

Wednesday, 21st March, 1945

COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

VOLUME I, 1945

(15th February to 14th April, 1945)

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH COUNCIL OF STATE, 1945



PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI,
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI
1945

CONTENTS

	Pages.		Pages.
Thursday, 15th February, 1945—		Wednesday, the 14th March, 1945—	
Members Sworn	1	Questions and Answers	251—271
Questions and Answers	1—11	Notice of Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	271—272
Notices of Motions for Adjournment—Disallowed	11—13	Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	272
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	13—19, 27—28	Statements, etc., laid on the table	272—273
Statements, etc., laid on the table	20—27, 28—41	Standing Committee for the Department of Information and Broadcasting	274
Messages from His Exoellency the Viceroy and Governor General	42	Standing Committee for the Civil Defence Branch of the Defence Department	274
Committee on Petitions	42	Standing Committee on Emigration	274
Congratulations to recipients of Honours	43	Resolution re Working of the Defence of India Act and Rules—Negatived	274—283
Governor General's assent to Bills	44	Resolution re Post-war development of industries, etc.—Negatived	283—308
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	44	Resolution re Economic sanctions against South Africa—To be continued	309
Presentation of the Railway Budget, 1945-46	44-52		
Friday, 16th February, 1945—		Wednesday, 21st March, 1945—	
Member Sworn	53	Members Sworn	311
Questions and Answers	53—57	Questions and Answers	311—325
Death of Khan Bahadur Muhammad Yahya	73	Notice of Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	326—328
Resolution re Cottage industry of dyeing and printing (cotton cloth)—To be continued	73—74	Standing Committee for the Legislative Department	328—329
Resolution re Accidents caused by military vehicles—Withdrawn	74—82	Standing Committee for the Department of Posts and Air	329
Resolution re Reservation of accommodation on railways for the civilian population—Withdrawn	82—92	Standing Committee for the Home Department	329
Resolution re Future recruitment, etc., to the Civil Services controlled by the Secretary of State—Negatived	92—102	Standing Committee for the Labour Department	329
		Standing Committee for the War Transport Department	329—330
Tuesday, 20th February, 1945—		Central Advisory Council for Railways	330
Member Sworn	103	Resolution re Representation at the Conference of Allied Nations to be held at San Francisco—Negatived	330—363
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	103—116	Resolution re Cottage industry of dyeing and printing (cotton cloth)—To be continued	363
General Discussion of the Railway Budget, 1945-46	116—150		
Thursday, 22nd February, 1945—		Thursday, 22nd March, 1945—	
Questions and Answers	151—157	Questions and Answers	363—391
Resolution re Amendment of the Council of State Electoral Rules—Negatived	157—171	Resolution re Application of economic sanctions against South Africa—Adopted	391—402
Wednesday, 23rd February, 1945—		Caste Disabilities Removal Bill—Introduced	402
Members Sworn	173	Delhi Sikh Gurdwara and Religious Endowment Bill—Introduced	402
Presentation of the General Budget, 1945-46	173—187	Resolution re Daily broadcast in Hindi—Negatived	402—421
Wednesday, 7th March, 1945—		Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	421—422
Questions and Answers	189—207		
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	207—211	Tuesday, 27th March, 1945—	
Statements, etc., laid on the table	211	Member Sworn	423
Standing Committee for the Department of Information and Broadcasting	211	Questions and Answers	423—439
Standing Committee on Emigration	211	Statements, etc., laid on the table	439
Standing Committee for the Civil Defence Branch of the Defence Department	212	Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	439
General Discussion of the General Budget, 1945-46	212—249	Standing Committee for the Food Department	439—440
		Defence Consultative Committee	440

	<i>Pages.</i>		<i>Pages.</i>
Tuesday, 27th March, 1945—<i>contd.</i>		Resolution <i>re</i> India's sterling balances—Adopted	564—576, 579—583
Standing Committee for the Industries and Civil Supplies Department	440	Standing Committee for the Department of Information and Broadcasting	576
Central Committee of the Tuberculosis Association of India	440	Standing Committee on Emigration	576
Standing Committee for the External Affairs Department	440—442	Standing Committee for the Civil Defence Branch of the Defence Department	576—577
Standing Committee for the Planning and Development Department	442	Standing Committee for the Posts and Air Department	577
Standing Committee for Education	442	Standing Committee for the Labour Department	577
Standing Committee for Agriculture and Forests	442	Central Advisory Council for Railways	577
Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands	443	Standing Committee for the Legislative Department	577
Standing Committee for the Commerce Department	443	Standing Committee for the Home Department	577
Standing Committee for the Supply Department	443	Standing Committee for the War Transport Department	577
Standing Committee for the War Transport Department	443—444	Standing Committee for the Food Department	577
Resolution <i>re</i> Further amendments to the Resolution on Road Development—Adopted	444	Defence Consultative Committee	578
Standing Committee for Roads, 1945-46	445	Standing Committee for the Industries and Civil Supplies Department	578
Indian Tea Control (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	445	Central Committee of the Tuberculosis Association of India	578
Resolution <i>re</i> Cottage industry of dyeing and printing (cotton cloth)—Adopted	445—453	Standing Committee for the Commerce Department	578
Statements of Business	453—454	Standing Committee for the Supply Department	578
Messages from His Excellency the Governor General	454	Standing Committee for the External Affairs Department	578
Indian Finance Bill, 1945—Laid on the table	454	Standing Committee for Education	578
Statement of Business	455	Standing Committee for Agriculture and Forests	578
Wednesday, 28th March, 1945—		Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands	578
Questions and Answers	457—469	Standing Committee for the Planning and Development Department	579
Notice of Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	469	Standing Committee for Roads	579
Statements, etc., laid on the table	469—471	Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of labour to Burma, Malaya, etc.—Adopted	583—591
Finance Bill—Motion to consider— <i>to be continued</i>	471—498	Statement of Business	592
Thursday, 29th March, 1945—		Wednesday, 11th April, 1945—	
Short Notice Question and Answer	499	Questions and Answers	593—606
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	499—502	Short Notice Questions and Answers	607—608
Finance Bill—Considered and passed	502—542	Notices of Motions for Adjournment—Disallowed	608—610
Statement of Business	542	Statements, etc., laid on the table	610, 610—611
Reply by the Honourable Sir Jeremy Baisman to the felicitations of members	542	Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	610
Friday, 6th April, 1945—		Standing Committee for the Defence Department	611
Short Notice Questions and Answers	543, 558	Standing Committee for Roads, 1945-46	611—612
Questions and Answers	543—557	Factories (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	612—613
Notices of Motions for Adjournment—Disallowed	559—561	Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	613
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	561	Indian Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Supplementary Bill—Considered and passed	613
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	561—562		
Resolution <i>re</i> Religious endowments—Withdrawn	562—564		

	Pages.		Pages.
Wednesday, 11th April, 1945—contd.		Saturday, 14th April, 1945—	
Repealing and Amending Bill— Considered and passed	613—614	Death of President Roosevelt	625—627
Indian Army (Amendment) Bill —Considered and passed	614—615	Questions and Answers	627—628
Indian Air Force (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	615	Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	628—629
Statement of Business	615—616	Notice of Motion for Adjourn- ment—Withdrawn	629—630
Thursday, 13th April, 1945—		Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	630
Questions and Answers	617—622	Aligarh Muslim University (Amend- ment) Bill—Considered and passed	630, 631—632
Bill passed by the Legislative As- sembly laid on the table	622	Mines Maternity Benefit (Amend- ment) Bill—Considered and passed	631
Standing Committee for the Defence Department	622—623	Statement of Business	632
Standing Committee for Roads, 1945-46	623		
Indian Patents and Designs (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	623		

COUNCIL OF STATE

Wednesday, the 21st March, 1945.

The Council met in the Council Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

MEMBERS SWORN

The Honourable Sir Olaf Kirkpatrick Caroe (External Affairs Secretary).

The Honourable Mr. Shamaldhari Lall (Nominated Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRIES IN BACKWARD AREAS

143. THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: (a) Will Government state whether it is a fact that H. M. G. has declared certain areas to be depressed areas and special efforts are to be made to establish suitable industries there? (b) Have the Government of India made special efforts to select areas and for starting suitable industries? What are such areas? (c) What industries have been selected for each area? and (d) Do Government regard any areas to be particularly backward, if so, what are such areas?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: (a) No.

(b) to (d). Certain Provinces such as Orissa, Assam, N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan are backward compared to others and Government will consider the acceleration of their industrial progress in so far it is possible in co-operation with these Provinces.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Will the Honourable Member explain his negative reply to (a)? Has His Majesty's Government not selected any areas or is the Government of India not aware of the fact?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: The Government of India is not aware.

REGIONALISATION OR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PARTICULAR INDUSTRIES

144. THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: (a) Will Government state whether any directions have been issued by the Planning and Development Department to guide the Examiner of Capital Issues in granting permission about regionalisation or the kind of industries to be permitted in any area? (b) If so, will Government lay a copy of it on the table? (c) Have new textile mills been sanctioned in the Bombay area? (d) Are there persons among the promoters of such textile mills who are not *persona grata* to the textile control authorities?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES: (a) The Examiner of Capital Issues works under the orders of the Finance Department, not of the Planning and Development Department, though the latter Department is, of course, represented on the departmental committee.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d). The information is not readily available but if the Honourable Member will let me have the names of any concerns which he has in mind, I will make appropriate inquiries.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Do Government think that in these days of controls, such persons who are *non persona grata* should be discouraged?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES: From the tenor of my reply the Honourable Member will appreciate that I cannot understand the significance of the term "such persons".

POST-GRADUATE SCHOLARS IN THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

145. **THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM** : Will Government lay on the table the following information about post graduate scholars in the Geological Survey of India in each of the two years ending 31st December, 1944 :—

(a) Minimum qualifications ?

(b) The names of newspapers and the dates on which the posts were advertised?

(c) The selecting authority, its personnel and the method of selection?

(d) Does the communal ratio apply to this service ? If not, why not ?

(e) The communal composition, i.e., (i) caste Hindus, (ii) Scheduled caste Hindus, (iii) Muslims, (iv) Sikhs and (v) others ? and

(f) the names of persons appointed as Assistant Geologists ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAMALDHARI LALL : The information asked for is laid on the table.

(a) A good University Degree in Geology or Geography ;

(b) The posts were not advertised ;

(c) Director, Geological Survey of India, made the appointments after interviewing candidates

(d) This was not a service. The first two scholarships were reserved for Muslims. Future scholarships were offered in accordance with the rules regarding communal representation in services.

(e) End of 1943—Hindus 4, Muslims 2.

End of 1944—Hindu nil, Muslim 1.

(f) In 1943—Mr. B. F. Mehta.

In 1944—Messrs. M. Haque, M. K. Roy Chowdhury, D. K. Chandra, S. C. Chakravorty and P. K. Ghosh.

I may, however, add for the information of the Honourable Member that out of nine post-graduate scholars who have been appointed as Assistant Geologists since the inception of the scheme four are Muslims, one Parsee and four caste Hindus.

NAMES OF PERSONS APPOINTED AS ASSISTANT METEOROLOGISTS

146. **THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM** : (a) Will Government state the names of persons appointed as Assistant Meteorologists in the two years ending 31st December, 1944 ? (b) Is there a paucity of Muslims ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : (a) and (b). It is not considered advisable, for security reasons, to give the names and the total number of candidates who were recruited as Assistant Meteorologists during the two years ending the 31st December, 1944. There is, however, no paucity of Muslims among the officers recruited during the two years. In fact Muslim candidates secured 31% of the total number of appointments made during this period.

DATE OF INCEPTION OF " INFORMATION FILMS OF INDIA "

147. **THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM** : Will Government give the following information about the " Information Films of India " :—(a) The date of inception of this scheme ? (b) Since what date exhibition was made compulsory ? (c) The number of films produced each year by Government, private concerns in India, and imported ? (d) Cost of production and printing in each of the three years 1942, 1943 and 1944 incurred by Government and paid to private concerns ? (e) The average number of copies printed of each film ? (f) The amount of films used by Information Films of India in 1944 ? and (g) The scale of charges, if any, realised from cinema houses ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : (a) 6th July, 1940.

(b) If by exhibition is meant exhibition of Information Films of India films the question does not arise. The exhibition of " approved " films was made compulsory from 15th September, 1943.

(c)	Government	Private concerns	Imported
1941	15	7	32
1942	13	..	93
1943	28	1	68
1944	49	5	71

(d) 1942 . . . Rs. 4,24,924.
 1943 . . . Rs. 4,85,240.
 1944 . . . Rs. 6,87,000.

(e) 46.

(f) 6,818,504 feet.

(g) Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 40 per week depending on the income of the cinema house
THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: On the income or the seating capacity?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN: Notice of the question, Sir. These details I do not carry in my head.

LIABILITY OF ALLIED POWERS FOR LOSS CAUSED BY THE EXPLOSIONS AT BOMBAY

148. THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Will Government state whether they have made any representations to H. M. G. on the subject of the liability of the Allied Powers for the loss caused to Bombay by the explosion which occurred on the 14th April, 1944? If so, with what results?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. No reply has yet been received from His Majesty's Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: How long ago did Government send their representation?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY: Formal representation was made on the 9th January, but, as the Honourable Member is aware, and as was stated on the floor of the House in the last session, His Majesty's Government were fully apprised long before that public feeling in this country was expecting them to bear the cost of the damage.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: The total cost, I hope.

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY: That is a matter on which I cannot say anything yet. It is one for negotiation.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Have Government asked for the total cost or for a part payment of the cost?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY: Government have made a representation on the whole situation and the cost to be borne by His Majesty's Government will have to be a matter for negotiation.

PANELS FORMED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

149. THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Will Government lay on the table the list of members of each panel formed by the Department of Planning and Development, and the principles under which they were formed? What Chambers of Commerce, if any, were consulted by Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: All the panels have not yet been completely formed. I propose to lay on the table of the House in the course of this session, a list of members of the panels asked for by the Honourable Member. Invitations are issued to persons prominently associated with the industries concerned and one or two experts and also to those who by their general knowledge of trade and industry are likely to be useful as members. No chambers of commerce were consulted.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Is it a fact that the Industries Committee of the Textile Control Board were consulted on this subject?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: No, Sir. The textile industry was dealt with in a slightly different manner in view of the existence of the Textile Control Board. The Planning and Development Department invited them to suggest names for the formation of a panel.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Has such action been taken in connection with other industries like jute, coal, etc.?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: I have already answered that.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Am I to understand that the membership of these panels is limited to industrialists and experts in particular industries and that there is no representation of consumers' interests in these panels ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL : I cannot add anything to the answer already given.

THE HONOURABLE SAIYED MOHAMED PADSHAH SAHIB BAHADUR : Is there on the panel anybody who represents the hides and skins industry ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL : I have already said that panels will be constituted. I shall lay in due course a list of members of the panels, together with the industries for which they will be constituted, on the table of the House.

