Law Member and Mr. Das himself, because what does Justice Macpherson want ? He says : " Do not have an eye-wash like the Sarda Act. Have a really good Bill which will do away with untouchability ", and this leads us to what the Honourable the Home Member said and what Mr. Rajagopalachariar has written : here the point of contact between the Congress leader and the Home Member is complete : both of them say " To go further bring a mandate from the people ". Without a mandate, I am convinced, in view of the terrible opposition that we find in the opinions obtained by circulation, that we have no right to proceed with this Bill. This is the fag end not only of a dying Session, but of a dying Assembly, which is already afflicted with the premonitory lethargy of death (Laughter), and so this will not be the proper time to proceed with this Bill, nor can this Assembly's successor proceed with this Bill. Everyone who happens to be a Member of this House will have to oppose the resurrection of this Bill, because on the Congress people's own finding, they must come with a mandate ; and they can only create that mandate—and here I am in complete agreement with the Honourable the Home Member—by propaganda and persuasion, and the Depressed Classes themselves will have to rise from the grave of depression and fight their own battles. Men like myself who believe in the removal of depression will stand by them.

The Honourable the Home Member concluded with a quotation from Bacon : probably he thought this piece of legislation was draconian : he was quoting from Bacon, what has been put in poetry by Tennyson :

" The minds of men are moulded by the process of the sun."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : What happens to the motion ?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer : Sir, I withdraw the Bill.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Has the Honourable Member the leave of the Assembly to withdraw his motion ?

Several Honourable Members : Yes, yes.

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

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré (Leader of the House) : It was agreed, Sir, at a meeting of Party Leaders convened by yourself on Tuesday last that business should be so arranged as to admit of the termination of the Session not later than Friday, the 31st August. To facilitate this object, it was agreed that all stages of the Steel and Iron Duties Bill should be concluded before the House rises on Saturday. If effect is given to this arrangement, the outstanding legislative business for next week will consist of the remaining stages of the Indian Army (Amendment) Bill and of the Indian Navy Discipline Bill, the report of the Select Committee on which will, I hope, be presented on Saturday, and the consideration and passing of the two uncontroversial Bills not yet introduced, the first of which makes a number of amendments in the Indian Statute Book, which are purely consequential on the position which would be created by the enactment of the Navy Discipline Bill and the second of which meets the desire which has been generally and strongly expressed by Members of the Assembly for the consolidation of the Indian Tariff Act. The first of these Bills will, I hope, be introduced on Saturday and the second on Monday next. The Assembly will also be asked, during the course of next week, to vote a few supplementary and excess grants and to take into consideration the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee for the years, 1931-32 and 1932-33. It was agreed at the meeting of Party Leaders, to which I have referred, that the report of the Committee on the working of the Ottawa Agreements will not be discussed during the current Session.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 25th August, 1934.