THE HONOURABLE SAIYED MOHAMED PADSHAH SAHIB BAHADUR : Has the panel for the hides and skins industry been formed at all ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL : I am not able to say. You may put another question.

THE HONOURABLE SAIYED MOHAMED PADSHAH SAHIB BAHADUR : Will the Government consider the desirability of including representatives from the hides and skins industry on these panels when they are formed ?

(No answer.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Have any panels been formed as yet ? If so, where is the difficulty in laying on the tables the names of members of those panels which have been formed ?

(No answer.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Will the Government explain the reasons for making politicians and economists as *persona non grata* for panels ?

(No answer.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : You have to be an economist when you get Rs. 2,500 in the Government of India !

SUPPLY OF PETROL COUPONS TO MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE

150. THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Will Government state :—

(a) For how many gallons of petrol coupons were given to each member of the Council of State and of the Assembly for the November (1944) Session of the Central Legislature ?

(b) For how many gallons of petrol are coupons to be issued to each member of the Council of State and of the Assembly for the current (Budget) Session ?

(c) Whether the quantity supplied is sufficient for the members' attending the Legislature and other usual proper purposes ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : (a) A statement is laid on the table of the issues made to members of the Legislative Assembly. As regards the Council of State, coupons to the value of 218 gallons were issued to members but details of individual issues are not available.

(b) The sanctioned scale of petrol ration is half a gallon to all members for each day on which there is a sitting of the Legislative Assembly or the Council of State, and a similar quantity for days when there is a meeting of committees to those who are members of these committees. Members of the Council of State have been receiving in addition one gallon a month to cover incidental journeys in view of the fact that the number of days when the Council of State sits is much less than that of the Assembly.

(c) The scale allowed has been in force for three years and was considered to be generally adequate. In view, however, of complaints of inadequacy received from time to time recently, the question has been reconsidered and orders have been issued to increase the supplementary ration allowed to members of the Council of State for incidental journeys from one to four gallons per month. At the same time an extra supplementary ration of two gallons per month has been allowed to members of the Legislative Assembly for incidental journeys. Half of these quotas will be allowed for periods of half a month or less.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : May I draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that we have sat only for three days up to date and we have to attend the Assembly and the Library and it is very unfair to give us less than the Assembly members ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : Actually the Council of State members do not get less, but rather more, because apart from the allowance for incidental journeys they get exactly the same allowance as members of the Assembly for days when they are sitting.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Is there any method whereby Government find out whether a particular member of the Assembly is attending the Assembly ? He may get the petrol ration all right but may use it for other purposes.

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : I do not think there is any possibility of that because rations are issued through the Council of State Secretariat.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : May I draw the Honourable Member's attention to this, that they should give us the same number of gallons as that given to the Assembly.

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : Do I understand that the Honourable Member suggests that that should be done irrespective of the number of days when this House is sitting ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Yes.

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : Then I am afraid I cannot accept the proposition.

Statement of petrol coupons issued to the members of the Legislative Assembly during the November Session, 1944.

Serial No.	Name	Total value of coupons issued (in gallons)
1	Seth Sunder Lal Daga	One.
2	Lala Sham Lal	Eight.
3	Pandit Nilakantha Das	Eight.
4	Sir Cowasjee Jehangir	Eight.
5	Seth Sunder Lal Daga	Eight.
6	Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi	Eight
7	Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur	One.
8	Mr. Ram Ratan Gupta	Eight.
9	Khan Bahadur Sheikh Habibur Rahman	Eight.
10	Mr. Sri Prakasa	Eight.
11	Mr. Abdul Qaiyum	Eight.
12	Choudhri Raghbir Narain Singh	Eight.
13	Mr. Shambhudayal Misra	Eight.
14	Seth Sheodass Daga	Eight.
15	Mr. Hoosenbhoy A. Lalljee	Eight.
16	Raizada Hans Raj	Eight.
17	Mr. E. L. C. Gwilt	Eight.
18	Mr. Badri Dutt Pande	Eight.
19	Sir Henry Richardson	Eight.
20	Mr. Lalchand Navalrai	Eight.
21	Mr. S. K. Hoemani	Eight.
22	Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad	Nine.
23	Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi	Eight.
24	Mr. B. Das	Eight.
25	Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar	Eight.
26	Mr. G. Rangiah Naidu	Eight.
27	Mr. A. C. Inakip	Eight.
28	Mr. Bhulabhai Jivanji Desai	Eight.
29	Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha	Eight.
30	Maharaja Bahadur Ram Ran Vijai Prasad Narain Singh	Eight.
31	Mr. H. G. Stokes	Eight.
32	Mr. Mohamed Ali Jinnah	Eight.
33	Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiar	Eight.

Serial No.	Name	Total value of coupons issued (in gallons)
34	Sir Vithal N. Chandavarkar	Eight.
35	Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir Jawahar Singh	Eight.
36	Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh	Eight.
37	Dr. G. V. Deshmukh	Eight.
38	Raja Bahadur Kushal Pal Singh	Eight.
39	Bhai Parmanand	Eight.
40	Mr. Dharendra Kanta Lahiri Choudhry	Eight.
41	Mr. Rajmal Lakhichand	Eight.
42	Khan Bahadur Ghulam Kadir Md. Shahban	Eight.
43	Mr. Frank R. Anthony	Eight.
44	Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piraoha	Eight.
45	Shams-ul Ulema Kamaluddin Ahmad	Eight.
46	Rai Bahadur Seth Sir Bhagchand Soni	Nine.
47	Sreejukta Ananga Mohan Dam	Eight.
48	Mr. Umar Aly Shah	Eight.
49	Babu Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya	Eight.
50	Babu Hari Sharan Prasad Srivastava	Eight.
51	Sir Syed Raza Ali	Eight.
52	Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon	Eight.
53	Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra	Eight.
54	Sardar Bahadur Captain Dalpat Singh	Eight.
55	Mrs. Renuka Ray	Eight.
56	Mr. H. M. Abdullah	Eight.
67	Mr. Gauri Shankar Singh	Eight.
68	Mr. Ramayan Prasad	Eight.
59	Mr. N. C. Chunder	Eight.
60	Sardar Mangal Singh	Eight.
61	Mr. N. M. Joshi	Eight.
62	Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan	Eight.
63	Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan	Eight.
64	Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh	One.
65	Mr. Muhammad Nauman	Eight.
66	Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali	Eight.
67	Prof. N. G. Ranga	Eight.
68	Mr. H. A. Sathar H. Essak Sait	Nine.
69	Maulvi Syed Murtuza Shaib Bahadur	Eight.
70	Mr. K. C. Neogy	Eight.
71	Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur	Eight.
72	Mr. K. B. Jinaraja Hegde	Eight.
73	Nawab Siddique Ali Khan	Eight.
74	Dr. P. N. Banerjee	Eight.
75	Mr. Manu Subedar	Eight.
76	Shrimati K. Radhabai Subbarayan	Eight.
77	Mr. K. S. Gupta	Eight.
78	Mr. A. Satyanarayana Moorty	Eight.
79	Khan Bahadur Shamsuddin Haider	Eight.
80	Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani	Eight.
81	Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan	Eight.
82	Mr. E. L. C. Gwilt	One.
83	Choudhri Muhammad Husain	Eight.
84	Maulana Zafar Ali Khan	Eight.
85	Dr. Habibur Rahman	Eight.
86	Mr. Saiyid Haider Imam	Eight.
87	Rao Bahadur N. Siva Raj	Eight.
88	Sardar Sant Singh	Eight.
89	Mr. T. T. Krishnamaohari	Nine.
90	Hajee Chowdhury Mohammad Ismail Khan	Eight.
91	Dr. Sir Ratanji Dinshaw Dalal	Eight.
92	Babu Kailash Bihari Lall	Eight.
93	Mr. Muhammad Ahsan	Six.
94	Shaikh Rafiuddin Ahmad Siddiqui	Five.
95	Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto	Four.
96	Mr. Umar Aly Shah	One.
97	Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta	Eight.
98	Babu Baijnath Bajoria	Four.
99	Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan	One.
100	Choudhury Muhammad Hussain	One.
101	Mr. Kuladhar Chaliha	Four.

Serial No.	Name	Total value of coupons issued (in gallons)
102	Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayed Muhammad Mehr Shah	Eight.
103	Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta	Eight.
104	Mr. Piare Lall Kureel Talib	Eight.
105	Khan Bahadar Mian Ghulam Kadir Md. Shahban	One.
106	Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra	One.
107	Hajee Chowdhury Mohammad Ismail Khan	One.
108	Mr. M. Ghiasuddin	Eight.
109	Mr. Muhammad Nauman	One.
110	Mr. Mohamed Azhar Ali	One.
Total		783 gallons

MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE OF AJMER

151. THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUITA SINGH : Is it a fact that on the expiry of the term of the present elected members, the Municipal Committee of Ajmer shall consist of 32 members to be nominated by the Chief Commissioner ? If so, why has the elective system been replaced by nomination ? Will Government make a statement on the subject ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : In order to avoid the expense and inconvenience of holding a fresh election during the war it is desired to continue the present Municipal Committee. As the Ajmer-Merwara Municipalities Regulation contains no provision for extending the life of the municipal committee it has been decided to secure this object by providing for nomination of members by the Chief Commissioner. It is the intention to nominate as far as possible the present members of the Committee to enable them to continue in office.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Is the Honourable Member aware that in spite of the war it was possible to hold municipal elections in certain provinces, the United Provinces for example ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : It is not a centrally administered area.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Are we to take it that in the centrally administered areas elections have been ruled out ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : No.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : That would be in harmony with the spirit of the Central Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Are elections going to be held for the Delhi Municipality ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : I require notice of that question.

CENTRAL SCHOOL OF AVIATION

152. THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUITA SINGH : Will Government state whether they are prepared to consider and give effect to a plan to establish a Central School of Aviation in India, with departments for training in Engineering, Radio and Aerodromes ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : Proposals for the establishment of such a school have already been drawn up and are under the consideration of the Government of India as part of their post-war plans for the development of Civil Aviation in India.

LOSS SUSTAINED BY INDIANS ON THE EVACUATION OF BURMA

153. THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUITA SINGH : Will Government state whether they have formulated their decisions in consultation with the refugee "Burma Government", on problems relating to the future of Indians in reconquered Burma, the compensation they would be paid for the losses sustained on

account of the Japanese invasion of the country ; and also the restoration of lost properties to legitimate owners ? If so, will Government make a statement on the subject ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. R. N. BANERJEE : The problems referred to by the Honourable Member are all being examined in consultation with the Government of Burma ; but the examination has not yet reached a stage when it would be possible for Government to make any statement.

GOLD SEIZED BY THE AXIS POWERS

154. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Will Government state whether gold illegally seized by the Axis powers, belonging to the countries they have conquered and plundered, have, by any means, found their way in India ; and if so, how ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES : No such gold has found its way into India, so far as the Government of India are aware.

ANNUAL SUBVENTION TO THE N. W. F. P.

155. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Will Government state whether the question of the revision of the annual subvention to the N.W. Frontier Province from the Centre is under active consideration by them ? Will the Central Legislature be given an opportunity of discussing this question before final decision is reached ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES : The answer to the first part of this question is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Will the Honourable Member explain why the reply is in the negative ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES : The reply is in the negative because that is the position, Sir.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS CENTRAL REVENUES TO PROVINCES

156. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Will Government state in what manner it is proposed to distribute the estimated Central revenue surplus of about Rs. 500 crores in the first five years after the war for the development of the Provinces ? Will any consideration be given to the comparatively backward Provinces like Orissa and Bihar ? What plans have Government formulated on this proposal ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL : Attention is invited to paragraph 2 of Section I of Part II of the Second Report on Reconstruction Planning from which it will be seen that it is very difficult to state at present, with any degree of accuracy, how the resources of the Central Government would be distributable. Nevertheless, for the purpose of assisting Provinces in the formulation of their plans, it has been indicated to them that they may assume that approximately one-half or two-thirds of the total estimated Central surplus, which in certain circumstances may amount to 500 crores, may be available for distribution to them, and that roughly the distribution would be on a *per capita* basis. The actual distribution, while bearing a relation to population, may have to take other factors such as the backwardness of the Provinces into account.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Has the Government decided to impose any conditions in making these contributions to the provinces or will they be free grants ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL : I must ask for notice of that question.

ARREST OF DR. BRAHMANAND AGNIHOTRI

157. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Will Government state why Dr. Brahmanand Agnihotri, who had settled down in Vienna before the war, and returned to India on the outbreak of the war, was arrested in Naini Tal on or about the 19th August, 1940, and was recently released from jail ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. E. CONRAN-SMITH : Dr. Brahmanand Agnihotri was arrested and detained in 1940 because his contacts with Germans, with German

controlled organisations and with persons of known anti-British tendencies rendered this action necessary to prevent him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the defence of British India and the efficient prosecution of the war. He was released because, at the present stage of the war with Germany, his further detention was considered unnecessary.

PLANS FOR UTILISATION OF INDIA'S STERLING BALANCES FOR INDUSTRIALISATION

158. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following statement made by a United Kingdom official at the discussion of the Economic Problems of the Far East, which was discussed by the Pacific Relations Conference at Hot Springs, on or about the 11th January :—

“ If Indians are basing their plans for the industrialisation of their country on their ability to get within an early period the repayment of their balances in London and the rest of the Empire, they will be disappointed ”?

(b) Will Government make a statement on the above subject, indicating when the locked balances will be available for the development of industry in India, or in any other way India may choose to devote her locked balances ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES : (a) The Government have seen a press report from Hot Springs containing the statement referred to.

(b) The Government of India contemplate sending a Delegation from India at a suitable time to discuss with His Majesty's Government the problem of the liquidation of the sterling balances.

POST-WAR ROAD DEVELOPMENT

159. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Have Government formulated their decision on the principle of the 450 crores road development plan approved at the Conference of Chief Engineers held at Nagpur in December 1943, under which Hyderabad (Deccan) will be the centre of national highways ? If so, will they state the main features of this plan, and the period during which it is likely to be carried out ?

THE HONOURABLE SIB SATYENDRA NATH ROY : I am not aware that Hyderabad (Deccan) will be the centre of national highways under the plan recommended by the Conference of Chief Engineers at Nagpur. The main features of that plan are contained in their report, copies of which are in the Library.

The Chief Engineers' Conference estimated that a scheme of road development based on their recommendations would cost about 450 crores for the whole of India of which about 320 crores would be required for British India. The Nagpur report has been generally approved as the basis of a road plan for British India and Provincial Governments are now preparing estimates on the basis of the rough yardstick contained in the report. The Nagpur plan was intended to be completed in 10 years. It is not possible yet to say how long the post-war road plan which will eventually be adopted will take to be carried out as this will depend upon the total sum available for road development from Central and Provincial resources.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Will the Honourable Member enlighten the House which of the Post-war Policy Committees considered this report ?

THE HONOURABLE SIB SATYENDRA NATH ROY : Policy Committee 3-A on Transport.

APPLICATION OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

160. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Has the attention of Government been drawn to the following statement of Mr. Winston Churchill the Premier of England, in the House of Commons on or about the 16th January :—

“ I have already made a statement about the application of the Atlantic Charter to the British Empire, and to India ”? Have Government ascertained in precise terms the significance of the reference to the Atlantic Charter in its application to

NOTE—Questions against the Honourable Raja Yuveraj Dutta Singh were put by the Honourable Mr. G. S. Motilal.

India ; and if so, are they in a position to make a statement on the subject with special reference to the time and measure of self-government to be granted to this country ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : I have nothing to add to the Prime Minister's reply to a question on the subject in the House of Commons on the 16th January, 1945, a Press report of which has been placed in the Library of the House.

LOAN FROM THE U. S. A. FOR INDUSTRIALISATION

161. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Is there any proposal for applying for a direct loan from the U. S. A., for industrialisation of India, or for any other purpose ? If so, will Government make a statement on the subject as may be necessary to understand the scope of the proposal ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL JONES : The answer to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not therefore arise.

SALE OF DETERIORATED FLOUR IN DACCA

162. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Is it a fact that about 44,765 maunds of deteriorated *atta* was recently advertised for sale by the Additional District Magistrate for food in Dacca ? If so, why was the *atta* allowed to deteriorate and not given to the people to save human lives ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. B. R. SEN : The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative though the actual quantity reported by the Bengal Government is 42,860 maunds.

This *atta* had been in stock since July, 1944 and could not be consumed as there was no demand for it. It deteriorated because of long storage in a humid climate.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Was it *atta* from Australian wheat or Indian wheat ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. B. R. SEN : Indian wheat.

REPRESENTATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

163. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Will Government state whether India has been invited to the United Nations Conference, which is expected to be held in March in the U. S. A., to draft a peace-treaty, and discuss kindred subjects ? If so, will Government state whether any non-official Indian will be selected to represent India ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : Yes, Sir, but the Conference is to be held in the latter part of April and is not convened to draft a peace-treaty, but (to prepare a charter for a general international organisation for the maintenance of peace and security). The answer to the last sentence of the Honourable Member's question is that the Delegations are to be at ministerial level.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Will the Honourable Member enlighten the House by giving a little greater detail of the functions of this Conference ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : There is a Resolution on this subject to be discussed today when, I think, everything will be unfolded. There is no point in my answering this question now.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : I think it will enlighten the House if the Leader of the House gives an answer now as to the purposes and the functions of that Conference.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : That could not be answered so easily in reply to a supplementary question. The House will get an opportunity to know everything on the Resolution which is to be discussed today.

CONSTRUCTION OF A CHAIN OF PICTURE HOUSES WITH BRITISH AND AMERICAN CAPITAL

164. **THE HONOURABLE RAJA YUVERAJ DUTTA SINGH :** Are Government aware that a big company is being formed with British and American capital

for the construction of a chain of picture houses all over India for the exhibition of a particular type of films? If so, what steps do Government propose to take to prevent the dumping into India of this type of films, and to safeguard the interests of the Indian cinema industry from unfair competition?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: *First part.*—Government have no information in the matter.

Second part.—Does not arise.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Are foreign companies allowed to open their branches without sanction from the Government now?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: So far as I know, yes.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: So the control is ineffective as far as foreign companies are concerned.

(No reply.)

PROFIT PERMITTED ON LANDED COST OF CONTROLLED ARTICLES

165. **THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM:** Will Government state:—

(a) What is the ordinary profit permitted on the landed cost of the controlled articles? (b) The names of establishment specially authorised to charge higher profits than other tradesmen and the reasons for it? (c) The list of articles on which profit permitted is 40 per cent. or more than the landed cost or manufacturing cost? (d) Are imports controlled? and (e) Is the quantum of imports up to now much less than the potential demand?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: (a) It is presumed that by "controlled articles" the Honourable Member means articles the profits of which are controlled under the Hoarding and Profiteering Prevention Ordinance, 1943. If so, the ordinary profit on the landed cost of such articles is the same as was allowed by pre-war normal trade practice, unless where it exceeds 20% it is varied by the Controller General, who is empowered to examine these margins and to approve their continuance or modification.

(b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the table.

(c) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply to the question No. 95 answered on the 7th March in which this information has already been given.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: In the reply to question No. 95 to which the Honourable Member has referred the cost was given based on the landed cost and not on manufacturing cost. In this question I asked for information about things which are manufactured in India on which we have given more than 40 per cent profit.

(No reply.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Another supplementary question, Sir. Is it necessary to take the Controller General's permission if ordinary trade profit is 200 or 100 per cent?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. M. PATEL: No, Sir.

List of Establishments which have been specially authorised to charge more profits than other tradesman:—

1. The Federation of Trades Association of India. This Association caters for the needs of an exclusive class of customers who demand a high standard of Service. Any special margins allowed are in strict accordance with the practice before the war. Besides their concessions will lapse where any profit margins or prices under the Hoarding and Profiteering Prevention Ordinance are fixed.
2. M/s. Kishanchand Chellaram & Sons, Madras. A special margin was claimed by the firm on the basis of prewar practice. This claim was inquired into thoroughly and after being satisfied about all details a margin of 61% was allowed.

3. The Power Tools and Appliances, Calcutta. The firm deals in Garage and Automobile equipment. These articles are used in India only by a few advanced and technically well equipped establishments. 75% was allowed to this firm, though it claimed a much higher margin on the basis of its prewar practice.
4. Nundy & Co., Calcutta. 60% over cost of manufacturer for wholesale and 100% for the retail were allowed to this firm for the value tubes manufactured. These margins were allowed partly on the analogy of the similar figures for rubber goods and partly because the Industry needed some encouragement.
5. Mousell & Co., for Diesel Engine Parts. These again are specialised machinery equipment. Special margins from 50% to 100% were allowed after obtaining expert advice from the D. G. M. P., Calcutta.
6. The Swiss Locomotive Works, Bombay, for Diesel Engine Compressors. Maximum margins up to 100% were allowed on the basis of prewar practice and after having obtained the advice from the D. G. M. P., Calcutta.
7. The Indian Tool Manufacturers Ld. Bombay, for that part of the Twist Brills mfd. by them which is released for civil trade. 1938 price list plus 115%. This margin was decided upon after Director of Munitions (Purchase, had gone into full details of the case and forwarded his recommendations.
8. Wellington Cycle Co., Bombay. The grant of a special margin for a certain type of Raleigh Cycle imported by this firm is under consideration. The firm is understood to have been giving free service for two years after the purchase of the cycles. The special margin will be sanctioned only if this condition is observed.
9. Dunlop Rubber Co., India, for cycle Rims. This margin is based on prewar trade practice. In fact, the firm claimed 100%. This margin could not be accepted as for other bicycles and parts, the maximum margin allowed is only 40%. This margin now allowed is only 60% over landed cost.
10. Messrs. Roy Brothers, New Delhi, Dealers in Ladies and Gents Woollen and Hosiery goods, Knitting wool, Handbags, etc. The margin allowed is 53%. The firm runs a specialised establishment of goods standing. This margin was also enjoyed by it before the war.
11. Seth Hassanam & Sons, New Delhi. 30% excepting Benares and Surat Sarees, Fancy articles and Toilet. This Margin has been allowed to the firm on its claim for special consideration based on pre-war practice being found to be justified.
12. Wassiahmal Assomal & Co., Bombay. For the same reason as for 11 above, this firm has been allowed to charge 60% over landed cost.
13. Volkart Bros., for Agricultural Implements and Tractors. 20% Profit Margin.
14. Spares. 75% over landed cost. ■
Much higher margins than these were claimed by the firm, but the matter was referred to the Department of Education, Health and Lands. The present margins were proposed by that Department.

CLOSING DOWN OF CERTAIN STATIONS ON THE B. & A. R.

166. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—
(a) Whether it has been decided to close down shortly several stations on the Bengal and Assam Railway ? (b) If so, what are the reasons therefor ? (c) Whether there does not exist at present abnormal vehicular transport difficulty in the Bengal Province due to shortage of petrol, coal and oil ? (d) Whether the Honourable Minister in Charge of Communications, Bengal Government, was consulted in the matter by the Railway authorities before they arrived at the decision of closing down the stations ? (e) Whether prior to their final decision the accessibility of the affected places by road or river was examined from the point of view of public service ? and (f) Whether in the event of closing down of the stations public and essential services will not be adversely affected ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY : (a) and (b). I understand that such closures as were decided on in consultation and agreement with th.

Bengal Government in the past have already been completed. Certain proposals for further closures have been objected to by the Bengal Government and have been postponed pending agreement.

(c) The situation is I, believe, substantially as stated by the Honourable Member.

(d) The Provincial Government was consulted.

(e) These matters were, I believe, fully considered before final decisions were taken.

(f) The withdrawal of transport facilities which have been in existence for some time must necessarily result in a certain amount of inconvenience to the public. The intention, however, is not to curtail facilities which are necessary to maintain essential civil and military services.

REDUCTION IN LOCAL TRAIN SERVICES ON THE B. & A. R.

167. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—

(a) The reasons for the cutting down of the already restricted local train services on the Bengal and Assam Railway as revealed by the recent time table ?

(b) Whether before framing such a time table the Honourable Minister in Charge of Communications, Bengal Government, was consulted ? and

(c) Whether Government propose to take steps to minimise hardships caused to the public ?

THE HONOURABLE SIB SATYENDRA NATH ROY : (a) Any cutting down of the local train services on the Bengal and Assam Railway is part of the general curtailment of all but the most essential passenger services in the present emergency.

(b) No, but the usual practice of consulting the Time Table Sub-Committee of the Local Advisory Committee prior to any major changes in the time tables was followed. A nominee of the Government of Bengal on the Local Advisory Committee is a member of this Time Table Sub-Committee.

(c) I am arranging for this question to be brought to the notice of the General Manager of the Railway for such action as it may be possible to take to minimise public hardships.

ALLOTMENT OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS

168. THE HONOURABLE HAJI SYED MUHAMMAD HUSAIN : (a) Will Government state whether other Departments were consulted before issuing Labour Department O.M. No. WII-4/114, dated 25th January, 1945 ? If so, which were the Departments against the proposal and how many were in favour of the proposal ?

(b) Will Government state whether the Imperial Secretariat Association or any other body representative of the staff affected by the above order was consulted before final decision in the matter was arrived at ?

(c) Are Government aware that there is a strong feeling among the Indian clerks against the order ?

(d) If the reply to (c) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to withdraw the said order and revert to the position that has existed till now ? If not, why not ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. C. PRIOR : (a) Yes. Government do not consider it necessary to specify the departments who were against or in favour of the proposal.

(b) Yes.

(c) Government have no information.

(d) Does not arise. Government have decided that the declaration by an applicant of his style of living will be accepted without question.

HINDU CODE

169. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—

(a) What steps have been taken to publish the draft Hindu Code in the Province of Bengal ;

(b) Whether Bengali translation of the Code has been printed for the purpose of its wide circulation ? If so, when ?

(c) The number of copies printed ;

(d) The method by which it has been circulated ?

(e) The price at which each copy is being sold ? and

(f) If it is not sold the reasons therefor ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : (a) The English version of the Draft Hindu Code was published in Bengal simultaneously with its publication in other parts of India early in August, 1944. Copies of the draft Code were widely distributed free of cost to various public bodies including the High Court, Bar Associations, District Judges, eminent lawyers, and distinguished persons and various other associations interested in the subject.

(b) Yes. Copies for free distribution were ready on the 10th February, 1945.

(c) 11,500, of which 10,000 have actually been distributed.

(d) Copies were distributed free by the Government of Bengal through District and Sub-Divisional Officers and District and Sub-Divisional Magistrates. Copies were also distributed direct by the Judicial Department of the Government of Bengal to some individuals and Associations.

(e) No price has been fixed as copies were distributed free.

(f) The Government of Bengal will distribute copies free to any member of the public asking for the same.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : In what vernacular languages have the translations been published and circulated ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : I should like to have notice of the question.

HINDU CODE

170. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—

(a) The names of the bodies or organisations which have sent protests against the draft Hindu Code ?

(b) The number of bodies or organizations which have sent their approval of the Code ;

(c) The names of individuals who have sent protests against and approval of the Code ? and

(d) The number of public meetings held in Bengal for and against the Code ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : (a) to (d). Numerous bodies and individuals have expressed views both for and against the draft Hindu Code. A number of public meetings have also been held, in which views have been expressed on the Code both ways. The labour involved in collecting and tabulating the desired information will not be justified by results.

HINDU CODE

171. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—

(a) Whether it is proposed to co-opt members from public bodies or organizations or societies on the Select Committee to take evidence ?

(b) If so, whether persons both for and against the Code will be co-opted equally ? and

(c) Whether supporters or opponents of the measure will be allowed to lead evidence and cross-examine witnesses ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : (a) to (c). It is not clear from the question to which Select Committee the Honourable Member refers. Select Committees appointed by the Legislature are not competent to co-opt members.

PERSONNEL OF HINDU LAW COMMITTEE

172. THE HONOURABLE KUMAR N. N. SINHA : Will Government state :—

- (a) The names of the personnel of the Hindu Law Committee ?
- (b) The qualifications of each of the members ?
- (c) The special qualifications which entitle them to such appointment ? and
- (d) which of them is a Sanskrit Scholar or versed in the Hindu Shastras ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL :

- (a) (i) Sir B. N. Rau, C.I.E., Chairman.
- (ii) Dr. Dwarka Nath Mitter, M.A., D.L.
- (iii) Principal J. R. Gharpure, B.A., LL.B. (Hons.), and
- (iv) Mr. T. R. Venkatram Sastri, C. I. E.

(b) & (c). *Sir B. N. Rau, C. I. E.*, the Chairman was a member of the Indian Civil Service and retired last year as a Judge of the Calcutta High Court.

Dr. Dwarka Nath Mitter was a Judge of the Calcutta High Court from 1926—37 and is now practising at Patna. He is a Doctor of Laws of the University of Calcutta, having been awarded the Doctorate for his thesis on the "Position of Women in Hindu Law". He is a member of the Sanskrit Association in Bengal, and has been the President of the Governing Body of the Calcutta Sanskrit College for a number of years.

Principal J. R. Gharpure is an advocate of the Bombay High Court of long standing and is now the Principal of the Law College at Poona. He is the author of several books on Hindu Law including an annotated translation of the Institutes of Yajnavalkya and the commentaries thereon.

Mr. T. R. Venkatram Sastri, C. I. E., is a leading member of the Madras Bar. He was Advocate General of Madras for a number of years.

(d) All the members are well-versed in Sanskrit and possess an adequate knowledge of the Hindu Dharma Shastras.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY : May I ask the Honourable Member whether it is desirable to have as Chairman of the Hindu Law Committee for drafting revolutionary changes in Hindu law a person who had himself married a European lady and had left the Hindu fold ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : I decline to answer that question.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : I very strongly object to this remark about an esteemed gentleman.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY : He is not a Hindu. That is what I said.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : This is a personal remark against Sir B. N. Rau and is highly objectionable. Government could not have selected a better Chairman.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : This question is barred by the Rules of Business as it makes an insinuation. Under the Rules of Business no insinuations are permitted.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : Is there any insinuation when an Honourable Member honestly asks—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order. If the Honourable Member wants to put a question, he should put it in a proper form.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : Is Sir B. N. Rau still in the Hindu fold ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Of course he is.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : That is well. No insinuation is intended against him.

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

LACK OF COPIES OF THE ELECTORAL ROLL OF VOTERS IN BOMBAY

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Honourable Members, I have received notice of a Motion of Adjournment from the Honourable Mr. Motilal which I will read to you :—

“ That the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, the non-availability of adequate number of copies of the first publication of the preliminary electoral roll of voters in the City of Bombay for the Central Assembly for inspection by the public.”

I should like to hear what the Honourable Mr. Motilal has to urge in support of his Motion ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) : What I have to urge is this. These electoral rolls are published by the Local Government acting as an agent of the Central Government.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : What does the Honourable Member mean by “ acting as an agent of the Central Government ” ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : In publishing these electoral rolls the Local Government does not act within the purview of its powers as a Provincial Government.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : What is the authority for that proposition ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : My authority is section 124 of the Government of India Act. The Provincial Government, as I said, act as the agent of the Central Government under sub-section (1) of section 124, and they are paid a large sum for that.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : It does not matter what they are paid.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : It is relevant, because if it were a provincial subject, the provincial revenues would have met the expenditure. But in this case it is a Central subject and the Provincial Government acts as agent to whom this work is entrusted under section 124. The question put by you was very relevant, and it has been, I hope, answered to your satisfaction.

Now, Sir, they have revised the list and they have now published what is known as the first publication of the list and persons whose names are not included in the list have got to put their claim before a proper authority, which in Bombay is the Judge of the Small Causes Court, and that claim should be submitted within ten days.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member's Motion specifically refers to the non-availability of copies of the list. Why is he going into all this? He must come to the point straight away.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Only two copies of this electoral roll have been placed there. The number of voters on the roll is 60,000. If I remember aright, the number of electors was as much as 90,000 or a lakh in the last general election in 1937. It is our common experience that names of even prominent men are omitted. You will perhaps remember—I do remember—that the name of Mr. K. F. Nariman was not found in the last electoral roll. I do not blame anybody for it.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I am afraid the Honourable Member is confusing rule 9 of the Electoral Rules with this question. Sub-rule (6) of rule 9 has nothing to do with the present Motion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : That is its very basis.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Has the Honourable Member anything further to urge ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Only two copies are placed, and if only two copies are placed, people will not be able to look up the list within the short time at their disposal. A report has appeared in the Press, and this is a matter of urgent public importance; otherwise many names may not be found in the list. It is the intention of Government that they ought to be found in the list.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : That is not the Motion. The Adjournment Motion refers only to the non-availability of the copies.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : If only two copies are placed, it is non-availability. As I said, I know it from my personal experience. In earlier days a number of copies were available. If only two copies are available, how are the people to go and find out whether their names appear in the list and how are they to put in their claims within ten days?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Will the Honourable Member also explain how it becomes an urgent matter of public importance?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : If the names are not entered within ten days—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Again I correct the Honourable Member. His proposition does not refer to the names. He only refers to non-availability of copies.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Non-availability of an adequate number of copies.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : There is no mention of the correctness or otherwise of the electoral roll in the Adjournment Motion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Who can say whether the roll is correct or incorrect—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order. I refer the Honourable Member to his Motion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : My Motion refers to non-availability of an adequate number of copies. More copies ought to have been placed. As an adequate number of copies have not been placed it is a matter of legitimate complaint, and that is my ground for moving this Motion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : (Bihar and Orissa : Muhammadan) : Sir, the position is that these rules are published for 10 days and any objections must be filed within that specific period. What I am telling the House is that the urgency arises because of the fact that the time is so short and that applications for amendment must be filed within this time.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : You contend that some members, who have neglected to do their duty, therefore consider that this is an urgent matter.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : No, Sir. I am not in charge of preparing the roll.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I did not say you neglected to do your duty.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : It is no fault of the elector that his name is not on the electoral roll. It is the fault of the Government which prepares the roll. Therefore, I suggest that we are perfectly within our rights and competence to ask that this matter be discussed. I will just point out the difference between a Resolution and an Adjournment Motion. An Adjournment motion is a censure on a neglect by the Government to take action which it ought to take in its course of business. We regard it as the duty of the Central Government to see that the Provinces do make available to the electors a sufficient number of copies to see whether their names are recorded or not recorded or incorrectly recorded. It is the duty of the Government to do this and therefore I submit that this Adjournment Motion is in order.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I hold that this Adjournment Motion is not in order, for two reasons. In the first place, it is part of the duty of the Provincial Government. The Central Government has no concern in this matter at

all. The function of preparing the rolls and seeing that they are correctly prepared and that a proper number of copies of the rolls are supplied to the public is the duty of the Provincial Government. It has nothing to do with the Central Government. I hold that the first reason assigned for this Adjournment Motion is out of order. The second reason is that it is not a matter of urgent public importance as it will appear to anybody. For these reasons the Motion is disallowed.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL (Nominated Official) : Sir, I move :—

“ That this Council do proceed to elect in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official members to serve on a Standing Committee to advise on subjects in the Legislative Department for the financial year 1945-46 ”.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM (Bihar and Orissa : Muhammadan) : Is the Honourable Member aware that the number of seats allotted to the Assembly has been increased in the other House ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : Yes, Sir. That is why it has been increased from two to three here.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, before you put the Motion to the vote, may I just say one word ? I think this is the first time that the Legislative Department has asked for the appointment of a Standing Committee to advise it. I should like to know what the functions of this committee, so far as the Legislative Department is concerned, will be. The Legislative Department deals with Bills. Its primary concern is legislation. Will the Standing Committee be consulted in regard to the formative stages of legislation ? I should like some indication to be given of the precise functions of this Committee. I can understand a Committee advising the Home Department or the Commerce Department. What exactly will be the functions of this Committee in relation to the Legislative Department is not very clear because, it is usual to have Bills referred to Select Committees after they have been introduced in the Assembly. Will the Legislative Department, in formulating legislative proposals, take the Standing Committee into consultation ? I should like to be enlightened on this point and I hope that the Honourable Mr. Lal will be able to tell us more precisely what the nature of the functions assigned to this Standing Committee is going to be.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL : Sir, this Motion is being moved in pursuance of the new rule which has been made regarding Standing Advisory Committees for the various Departments of Government. If my Honourable friend had had the advantage of pursuing the new rules, all his difficulties would have disappeared. Rule 7 of the rules says :—

“ The following subjects will be laid before the Standing Committee :—

“ All Bills introduced or proposed to be introduced by non-official members of the Legislature, and Legislative proposals which the Department concerned intends to undertake and on which the Member in charge of the Department desires the advice of the Committee ”.

There are other rules also but this one will perhaps answer the points raised by my Honourable friend. Perhaps he is under a misunderstanding. We are not responsible for all the Bills that are introduced by Government. We are concerned merely with the drafting of the Bills. But there are certain subjects with which we are departmentally concerned also ; for instance, the Code of Criminal Procedure, the code of Civil Procedure, and so on. On these subjects, if we intend to introduce any Bill in the Legislature, we will certainly be very glad to have the benefit of the advice of the Standing Committee. So far as our main subjects are concerned, we cannot really ask the Standing Committee because we ourselves are advisers of Government, and naturally, advisers cannot seek advice. As far as that part of our functions is concerned, naturally we cannot be expected to seek the advice of the Standing Committee.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : What about the Income-tax Tribunals and the Special Tribunals which are dealt with by the Legislative Department ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAVAX A. LAL: Those will be one of the subjects on which we would certainly be glad of the opinion and advice of this Committee.

The Motion was adopted.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF POSTS AND AIR

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN (Posts and Air Member): Sir, since giving notice of this Motion, I find that the Assembly has increased its representation from three to five. So I intend to raise the representation of this House from two to three. With your permission, I shall move the Motion as amended.

Sir, I move :—

“That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official members to serve on a Standing Committee to advise on subjects dealt with in the Department of Posts and Air during the year 1945-46”.

The Motion was adopted.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. E. CONRAN-SMITH (Home Secretary): Sir, for reasons already indicated to this House, I should like, with your permission, to substitute the number “four” for the number “two” in this Motion and to move it as amended.

Sir, I move :—

“That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, four non-official members to serve on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects in the Home Department”.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan): What is the corresponding number for the Assembly?

THE HONOURABLE MR. E. CONRAN-SMITH: The number is “eight” for the Assembly.

The Motion was adopted.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE LABOUR DEPARTMENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAMALDHARI LALL (Nominated Official): Sir for similar reasons I propose, with your permission, to substitute “five” for “three”

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAMALDHARI LALL: Sir, I move :—

“That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, five non-official members to serve on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects with which the Labour Department is concerned”.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal : Non-Muhammadan): How many are there from the Assembly, Sir?

THE HONOURABLE MR. SHAMALDHARI LALL: Ten.

The Motion was adopted.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE WAR TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY (War Transport Secretary): Sir, I move :—

“That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official members to serve on the Standing Committee to advise on subjects with which the Department of War Transport is concerned, other than those within the purview of the Standing Committee for Roads, during the year 1945-46”.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan): The number has not been changed?

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY: No, Sir. It has not become necessary.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM (Bihar and Orissa : Muhammadan) :
What is the number in the Assembly, Sir ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR STAYENDRA NATH ROY : Five.

The Motion was adopted.

CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS

THE HONOURABLE SIR SATYENDRA NATH ROY (War Transport Secretary) : Sir, I move :—

“ That this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, six non-official members from the Council who shall be required to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways for the year commencing 1st April, 1945 ”.

The Motion was adopted.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : With reference to the six Motions which have just been adopted by the Council, I have to announce that nominations to the Committees will be received by the Secretary up to 11 A.M. on Tuesday, the 27th March, 1945 and the date of election, if necessary, will be announced later.

RESOLUTION *RE* REPRESENTATION AT THE CONFERENCE OF ALLIED NATIONS TO BE HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW (Madras : Non-Muhammadan) :
Mr. President, I move :—

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that representation be made to His Majesty's Government to secure adequate representation of the non-official representative opinion of India at the Conference of Allied Nations proposed to be held on 25th April, 1945 at San Francisco, U. S. A. ”.

Sir, let me begin with offering my thanks to Government for having allotted a special day. It has come about quite accidentally by the good offices of the Secretary, Mr. Lal. As we have got very few days for non-official Resolutions, my Resolution came last on the agenda last time and I am grateful that separate time has been allotted for this discussion because the importance of the subject demands such a course.

Sir, the circumstances that warrant the acceptance of the Resolution are by now well known. The Great War No. 2 is coming to a close on the Western Front. The victors are planning for an effective peace. The Teheran, Moscow and Crimean Conferences are a series of connected happenings with the ultimate purpose of annihilating the aggressor and bring about a lasting peace to this distracted world. Both President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill have indulged in high-sounding phrases to boost up their future plans for world peace. Mr. Roosevelt has said—and I quote from his speech—

“ The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, of one party or one nation. It cannot be an American peace, or a British or Russian, French or Chinese peace. It must be peace which rests on the co-operative effort of the whole world ”.

Again he said :—

“ Responsibility for political conditions thousands of miles overseas can no longer be avoided by this great nation (U. S. A.) ”.

Then again in another place he said :—

“ We shall have to take responsibility for world collaboration or we shall have to take responsibility for another world conflict ”.

Referring to the representation of the United States of America on the Conference he said that the American Delegation is in every sense of the word bipartisan. World peace is not a party question, any more than is military victory.

Mr. Churchill said :—

“ The Conference at San Francisco will bring together all those representatives of the United Nations who declared war on Germany or Japan ”.

I want you to note the words "all those representatives of the United Nations who declared war on Germany or Japan"—United Nations, not of the Governments who declared war on Germany or Japan.

"The former League of Nations will be replaced by a far stronger body".

That is Mr. Churchill's hope at any rate. And he continues :—

"On such an occasion it is clearly right that the two leading parties of the Government and the British Nation should be represented".

He makes a clear distinction between the British Government and the British Nation and he wants that the representatives not only of the British Government but also of the British nation should be represented at San Francisco to achieve the results aimed at and says :—

"The chief representatives at this Conference will be the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Eden, and Lord President of the Council and Leader of the Labour Party Mr. Attlee".

Again, Sir, Mr. Attlee said :—

"I believe that at San Francisco we shall be taking part in a Conference that may well determine the future of mankind for centuries".

This is the nature of the Conference which is being ushered into existence by the great powers of the earth. Russia which has got only a single party Government will be represented solely by M. Litvinov.

Sir, the above quotations from the principal actors on the stage at San Francisco will give an idea of the bugle-blowing and tub-thumping with which the masters of propaganda are ushering this great conference into existence.

My Resolution asks for nothing more than that representative non-official Indians should be sent to represent India at this Conference, pregnant with the dawn of a new world and a new civilisation for mankind. When the down-trodden peoples of Europe and the Pacific are asked to look up to this phenomenon as the instrument of their deliverance from slavery and guardian of peaceful existence in the future, has India with 400 millions of people held in bondage a ny cause for satisfaction, much less enthusiasm for this conference ?

The way the British imperialist is treating this country does not augur well for the peace of this world. If sunrise is to shine and illumine all the dark and desolate corners of the earth, is it not foolish to think that it cannot penetrate the dark chamber of British imperialism.

Let us see how the Conference is composed. It is said 39 nations are being invited to the Conference. They form the general assembly. The organisation is based on the principle of sovereign equality of all States. That was the principle agreed upon at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference on which this Conference is being convened.

The first principle on which the organisation is based is the principle of *sovereign equality* of all peace loving States. Has India got the sovereign equality with the other States that are being gathered round this Conference ?

11 A.M.

There is no sovereign equality between India and England but it is one of absolute inequality. The other Dominions of Canada, Australia and South Africa are also invited to the Conference. The Canadian Government has made it clear that Canada could not enter into any pre-San Francisco commitments which would limit the Canadian delegation's autonomy. Australia has more than once made it clear that her geographical situation in the Pacific renders it incumbent on her to align her policy more in consonance with the United States than with Great Britain and her Empire. Sir, the wave of racial supremacy and the white man's burden that is sweeping South Africa at the present moment both against the Indian settler and the African native coloured races renders it an ugly misfit in the Empire window dressing. Field Marshal Smuts who is responsible for all the anti-racial feeling that has been created in South Africa will sit as the loud speaker of Mr. Churchill at the Conference table at San Francisco. With what face can the Government of India's representatives sit side by side along with Field Marshal Smuts while every day you see adjournment motions and criticisms levelled against the policy of the Government of India in not enforcing the sanctions against the South African Government.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : That is done more in the Assembly.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : I know, Sir, the Council of State has got a tradition which it will never outlive.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : You are paying a compliment to your own House.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : But I want to see it very much changed now.

The docile India is the only country that serves as the performing animal in the hands of Churchills and Amerys. They nominate their own creatures who are well-trained performers in the empire circus ring. What place has this ancient and unfortunate land in this Conference of the free peoples of the world ?

Mr. William Dobbie, M.P., evidently a superior type of Englishman, has said :—

“ The Government of India has nominated for San Francisco its stooges. I wonder if Lord Wavell was well advised in selecting ‘ yes ’ men for the job which would require *Strength of character and independence of thought*.”

It would have been a stroke of statesmanship on the part of the Viceroy if he had released Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and sent him to San Francisco ”.

Perhaps Mr. Dobbie forgets that want of statesmanship is the supreme qualification for Indian Viceroyalty.

Then, Sir, a leading newspaper from the United States, the country entrusted with inviting the delegates and playing the host, has got the following complimentary comment on the episode. The *Chicago Tribune* in its leader says :—

“ The composition of India’s delegation at San Francisco meeting ‘ establishes their stoogeship authoritatively ’ ”.

Mr. Dobbie in England and 3,000 miles across the Atlantic the *Chicago Tribune* in America have hit upon the same word “ stooge ” with regard to the nominations. The paper concludes :—

“ It is an advance demonstration as to how much the Atlantic Charter spirit will rule the gathering ! ”

The Atlantic Charter, Sir, is a seaweed that does not thrive on land. It was conceived on the high seas and it was drowned in the high seas in the Atlantic itself. The moment it was brought about it was repudiated by Mr. Churchill. Some time later Mr. Roosevelt said that it was only an oral understanding which is not binding on anybody. Now, again, I do not know at whose instance it has been again revived and salvaged. It is being offered as a sop to the Colonial peoples wherein lies their salvation. But public opinion either in America or elsewhere do not believe that these statesmen will carry out the terms of this Charter into actuality. Sir, the picture will be complete with Lord Hailey as the adviser, i.e., the general manager of the empire show. We know the history of Lord Hailey. He is one of the most earnest watch-dogs of British imperialism. He has written a book on Africa and he has been considered as a very loyal servant in India who has held India for the British for a long time. This is the gentleman who wanted even to remove the word “ Dominion Status ” from the Government records lest people should attach great faith to the promises of the British Government with regard to Dominion Status.

Sir, can there be a more galling position for the nominees of the Government of India than this, to go about there and occupy a subordinate place ? In another place, an Honourable gentleman has repudiated this charge, that they are not occupying a subordinate place. What is it ? They must go to London first, take part in the pre-arranged Press rehearsals ; they must take lessons in what they have to say and what they have not to say from Mr Amery and then follow the leader of the Delegation to San Francisco. I do not propose to go into the details of the constitution and voting methods that are being aired in the Press with regard to this Conference. Our fundamental objection is that India should be treated as a subordinate branch of the British Government. Its nominated delegates have not the freedom or the courage to at least draw the attention at the bar of the world opinion to the deplorable state of affairs in this country.

Sir, the very composition of the Conference starts with this initial handicap. Lebanon and Syria have got a place of honour around the table which this vast country with all the great service which it has rendered to the Empire cannot enjoy at the Conference table. British statesmen may convene any number of Commonwealth Relations Conferences in London but they cannot deceive the world. It is a misnomer for Empire and the relations are any thing but happy and cordial.

The tragic part of the scheme is that President Roosevelt is continuing the same song of the white man's supremacy. If you see the politics that is behind this whole show it is one of competing imperialisms—between the American and British imperialisms. It is a concerted action on the part of the white races to dominate the world and Asiatic countries. We know why America wants to annihilate Japan. Russia is setting up a Communist junta in China to overthrow Chiang Kai Shek and wants to have complete control over China. England wants to retain its Empire in India and to reconquer its lost empire in Burma, Malaya and Hongkong. The principal actors on the stage of San Francisco are completely permeated with the idea of the Empire and the domination of the white man over the coloured races and they want to retain what they have got there. In this connection I would like to read a summary quotation from what the Socialist Norman Thomas said in New York :—

“ The greatest danger of a Third World War would arise in Asia due to the American desire to preserve white supremacy. The present American tendency is towards annihilation of Japan with nothing put in its place. One of the reasons for this annihilation is racism. It is the desire to maintain white, chiefly English-speaking, supremacy. Unless something better is done than the Big Three plans at Cairo, Teheran, Yalta and the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, the next generation will see a series of revolts in Asia ”.

There is much truth, Sir, in this. Even at this late hour the British Government cannot recognize independence of this country and make her a nation with self-respect for the table at San Francisco, but India cannot remain like this for long. It will not remain for long contented with Noons and Mudaliars or the status which she is now enjoying. I quote, Sir, Mr. Sumner Wells, the late Under Secretary of State in America, who was chucked out of the Roosevelt administration because of his outspoken attitude taken with regard to the Colonial peoples. He says :—

“ I believe that these new forces of nationalism can successfully be canalized into peaceful and constructive channels only if the powers of the world, in a future international organization are willing to adopt the basic principle that no nation possesses the inherent and unlimited right to dominate alien peoples. They must recognize that the so-called colonial powers are obligated to prove to world public-opinion, as represented by an international organization, that their administration over alien peoples is to the interest of the governed, and has for its chief objective the assumption of self-government by these peoples ”.

With regard to India, he says :—

“ Thus it is clear that, provided the people of India and the British Government can reach an agreement as to the basis upon which an independent government of India can be established, a solution for this ever-increasingly intricate and dangerous problem can be found. Such a solution will not be made easier by intemperate outpourings from Downing Street ” ——— the reference is to the outpourings of Churchill,——and a snub to him —

“ nor by equally intemperate insistence by pundits in the United States that the way to solve the problem is for British authority to remove itself bag and baggage from India between dawn and night. Obviously the ideal method of solution is through direct negotiation between the British Government and the representative leaders of India ”.

With this every sane man in the country agrees, except the British bureaucrats in India.

“ It is a method which has already frequently been adopted. However, should these efforts continue to fail, the executive council of the international organization, through its agencies, should stand ready to assist in composing the difficulties which might still exist ”.

This is where Mr. Sumner Wells claims that the question of India is not Britain's private business but the business of the whole world if the peace of the world is to be guaranteed and another world war is to be avoided. He further says :—

“ A continuation of the present impasse after the war will seriously endanger the peace and stability of all of the Far East ”.

[Mr. Thirumala Row]

This is not the empty threat of an Indian nationalist ; it is the far-seeing statement of a statesman who has had access to all the secret records of the nations of the world. He knows how human feelings are being swayed all over the world with regard to the domination of the white man over the coloured races. If a third world war which will be more ghastly is to be avoided, it is the duty of British and American statesmen who are going to meet at San Francisco to see that the legitimate aspirations of 400 million people are justly satisfied. I implore the bureaucrat in India and the short-sighted Churchill in England to wake up while there is still time. The men that flatter you and sell their country for immediate gains are not your true friends. Even the *London Times*, the watch-dog of Conservative privilege, says :—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order. The Honourable Member should not read from newspapers.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : Then, I will simply quote from memory. I think I am at liberty to quote from memory. I am not reading from any newspaper ; I did not bring any newspaper.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member can quote from memory.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : “ Anti-British sentiment, if not replaced by a better understanding , may attain a pitch at which it will imperil that close co-operation between Britain and India in the world after the war upon which the future of both countries and indeed of general security so largely depends. Until political India can be convinced that British-intention as already declared will, in fact, be carried out no positive co-operation nor constructive endeavour will be forthcoming from India herself.” That is the opinion of the *London Times*. Don't you see that an opportunity has presented itself here and now to ask the biggest political parties in India to send their representatives to San Francisco to represent India ? This will touch the heart of the whole nation and wipe away all the bitter memories of the past at one stroke. You don't realize you will look small in the eyes of the world at the blatant dishonesty of your action in taking two “ yes-men ” who have no freedom of speech or action or status at the table of free nations. They will look smaller than the delegates of Lebanon and Syria, let alone other countries. You are sowing the dragon's teeth of the next war at San Francisco by your short-sighted action, as you had sown the seeds of the present war at Versailles. The sorry part of it is that America, China and Russia are your compeers in this game. If you don't listen betimes, it will be too late.

I do not intend to dilate much upon this. I only say : take this opportunity of sending India's true representatives, not people who always play second fiddle to your tune, but people who have character and courage, people who can suffer for their convictions and adhere to those convictions through fire. I request the Government to see their way to accept my Resolution. I know the nature of this House too well, even from a distance, as the Honourable the President was kind enough to refer to it. I have no misgivings about the character of this House or the verdict which it is going to pass on this Resolution. (*Interruption.*) As an elected member of this House I have a duty to discharge by the country.

The people and the electorate are my masters, and not the British Government, as they are to a substantial section of this House. My friends have warned me that the Government will take undue advantage by throwing out this Resolution and cabling to America that this Resolution has been debated in India's Parliament.

I say that the dice is loaded against popular parties in this House. In a House of 58 there are 26 nominated members and 32 elected members.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order. Please do not digress from the Resolution. Everybody knows the constitution of the House. That need not be referred to.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : I am speaking not only for the members of this House but for a much bigger audience.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member is not speaking in this House for a bigger audience than this House.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW: I beg to submit that if there is any institution in India which has got the biggest propaganda value, it is this House, and the other House which is being exploited by the Government for their own purposes. Therefore, Sir, I request you to hold the scales even between all parties in this House. If you want to have the real opinion of this House, I challenge the Government to remain neutral and their nominated members to remain neutral and see what the verdict of this House is. It is no use getting people whose vote is already pre-determined by an authority over whom they have no control. That is my point. I speak on behalf of the Congress party. We are a small number in this House, but the Congress is the largest organisation in the country which can alone deliver the goods. I also suggest that my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossain Imam, can deliver the goods on behalf of the Muslim League party which claims to be the next biggest party in the country. If the Viceroy sends the representatives of both these parties, they will have every authority to speak on behalf of the country. In that case we will forget all the misdeeds of the British Government in this country and join with the British Government in evolving a new constitution for the happiness and freedom of the peoples of the world. It is in that spirit that this Resolution is moved. It is not carping criticism.

This Conference is being held on a world-wide basis. In the words of Mr. Atlee himself, the result of this Conference is going to decide the destinies of the peoples of the world for centuries to come. Is the British Government going to decide the destiny of 400 million people through two of its nominees? I think this is the only Government that is sending its own nominees to the San Francisco Conference, in which about 1,200 delegates are going to assemble. You will not find members identical with these two members sitting in that great Conference. Why do you want to stultify this great country before a Conference of independent nations? Do not send them. Send the Viceroy, or one of your own people. Send the Secretary of State, who is able to speak for all people, because he is the Grand Moghul who is ruling India in the most autocratic way. That is my suggestion.

With regard to the amendment of my Honourable friend Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member should not anticipate the amendment at this stage.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW: Generally, when discussions take place on Resolutions, it is customary to allow the Mover of the Resolution to deal with amendments also. There are precedents. If you want me to leave out any reference to the amendment, I am prepared to do so; I will deal with it after it is moved, in my winding-up speech.

Sir, by no stretch of the constitutional theory or practice, by no stretch of the imagination and intelligence of the British Government can these two estimable gentlemen be called representatives of the Indian nation. Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt and every other prominent person who is connected with this Conference wants the representatives of their nations. The U. S. A. have nominated both the Republicans and the Democrats. The British Government have nominated both the Conservatives and Labourites.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: You have said that so often. You are repeating your argument.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW: I won't do it, Sir. For the sake of reminder, so that people may not forget, I have repeated it once. I beg to commend this Resolution to every section of this House. I appeal to the nominated Members for once to be independent in the cause of their country. After all, you may be deprived of your seats, but we will take you in the elections if you want to come back. But please do not vote against this Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT (to the Honourable Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar): I will now call upon you to address the House. You can move your substituted Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASAWMI AYYANGAR (Madras : Non-Muhammadan): Mr. President, before offering any remarks on the Resolution, I wish to be permitted formally to move the amendment which stands in my name, so that I can speak both on the Resolution and the amendment. There is one small verbal correction that I have to make in the typescript of the amendment which has been circulated to Honourable Members of this House, and that is, the substitution of the word "parties" for "bodies". I will read the amendment as corrected, Sir.

I move :—

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

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that to the delegation he has already selected for representing India in response to the invitation extended to the Government of India to take part in the conferences to be held shortly in London and San Francisco on the world security organisation, he do add an elected member each of at least the two major political parties in the Central Legislature.'

The case for my amendment, as I shall develop it, will be simple and I hope will carry conviction to whoever may speak on behalf of Government in connection with this Resolution. The importance of this Conference cannot be overestimated. It is a unique event in the history of the human race. It is for the purpose of evolving a world organisation for the maintenance of peace and security and for the furtherance, if I may put it in the form of that concise expression, of human welfare. Sir, my Honourable friend Mr. Thirumala Row has referred already to some of the objects of this Conference. But the main thing that we have to take note of is the statement of President Roosevelt that it is intended "so to organise the peace-loving nations that they may, through unity of desire, unity of will and unity of strength be in a position to assure that no other would be aggressor or conqueror shall ever get started."

That is why from the very beginning of the war and paralleling our military plans, we have begun to lay the foundations for the general organisation for the maintenance of peace and security. I wish, Sir, in connection with a description of the objects of the Conference, to draw attention to one or two important considerations. The main purposes of the Conference are stated in Chapter I of the Pamphlet which has been issued by the United States Publicity Organisation, on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. The first purpose is to maintain international peace and security and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means the adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to breaches of the peace. The Honourable Mr. Thirumala Row has already referred to the fact that the organisation is supposed to be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States. So far as that point is concerned, there is nothing either in the nature of the invitation that the Government of India should have received in connection with this Conference or in the circumstances which will surround the holding of this Conference which need detract from India's representatives, whoever they may be, claiming the most perfect equality with the representatives of any other nation that may be represented at that table.

The other point I wish to refer to, which is not so fundamental a part of the purpose of this organisation, is one which is stated in Chapter IX, section A, paragraph 1. I would read it to the House so that we may understand how comprehensive the scope of this Conference is going to be. It says :—

"With a view to the creation of conditions of suitability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the organisation should facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly and under the authority of the General Assembly in an Economic and Social Council".

I have read these few passages to the House in order to draw attention to the unique importance of this gathering. What we are today engaged in considering on this Resolution is, India having been invited to this Conference, who

should properly represent her on it? I wish to make one or two things very clear. In an International Conference of this sort, it is impossible for me at any rate to contend that the Government of the nation which has been invited should not be represented. The Government of the nation should be represented. But it should be impossible also, on the part of the Government themselves, to contend that, to a Conference of this sort, no people other than members of the Government should be sent. I wish in this connection to refer to a convention in British parliamentary government, the way in which the executive in Great Britain acts whenever large questions of peace and war and immensely important issues relating to foreign policy have to be decided. The convention as I understand it, is that whoever is responsible in the Government for these matters usually sends for the leaders of the Opposition, takes them informally into confidence, puts them wise on what is proposed to be done and obtains from them a kind of informal concurrence to whatever is proposed to be done. The reason for this convention is obvious. After all, foreign policy, relations in international matters, are not questions for this Government or that Government, for this party or that party. They are questions of a national character and continuity is very essential in matters of that sort. That is why whichever Government may be in power, it always takes the leaders of the Opposition into confidence before it arrives at important decisions of this sort. Sir, in this connection I should like to refer to the experience of a great man who tried to re-order the world in his own way at the end of the last war. I am referring to the late President Woodrow Wilson. He was responsible for many things that followed the end of the last war, but he was unable to carry his own nation with him when it came to the question of the Congress implementing what he had said or done. The Honourable Mr. Thirumala Row has read to you some passages from Mr. Sumner Welles' book. But I should like to read to you a passage which seems particularly relevant to the issue that we are today considering. Here is what he says as an explanation for the failure of President Woodrow Wilson :

" It was unfortunate that he refused to appoint to the Peace Delegation men who were capable of following an independent line of thought. It was unfortunate that the President stubbornly refused to appoint to the Peace Commission outstanding representatives of the Republican party, able because of either their position or their personal influence to speak with authority for the opposition party. It was even more unfortunate that he had not previously consulted with leaders of both parties in the United States Senate, and in the House of Representatives as well, so as to obtain their co-operation, if possible in bringing about the participation of the United States in the League of Nations."

Now, Sir, the moral is clear. There is one point to which I would like to draw the Government's attention. Assuming that their representatives going to this Conference put their signatures to the conclusions arrived at at this Conference, according to precedent in this Legislature, they have to come back to this House and ask for a vote of approval of whatever their delegates may have put their signatures to. Well, it may be a nominal kind of approval in the Legislatures as now constituted; but the precedent is there. It was followed in the case of the U. N. R. R. A. I think it was followed in the case of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Commission. I take it also that whatever our representatives put their signatures to at the Bretton Woods Conference will also come up for discussion before the Houses of the Legislature. These are subsidiary bodies to this main body which is going to be set up at San Francisco. These organisations will be fitted into the general world peace organisation. Now, when you have to come before this House for approval of what you do at a Conference of that sort, is it not wisdom, is it not discretion, on your part to associate with this Delegation members representing the chief political parties in the Legislature? That is a matter which I suggest to the Government to consider very seriously.

Now, Sir, there is another point. India is unlike other countries in the fact that we have not a normally constituted Government functioning in this country. Before I proceed to state my point on this issue, I wish particularly to emphasise the fact that I have nothing to say against the personal worthiness, the ability, the patriotism—and the gifts of speech which at any rate the Leader of the Delegation possesses. I have known him for over a quarter of a century.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I am glad you have referred to them.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : I have no doubt, Sir, that he will do honour to himself by leading this Delegation. I want also to make it clear that if you accept my amendment and add the leaders of the two major parties in the House or persons nominated by them, I should still approve of the Honourable Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar leading this Delegation—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I cannot allow a further amendment to your substituted Motion.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : I am not amending anything. I am only expressing my view. I will not put it on any personal grounds. I take it that when a Delegation goes as the choice of the Government of a particular State, it is only appropriate that a member of that Government, should lead the Delegation. That is the ground on which I would put it. Now, Sir, having said that, I should proceed to ask the Government now in power, in office, would it be appropriate that India with her 400 millions, with her great war record, and with her ancient culture and civilisation, should be represented at this world Conference solely and entirely by members of a Government which—we need not go into the reasons—is defeated every day in the Assembly, which is defeated perhaps more than once in the Assembly on particular days? I am only asking you to consider what the effect on the world would be if you send to that Conference only representatives of this Government. They no doubt continue in power, they continue in office, and whatever positions they can occupy as members of this Government let them occupy in this Delegation. But if you want—

THE HONOURABLE SIR SHANTIDAS ASKURAN (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan): On a point of explanation, Sir. The Honourable the Mover of the amendment agrees to the Honourable Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, the Government member, leading the Delegation and he wants two members to be co-opted from the political parties. If there is a difference of opinion between those leaders and the Government officials, then what is the solution? I would like to know from the Honourable Member.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : The members of the Delegation will have to hammer it out amongst themselves and come to an agreed conclusion. I do not think that will be impossible. I will tell you in a moment why non-official representatives will contribute more to the discussion of questions at this Conference than the Government members can. Take this one point. We find country after country nominating its representatives to this world Conference. We know, for instance, what Mr. Churchill thinks of the main issues that will come up before this Conference.

We know what President Roosevelt thinks of the main issues which will come up before this Conference. We know what even Field Marshal Smuts thinks.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal : Non-Muhammadan) : On a point of order, Sir. Has the Honourable Member ascertained from the leaders of the political parties whether they will recognise Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar as their leader?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : That is not a point of order. It is only in your speech that you can refer to such matters.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY : On a point of information, Sir.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT (to the Honourable Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar) : You proceed please.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : My answer to my Honourable friend's question is that I am not in the confidence of those leaders and I have not asked them that question but what I am suggesting to this House is something which on the merits I consider the proper thing to do.

Now, Sir, I was mentioning that all countries, the leaders of all countries, are placing before the world preliminary, tentative views about the main issues which will come up before this Conference. I do not recollect that the Government of India have ever put us wise on what they think about the issues that will come up before this Conference. I cannot recall any single occasion on which the Government of India's selected representatives have either in these two Houses or elsewhere given an indication of their views on questions which will come up before this Conference. But, as against a thing of that sort, Sir, I shall read to you a passage from a Resolution, which is now rather famous in this country, which gives an indication that the main, the most important, political party in this country has thought about these matters and has laid down what it thinks should be the principles on which a world organisation should be established in the future. This is what it says, Sir :—

“While the A. I. C. C. (that is the All-India Congress Committee) must primarily be concerned with independence and defence of India in this hour of danger, the Committee is of opinion that the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation or another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples and the pooling of the world's resources for the common good of all. On the establishment of such a world federation disarmament would be practicable in all countries, national armies, navies and air forces would no longer be necessary and a world federal defence force would keep the world peace and prevent aggression. An independent India would gladly join such a world federation and co-operate on an equal basis with other countries in the solution of international problems. Such a federation should be open to all nations who agree with these fundamental principles. In view of the war, however, the federation must inevitably to begin with be confined to the United Nations. Such a step taken now” (that is Sir, during the pendency of the war) “will have a most powerful effect on the war, on the peoples of the Axis countries and on the peace to come”.

I am sure, Sir, that Honourable Members will guess who was responsible for this particular part of the All-India Congress Committee Resolution and yet the author of this statesmanlike pronouncement, which anticipated by two years the purposes and objects of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference Resolutions, is languishing in jail, languishing not for what he has done but languishing, as the Honourable the Home Member seems to have said elsewhere, because of the fear as to what he might do if he were at large. Well, Sir, if the Government of India had had sufficient imagination, sufficient statesmanship, in connection with the selecting of their representatives for this world Conference they ought to have released that man from detention and asked him to go forth to San Francisco and speak in the name of India, not in the name of India that is but in the name of the India that is to be. Now, Sir, short of that, what I am suggesting in this amendment is that the Governor General in Council should send for the leaders of the two most important parties in the Legislature and ask them to represent this country on this delegation themselves or to nominate people in whom their parties have confidence. That is my suggestion. Now, Sir, I wish to make it clear that while I have mentioned the two major political parties, I have not ruled out representatives of other parties if they are of sufficient importance and if the strength of the delegation can admit of it. I have only said that there must be an elected member each of *at least two* major political parties. Now, Sir, there are very important questions which are going to come up before this Conference.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Please bring your remarks to a close now. I know your speech is very important but for a speech on an amendment you are only entitled to 15 minutes and I have already allowed you nearly nine minutes more.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : Sir, the issue is so important that I thought I could ask for your indulgence.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : It is on account of that that I have allowed you nearly 10 minutes more.

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH (Education, Health and Lands Member): I think he should be allowed to speak. He is making a very cogent speech.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR: I will try and condense my remaining remarks.

I was mentioning, Sir, that very important questions will come up before this Conference for consideration and one of the things that it will have to consider will be whether this organisation should be split up into a number of regional organisations. India, with her strategic position in the Indian Ocean and the near Pacific should occupy a place which she alone is entitled to in the present conditions. Her great war effort entitles her to a position which is second to none. Now, Sir, France is going to have a seat to herself; one of the permanent seats. China is going to have a permanent seat to herself. But when the defence of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia is going to be organised India's strategic position will by no means be inferior to that of China and it will be one of the most important matters for the Conference to consider whether India should not claim a place by virtue of her participation in this war, by virtue of her future strategic position in the East, which would not be inferior to that of China.

Then, Sir, assuming that she is given a place only alongside the other Dominions of the British Commonwealth, that itself, in my opinion, would do her a certain amount of injustice. I do not wish to refer to Canada and her war effort, or Australia but compared with South Africa India's place must be very much higher in spite of the fact that Field Marshal Smuts will perhaps be one of the most prominent figures on the stage of this Conference.

Then, Sir, there is the question of voting. The five permanent members have affirmatively to concur in any decision which involves other than procedural matters. I believe that to be the position—I am only speaking from memory. That was supported by Mr. Sumner Welles in his proposals for a world organisation. He supported it on the ground that the opposition in America would be silenced by the argument that this particular provision would enable the United States to exercise a veto on any decisions in which she is unwilling to concur! These are matters which have to go before this Conference. I know that the external affairs of this country are as sacrosanct, and on as high a pedestal, as its ecclesiastical affairs! Both are matters for administration by the Governor General in his discretion under section 11 of the Government of India Act.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: May I interrupt? That would have been the case under Federation, but that constitution is not in existence. The Governor General in Council—

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR: I am glad to have that statement from the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe. But what I am suggesting is that we have the constitution and that constitution is going to come into existence sooner or later; and in that constitution external affairs are going to be, as I said, on the same high pedestal as ecclesiastical affairs.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: The Honourable Member apparently assumes that we are going to have Federation under the Government of India Act.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR: We may have it sooner than we imagine.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: No, Sir.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR: However, that is a different matter. What I say is that the Governor General in Council has selected these delegates. I am astonished that, when the invitation came to the Government of India, which includes eleven Indian members it did not suggest itself to that Government that the leaders of the leading political parties in the Legislature should be sent for and consulted before the selection was made. I think it was the duty of the Government of India as an institution to have done that. Now that they have selected their representatives, so far as representatives of the Government go I have nothing to say, but so far as sending them exclusively to this Conference is

concerned, I have the strongest objection. If you want to carry the whole world with you, if you want the world to hear, not the voice of India and of her Government as they are today, but the voice of the India which is on the threshold of independence then you ought to send people who can speak in that voice, who can command the following that is necessary to implement the decisions of this Conference.

I very strongly appeal to the Government to accept what, without undue modesty I consider, to be the very reasonable proposition that I have put before them, and I hope they will do so.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I will not detain the House much longer by reading the amendment. I will now ask all Honourable Members to address the House simultaneously on both the Resolution and the Amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) : Mr. President, in choosing Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, Sir Firoz Khan Noon and Sir V. T. Krishnamachari as the representatives of India to represent us at the Conference to be held in London and San Francisco, Government have so far only adhered to the policy or the system of appointment followed in this country and also to a certain extent the system of appointment in the British Commonwealth. It is the responsibility of the constitutional Government to make the appointment. I do not doubt for a moment the nationalism of these three gentlemen. They are men of wide experience, deep knowledge and have had experience of international conferences. It is not correct to say that they represent national opposition to freedom. Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, though an official, has amply proved his nationalism very recently at the Commonwealth Relations Conference.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : He is of a different calibre.

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL : These gentlemen may also turn out to be of the same calibre.

Sir, it is said that the appointment of these three gentlemen detracts from their representative character in the sense that they do not represent the non-official side or the opposition side in the Central Legislature.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : Not the country either.

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL : We would like to speak today with the voice of the people more than with the voice of the Government, especially at a time when there is not complete identity between the Government and the people. But what has happened in other countries? Take the case of the United Kingdom, Major Attlee, leader of the Labour Party and one time Leader of the Opposition, has been asked to join this Delegation. Major Attlee today is no more the Leader of the Opposition; he has joined the Coalition Government and is today the Deputy Prime Minister. What has happened in the United States of America? An invitation has been sent to members of the Republican opposition party, but as we see from Press reports, these gentlemen have not accepted the invitation. They want to know whether they are to be briefed at this Conference by Government or whether they will be allowed to have a free hand. There is a certain amount of doubt on that point.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Where did the Honourable Member get this?

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL : From the Press reports.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GOPALASWAMI AYYANGAR : Does the Honourable Member know that the United States Delegation consists of eight persons, of whom one-half are taken from Congress and that they have been taken in equal numbers from the Republican and Democratic parties? They are not persons belonging to the Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL : So far as my information, based on Press reports, goes, the members in opposition have not accepted the invitation because they want to be quite sure on the point as to whether they would have to speak to a Government brief or whether they would have a free hand. However, Sir, if the Government member in charge of the Resolution wants to make a statement on this point, I think the issue will be clarified. If the original Resolution or the amendment has expressed an entire lack of confidence in the members of the present

[Mr. M. N. Dalal]

Indian Delegation the Resolution and the amendment could have been considered on their merits. But, what is asked for is the association of non-officials with officials in this Delegation without making any mention as to the consequences of a difference of opinion between the official and the non-official side. I would ask you : supposing there is a conflict of opinion, could the delegates speak with two voices ? I for one would think such a thing preposterous.

There is another question which I should like to ask some Honourable Members. Are the Leaders of the Opposition in the Central Legislature today prepared to go to this Delegation with a Government brief ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : No.

THE HONOURABLE MR. M. N. DALAL : I would ask my Honourable friend, Mr. Motilal, supposing there was a National Government in this country. Would such a National Government have included members of the Opposition in such a Delegation ? (*An Honourable Member* : "Certainly.") But that is not the practice in the U.K. I have just explained that Major Attlee is no more a member of the Opposition but is today the Deputy Prime Minister. This brings us to the all-important question, the question of the formation of a National Government, which is the natural solution to all our ills and political problems. Until we have a kind of a National Government I do not think we can remedy the political problems of this country. Passing Resolutions will not have much effect. (*An Honourable Member* : "Who is holding it up ?") That is a matter for my Honourable friend to decide for himself. Each one has his own individual opinion on the point.

I am in entire sympathy with the principle of the Resolutions so far as the appointment of non-officials is concerned in a general way. But I am afraid it creates in this particular instance certain practical difficulties which are very difficult to overcome. It might, if I may say so, encroach upon India's honour and security which is the very object of this Conference. Therefore, Sir, my attitude on these two Resolutions would be to remain neutral.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT (to the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe) : I think that if at this stage you make some remarks, it will simplify matters and the House would be in possession of important facts relating to the appointment of this Delegation. Other Honourable Members would be entitled to speak afterwards. But it will simplify matters if you make your observations now.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE (External Affairs Secretary) : Sir, might I start by saying that I personally noted with great satisfaction the fact that the Honourable Mover of the amendment should have refrained from criticising—in fact he praised the Leader of the Delegation and acknowledged that the constituted Government of the day must nominate at least in his view a proportion of any delegation which goes to represent India in international affairs. That was very satisfying. And may I also say, Sir, that I view the general feeling that lies behind both the original Resolution and the amendment with very great sympathy ? I think that out of it a great deal of good might come for reasons which I will try to develop later in my speech. It is natural that popular opinion in India should wish to be associated with great events in the outside world. What we have to consider is, how that can be done and what are the lessons that ought to be drawn from that very natural desire. At any rate, that is a very comprehensible position with which I think, every patriotic Indian would feel a good deal of sympathy and not only Indians but people who are looking at the Indian stage, people like myself, who have endeavoured for 30 years to give their best to this great country. Something has already been said about the make-up of delegations from the British Commonwealth countries and a good deal has been said in the statesmanlike speech of the Honourable Mover of the amendment about the make-up of delegations from America. Now, Sir, as regards the British Commonwealth delegations, the United Kingdom and all the other Dominions, the general principle is to be that they should be Ministers of the Crown. It will be said, "That is all very well where there is responsible Government". Now, I agree with that point entirely. I only wish there were responsible Government in India. There is responsible Government in the Provinces wherever a certain Party has been ready to work it. But, unfortunately

we have not yet got responsible Government at the Centre. We are, therefore, in a very difficult position. One must realise, as has been suggested by the last speaker, that it is not really possible for parties who have not had responsibility in governing their own country or any share in the Government or in taking office, who have not assumed, who have edged away from responsibility perhaps for one reason or another or have for some other reason felt that they could not take up or have not wished to take up office.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN-IMAM : Were they ever invited ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : Cripps. It is not possible for such parties to come forward and say now, "It is all very well ; we will have nothing to do with the Government of India, but we wish to represent India on the international stage". Is that, I ask you, a possible situation. If they were to go what would their credentials be ? One must remember that in one's own country one can understand the dust and turmoil of political opposition and even dislikes. We can take hard knocks and where there has been a good deal of it, we understand it. But in the outside world it is different. If the Opposition who have not held any responsibility in India's affairs were to go forward and claim to represent India, what would their credentials be ? The argument might be used as regards one great Party that they have not shown any marked enthusiasm in the war. Can they be accepted as having good credentials for keeping the peace, for making organisations which have to keep the peace ? In the case of another Party, they might be asked whether they represent one India or two Indias. What do they stand for ? Do they want one India or two Indias ? That Party would have to adopt a very careful attitude before they can stand on an international stage for India. They have not thought about it, I know. Then there are many examples that we have had lately of eminent Indians, a gracious lady, a most Honourable Member of this House, another Pandit of this Honourable House, who have been in America and giving out views which are said to represent the views of India in certain circles. I was very disappointed to see—it is a matter in which I took the keenest interest when I last had the honour of appearing in this House—that this question of entry and citizenship in America has been indefinitely postponed. I hope that postponement was not in any way connected with what these unofficial representatives have been saying in America. But one of those representatives at least has indulged in cheap gibes of the great fighting element in this country and that is not the sort of thing that can be said in a foreign country if India is to stand as a great country before the world. I ask Honourable Members to ponder that most deeply and gravely.

All these things might be said about associating the Opposition. But, as I said at the beginning of my speech, in spite of all that, I cannot but feel a real sympathy for any patriotic Indian who wishes to stand up, that the leading parties should wish to stand up and represent their country on a foreign stage and that is why I should like to speak as if I am myself an Indian patriot who feels the very deepest desire that this country should become a great power, as she may well be. As the statesmanlike speech of the second speaker mentioned, India is in the middle of Asia. She is a great land mass, with a magnificent history, culture and tradition and an enormous population, a huge war effort, a great industrial potential. In many ways he is quite right in saying that India may well vie with China and possibly even with France. Great things are going to be done at this Conference. It is essential that India should stand well and should be worthily represented. And is it too much to hope that desire, that very natural desire, to stand well on the international stage, will induce those people who suffer from frustration, one way or another, for one reason or another, to stand in and come in the Government of this country internally and to take their due share in responsibility in this country ? Is that too much to hope ? Is it not possible that with that division of a great India before us, before all of us, all patriotic men, we should cast aside these party differences ? We should stand not for a party but for the State and first of all consolidate ourselves inside our own State, then, and only then, shall we have the right to claim to represent India abroad. In my own country there is a great tradition. That tradition is that when there is a threat from abroad, when foreign affairs are under discussion, when matters of security come up, we close our ranks and stand as one man before

[Sir Olaf Caroe]

the world as a rock. In foreign affairs there are no parties not when essential questions are under consideration, and when it comes to the defence of England, party matters fade away. So it seems to me it should be with India. All this discussion of party, one party, two parties, all parties, should not loom large, when we have under consideration the honour and dignity of India in the ranks of nations. In international affairs we must in fact rise above internal differences. And I would like to give my faith, the belief that when in India that attitude is taken, it will alter the whole approach of political parties to the political problem within India, because in matters of security on the world stage one has to deal with realities and not with figments of the imagination. So that any movement or urge like this to come forward to represent India internationally is much to be welcomed and worthy of every encouragement and sympathy and understanding if only the suggestions that it fixes in our minds can be turned to practical use in the governance of this great country. I would therefore appeal to the House to turn into a new channel, a new and fruitful channel, that would irrigate fresh fields, this wish that all parties should take their part in making India great. (*Applause.*)

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

The Council reassembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: As there are many speakers in the afternoon I would strictly enforce the time-limit.

THE HONOURABLE SIR RAMUNNI MENON (Nominated Non-Official): After the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe's speech this morning there is very little that one can add towards an adequate appreciation of the various issues that the Resolution and the amendment moved this morning have raised. Nevertheless, I think it will be useful to make one or two observations. As one takes a rapid survey of the events which have led up to the San Francisco Conference certain things stand out. The whole conception of an international organisation is primarily due to the declaration of policy and mode of action contained in the Four-Power Moscow Declaration, in which the four principal Allies undertook to do every thing in their power to lay the foundation of an international organisation. Under the stress of war these four Powers have prepared the groundwork of a plan for such an organisation. The actual proposals forming this groundwork have been published in a White Paper. Here, I would like to make a request to the Government—I do not know to what Department of the Government I should make the request—but the request is this. People like myself find it very difficult to get at authentic papers, relating to important matters. It should be quite easy for the Government to get important White Papers as soon as they are published in London, a few copies to be sent over here by air mail and to have a sufficient number of copies printed in this country and made available either free or at cost. A procedure of that kind would have helped us to obtain the White Paper containing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and to study the contents of it and to make informed comments on the subject when it came up before the House.

Well, Sir, the proposals deal at great length with the various aspects of the international organisation and these are the proposals which will be brought up at the San Francisco Conference for consideration. Now it is interesting to note—in fact, it is important to note—that the powers invited to the Conference are only the United Nations, that is to say, those countries that have subscribed to the United Nations' Declaration. In other words, there seems to be a very close connection between active war effort and the opportunity to take part in discussing a scheme for an international organisation. I think it is very important to bear this in mind; otherwise, it is difficult to understand why important nations or countries like the Vatican, Spain and Ireland are left out. The Vatican may pray, Franco and De Valera may rend the air with their threats and denunciations but they are not likely to find seats at the Conference table. That is a very important point for us to remember. Now, it is agreed on all hands that the proper authority in a country to receive the invitation is the Government of the country. But

it is argued that the Government should have taken into their confidence or included in their Delegation members of Opposition parties, and, as examples, have been cited the cases of the United Kingdom and the United States. But I should like to point out that in all these cases all the parties have combined in the war effort. There is no difference of opinion or attitude or policy in regard to the war among the different parties. Now, a very interesting case would be—I should like to get some information in regard to it but unfortunately such information is not available—that of Egypt. It will be interesting to know what the Egyptian Government would do in regard to its Delegation. Will it include members of the Wafd Party which has consistently non-co-operated with the Government and has consistently voted or acted against the Allies. That would be a very interesting point for purpose of comparison. If the principle that I think I can detect in the action of the great Powers, namely, that there is an intimate connection between active war effort and association in the deliberations at the San Francisco Conference is correct, I do not see how we can justifiably ask for the inclusion of the two prominent parties in this country, which have so consistently and vigorously non-co-operated with the Government in their war effort.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Question.

THE HONOURABLE SIR RAMUNNI MENON : Sir, it seems to me, therefore, that the Government of India have taken the only constitutional step that they could take under the circumstances in nominating two of their members as their delegates. It may be an unfortunate thing that members of the Opposition parties are not in the Delegation, but our regret should be that they are not in the Government of India. I am very glad that some of the speakers this morning have expressed their appreciation, in very generous terms, of the services which the members of the Government of India, who have been chosen as delegates, have rendered to this country. Now, these gentlemen, Sir,—I am not speaking of the two members only who have been selected, but I am speaking of all the members of the Government of India—these men have taken upon themselves the most onerous duties in a most critical period in the history of this country. They have done their work well and they have deserved well both of the Government of the country and of the people of this country. I am perfectly confident that the two members of the Government selected as delegates will discharge their duties at the Conference to the satisfaction of everybody. The interests of the country will be quite safe in their hands. And here I would like to add I think it would be a very strange turn in the policy of the Government of India, indeed it would be nothing short of a lack of moral sense if the members of the Government of India who have served the country so well are not given the opportunity of serving the country at conferences and deliberations, which will mark the closing stages of the war. I am having in mind particularly the peace conference which will follow the conclusion of armistice. I really hope that some of the present members of the Government of India will have the place of honour at the peace conference.

Now, Sir, there are two other points which I should like to stress. Assuming for argument's sake that members of both the major Opposition parties are included in the Delegation, what is the guarantee that they will speak with one voice? I do not mind their speaking in different languages: they may speak in Hindi or Urdu. But will they speak in the voice of Hindustan or Pakistan or of India? That is the vital question. Certainly I can see no indication whatever that the representatives of the Opposition parties will collaborate in a sincere manner with the representatives of the Government. Again, why should we confine ourselves to the two parties specified in the Resolution and amendment. There are other parties in this country. There is the party of the Scheduled Castes, a very important party. There are also other parties. There is the non-Brahmin party. There is the Hindu Mahasabha. I consider that in any conference convened to settle the political status of India or the constitutional problems of the country all parties should be represented. The occasion for the meeting of parties will arise not outside India but in this country. In the light of all these circumstances I can find no justification for asking the Government to modify their decision already taken

[Sir Ramunni Menon]

to the extent of including in the delegation representatives of the two Opposition parties. I am therefore opposed to the Resolution as well as the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan) : Mr. President, the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe has spoken like a constitutional purist. He has taken the line that this country has no responsible government, that the Conference which will meet at San Francisco will be a conference of the governments of the day, and that only the government of the day can be represented at the Conference at San Francisco. The Honourable Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar in the very able speech which he delivered pointed out that in the United States, with the executive of which Mr. Amery often compares the executive of this country, the executive has, in selecting the Congressional part of its Delegation, appointed an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans who have been appointed were not at one time enthusiastically in favour of the war effort. There is a very notorious isolationist, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, who is going to be one of the representatives of the American Congress to the San Francisco Conference. There is therefore a precedent for the view that Opposition parties can be represented at the San Francisco Conference. I was just now revising my reading of Mr. Lloyd George's *Truth about the Peace Treaties*. He blames Wilson for torpedoing the League of Nations. He says that the greatest mistake that Wilson made was that he did not include the Republicans in the Delegation which he took to the Peace Conference. This is not going to be a peace conference ; this is going to be a peace-keeping conference, as Senator Vandenberg said the other day. I will not trouble the House with that quotation from Mr. Lloyd George: I have got the book here, but as time is limited, I will just mention that Lloyd George thinks that one of the principal difficulties in the post-war world was Wilson's attitude towards the Republicans, his hesitation to have any dealing with them. Britain without the Commonwealth and the Empire is comparatively a small power, when you compare it with the United States. She has lost the pre-eminent position which she enjoyed in the world before. It may hurt our British friends to be told this to their face, but Britain, as Mr. Edward Thompson said, is likely to be a courtesy big power in the future world. Well in a small way the British are doing exactly the same thing which Wilson tried to do with the Republicans so far as the Indian Delegation to the Peace Conference was concerned. This is neither in their interest nor ours.

Sir, I would have very much liked to avoid personal issues on an occasion of this nature, but the references which were made to my distinguished leader, Dr. Kunzru, and another equally respected leader of Indian opinion, Mrs. Pandit, make it necessary for me to take a stronger line than I had originally intended to take. Let me state quite plainly and bluntly that these two gentlemen, howsoever amiable they may be in personal life—

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : Gentleman and lady.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : I am thinking of Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar and Sir Firoz Khan Noon. Let me tell my Honourable friend Sir Olaf Caroe, expert on external affairs, authority on world questions, let me tell him quite plainly and straightforwardly that these two representatives, these two drummer boys of British imperialism, carry no weight whatever with the public of this country. Let them seek election on the Hindu Sabha ticket ; let them seek election on any ticket ; let them seek election on any ticket, and I challenge that they will not get even the number of votes which will be necessary not to lose the deposit. They have suffered successive defeats in the Assembly, and the Assembly is kept going by the will of the Governor General. If you think that the defeats that they have sustained do not reflect the mind of the people, then dissolve the Assembly, dissolve the Council of State, and hold fresh elections, and see whether your drummer boys will be anywhere in the picture. We shall be able to come into these Legislatures, because the people of the country—whether our British friends have any respect for us or not is an immaterial matter—the people of the country have respect for us, have confidence in us. They think that we have rendered some services to the country. It does not matter to us what the San Francisco Conference says or what the powers gathered at San Francisco think. For winning

independence, you need your own efforts. Something like that was said by the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe. I think it is wonderfully true. I think we shall have to struggle through to our independence. We have seen how hollow the professions of democracy and freedom in this war have been so far as this country is concerned. We have seen what is happening in South Africa. One of the questions to which the San Francisco Conference will address itself, according to General Smuts, will be the future of South West Africa. He wants the mandate system to be abolished, and he wants to swallow all that land for the South African whites so that he and Dr. Malan, who has not co-operated with the war effort and who is actively opposed to the war effort, and the Dominion Party and all the other South African whites might continue to oppress the natives of South Africa.

From a strictly constitutional point of view, if the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe's argument is to be accepted, India should have no place at San Francisco. The Conference is a Conference of nations which possess the quality of equal sovereignty. India has no sovereignty. The Government of India is a subordinate branch of His Majesty's Government. Of course the Communique says that Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar and Sir Firoz Khan Noon have been appointed by the Governor General in Council. Note the words "Governor General in Council". They have not been appointed by the Secretary of State; they have not been appointed by the Governor General; they have been appointed by the Governor General in Council. Probably the idea is to give to the world the impression

3-5 P.M. that it is predominantly the Indian Executive Council which has appointed this Delegation. But the world cannot be deceived by all this.

You can fool some people for all time, or all people for sometime, but you cannot fool all people for all time. If you push the constitutional argument too far, you come up against this difficulty that India should not be represented at the San Francisco Conference because India has no international status. British Guiana, Trinidad, Fiji and Ceylon are not going to be represented. How do we differ, so far as the internal structure of our Government is concerned, from these countries? We aspire to be a great country. We want to go to San Francisco as equals. But we are not going there as equals. It is no use saying that the Government of India will go there as an equal of even small countries like Belgium or Holland or Lebanon. These small countries will have a greater position than India which will be represented by the trumpet boys and the show boys of British imperialism at the San Francisco Conference. Sir, the real reason why we object to representation of this type is that we do not wish our views, our outlook, our attitude towards international questions to be misrepresented in the United States or in any other country. There is no greater calumny than the calumny that the people of this country have in any way, direct or indirect, been in sympathy with Fascist modes of thought. Sir, if real anti-Fascism was a qualification for membership of the San Francisco Conference, then Jawaharlal Nehru should have been there. Jawaharlal Nehru to whom a tribute was paid by that liberal columnist, Michael Foot, who instituted a comparison between him and Lord Linlithgow to the disadvantage of Lord Linlithgow. It is quite clear that the Government of India do not want the real representatives of India to go. But it is said there are so many divisions and the Congress and the League do not speak the same language. They are not agreed as to the future of this country. The Muslim League wants a division of the country, the Congress wants to maintain the integrity of this country. May I ask Sir Olaf Caroe whether this San Francisco Conference will discuss the internal organisation of India and the other countries of Britain or whether it will consider and plan the future security of the world? How is the question whether politically the Congress and the League are in agreement as to the type of constitution that an independent India should possess a relevant issue? It has been asked, "Why should it be only the Congress and the League? There are other parties also." I should very much like other parties also to have some representation. I do not belong to either organisation and therefore I cannot say that the Congress and the League are the sole representatives of India. But the Congress and the League are—I am stating the facts—the two strongest political organisations in this country and just as the Liberal Party has for purposes of representation been eliminated by Mr. Churchill and is quite content to be represented by Mr. Atlee, so I am for purposes of representation quite prepared to let the Congress and the League

[Mr. P. N. Saprū]

represent me at the San Francisco Conference. That is my answer to the criticism that the depressed classes, the non-Brahmans who have been, I think, defeated by Mr. Thirumala Row at the Council of State elections, — that all these have not been given a place in the San Francisco Conference representation.

Sir, let us see what the attitude of the United Nations has been in regard to other countries. Poland is not going to be invited to San Francisco because Britain and America have withdrawn recognition from the Polish Emigre Government, and the Lublin Government has not yet been broad-based. Therefore, invitation cannot go to the Lublin Government. Until Poland comes to possess a National Government, no invitation can be sent to Poland. That has been the policy in regard to Poland. Why can't you before the San Francisco Conference, give to this country a National Government and enable the people of this country to be represented by their own men? It has been said that only those who have co-operated with the war effort whole-heartedly can participate in this Conference. But, some time was given to countries like Turkey, who had not co-operated whole-heartedly with the war effort, who stood on the fence, to qualify themselves for this Conference. Some time was given to Egypt to qualify itself for this Conference. I do not think you can push that argument too far. You must remember one thing. So far as the constitution of this country is concerned, it is of a *quasi-federal* nature. The League may be in opposition at the Centre but it is the Government of the day in two big provinces. Today, the Congress may be in opposition at the Centre but it is the Government of the day in one province and it is a key province so far as this country is concerned. Therefore, you cannot say that the Congress and the League represent a revolutionary opposition. If the Congress represented a revolutionary opposition, then I cannot understand how Dr. Khan Sahib was called upon to form the Ministry in the N.-W. F. P. There is much that could be said on this instead of San Francisco. But I am just closing my remark and I say this that the fact of the matter is that you do not want real representatives of Indian opinion to go to the United States or to other countries. You feel your position weak because you are not prepared to give up your Imperialism. If you were prepared to give up your imperialism, you could be still strong in the world. But you would not like to liquidate your imperialism. You would like to retain your imperialist hold over countries you rule and thus be strong. But you cannot be strong in this way. That is the paradox that faces Britain and until she finds a solution of this paradox, the future is dark both for Britain and this country.

THE HONOURABLE SAIYED MOHAMED PADSHAH SAHIB BAHADUR (Madras : Muhammadan) : Sir, the question is whether this Conference at San Francisco is going to commit the same blunder which the people who met at Versailles committed or whether it is going to do the great trick which it is proclaimed with a great blow of trumpets it is going to do and whether the high hopes which are now raised of the Conference at San Francisco can have a chance to fructify. I feel that the one condition precedent to it is the nature of its composition. If this Conference is really going to eliminate war, and save the world from carnage and destruction and all the evils to which the world is subjected every now and then by powers which are driven mad by their ambition for world domination, it is necessary that this Conference should have as its delegates people who could bring all points of view for liberation. It is not the question of the capacity or the intelligence of the Delegates to the Conference. The one condition which will insure the success or will go to foil the efforts of the people assembled at San Francisco will be the freedom with which the various countries and leaders who are assembled there will ventilate their difficulties and represent their needs. Looked at from this point of view, it is obvious that the Delegation which the Government of India is now proposing to send is defective. When I say this, I would add at once that I should not be misunderstood. I have individually considered every one of the three distinguished persons who have been nominated to represent India at the Conference. They are people about whose capacity, judgment and integrity there can be no question. I endorse every word of what my Honourable friend Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar has said about the high degree of intelligence, integrity capacity and capability of the Honourable Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar. He has been a friend of mine from my boyhood and I feel

sure that he is one of those rare politicians and statesmen in the country who can very well and effectively put their case before the Conference. The same could be said of our distinguished colleague the Honourable Sir Firoz Khan Noon. He has also very ripe and considerable administrative experience and has given every proof of his honesty and integrity and capacity. But the question is not merely about capability. The question is whether he will have the freedom to express his real views. Even as regards the third Delegate, Sir V. T. Krishnamachari I could speak with personal knowledge. He is also one who could put his case very effectively. But I repeat that it is not a question of one's capacity. It is a question of the latitude one would have, of the freedom one would have, to express his real views. These three gentlemen, two who are members of the Government and the third a representative of the States, are not quite independent and have got to take their cue from the British Government. Will these people be able to put the Indian point of view when the British and Indian interests are in conflict? It is for this reason that we demand that there should be in addition non-official representation at this Conference. So far as these three gentlemen are concerned, both the Honourable the Mover and Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar have made it quite plain that they do not want any of these to be removed from the Delegation. All that we demand is that there should be non-official representation also.

Now, Sir, one word as to how the parties which have not actively contributed to the war effort could have the right to be represented at the Conference. I need not say much about it since my Honourable friend Mr. Sapru has already dealt with this point. He has given instances of representatives having been nominated by various countries who have actively opposed the war effort. It is not necessary therefore to say much about it. I will conclude my remarks on this aspect of the question by merely stating that so far as the Muslim League is concerned the Muslim League never opposed the war effort. On the other hand, from the very beginning they took an attitude which was a realistic attitude. But for that realistic attitude of the Muslim League, it would have been impossible for the Government to get millions of young men from the country. One word from the Qaid-e-Azam prohibiting Muslims from taking part in the war effort would have to a very great extent affected the war effort. As to whether the Muslim League would speak for one India or two Indian, it is obvious that at that Conference there will not be any question which will go to affect the internal political conditions in the country. As has been observed by my Honourable friend Sir Rumunni Menon, even though he has taken a hostile attitude to the Resolution, he has himself admitted that the groundwork has already been prepared for this Conference and from the groundwork we find that there are not going to be any occasions at this Conference when questions affecting the internal condition in the country would arise. If the representatives from the two major parties are there, the presence of each one of those representatives and the consent of those representatives for what may be agreed to at the Conference will be a guarantee that both parts of India, Hindu and Muslim, will stand by what their representatives commit themselves to.

Now, Sir, so far as the Bretton Woods Conference was concerned it was not found impracticable to include non-officials and the work which the non-officials had been able to do and the help that they had given to the Delegation to the Conference has been admitted by the Government themselves. The Honourable the Finance Member has paid tributes to the way in which the non-official part of the Delegation acquitted itself in the discharge of its duties. So, Sir, I say that Government would be doing something really very good and would be showing a very helpful gesture if they would concede to the demand which has been made in this House. It is just possible, Sir, that when the representatives of the two major parties are asked to go there, and when they agree to go there, it may be that they may begin to think as to what line of action they should adopt so that they might be able to put up an agreed demand and this, Sir, will possibly pave the way for a happy solution of the deadlock which is keeping everything at bay in this country, which is impeding progress in this country. I am therefore strongly of opinion, Sir, that if only Government accedes to the demand which we make it will be making a real contribution, possibly a substantial contribution, to the solution of the political situation in this country. It will go a very long way in keeping up the flagging interest in the political morale of this country.

THE HONOURABLE KUMAR NRIPENDRA NARAYAN SINHA (West Bengal : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, the Resolution of my Honourable friend Mr. Thirumala Row is simple and self-explanatory, and does not require many words to commend itself to this Honourable House. I need not refer in detail to the objects of the San Francisco Conference, which is intended to discuss the proposals for the establishment of a general international organisation in pursuance of the plan discussed at Dumbarton Oaks, by the representatives of the U.S.A., Great Britain, Russia and China. From the general outlines of the constitution of the proposed organisation, it appears that the "Big Three", U.S.A., England, and Russia and behind them China and France will constitute themselves into armed trustees for the peace of the world. How far this portion of the proposal is in accordance with democratic theory, loudly proclaimed by its principal sponsors, I cannot say, but if in practical application the method proposed ensures effective prevention against the aggression of the peace of the world, it has much to commend itself. The proposed organisation, there is no doubt, is fraught with immense possibilities—possibilities for the weal or woe of the world—and it is obviously necessary that all countries concerned should be properly represented on it. It is understood that invitations have been extended to all members of the United Nations, except perhaps Poland. India is also to be represented at this Conference. Upto this point, I take it, there is a fair amount of unity between Government and non-official opinion. But the question as to how this country is to be represented, forms the bone of contention between the Government and ourselves. Other countries which enjoy the blessings of self-government, can be easily and properly represented by the official spokesmen, for there, the views of the country are reflected in the views of the Government. The state is the symbol of the people and the people can make and unmake the form of Government at their discretion. But in India the case is unfortunately different. This country does not enjoy the blessings of a popular Government, it is not free to express its own opinion, and the foreign Government which rules over the country, can, by no stretch of imagination, be said to be representative of the people. In fact, the Government of India are only a subordinate branch of His Majesty's Government in England, and dances at the tune of the latter. Under these conditions can the views of the people be said to be identical to the views of the Government? If the opinion of the country is to be truly represented, it must necessarily be through the representatives of the people. The present position in a nutshell is this. Great Britain is apparently going to have a big finger in the pie at the proposed Conference; the Government of India is merely subservient to the Government in England, and the nominees of the latter cannot therefore go against the wishes of their masters. So there is no point in sending a delegation to the Conference, which will merely say ditto to those from whom they derive their little authority. Sir, I have nothing to say personally against the officials who have been selected by the Executive Government. They are very estimable persons but their position as the nominees of the Government, and the fact that they themselves hold high position in this foreign system of Government, disqualifies them from representing popular and non-official opinion of the country. This is such an elementary and simple proposition that nobody can dispute it. I therefore plead that if India is to be represented at all at the conference, she should be represented by the non-official representative opinion of India.

Sir, India is vitally interested in the result of the Conference. For all practical purposes, the ill-fated League of Nations has ceased to exist or is now in a moribund condition. But this country continues to be heavily saddled with the financial burden of supporting it. This is evidently unjust and unfair, but we have no hand in the matter. It is all ordained for us by the system under which we live, but over which we have no control.

Sir, the composition of this House is such that we are bound to lose if Government opposes us. But this need not deter us from performing what we conceive to be our duty. If Government chuckles over our defeat in this House, can we not legitimately chuckle over the series of defeats suffered by them in the other House? Sir, I am not concerned with the exact phraseology of the motion, which if necessary, may be amended, in a suitable manner. But the purpose of the Resolution is there, clear and crisp. There is nothing in it that could dispel me from my

feelings of support and with these words I support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Thirumala Row.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL (Bombay : Non-Muhammadian) : We regard war as a curse. It has laid desolate and destroyed very fair portions of Europe and some parts of Asia. We are interested in seeing that permanent peace is established on this earth. We are not a whit behind any nation in this longing desire of ours. The League of Nations was born of the war, in 1920 and the inequalities and the inequities of the treaties then devised made America withdraw and stand out of the League of Nations and that has been responsible for another war twenty years after that event. We would like to make our own contribution in securing international peace and security and there is greater reason for India's contribution being valuable in this respect, for if India did stand out of the war it was because she did not like war—

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : She did not stand out.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : If she did, I said. India did not stand out of the war. But Sir Olaf Caroe did say that those who had not taken part in the war would now like to go to the peace conference. If India did not go to war, does it not give her all the greater title now to take part in the peace ? Does it not entitle her to take part in arranging peace even for the future ? India was prepared to make her contribution in winning the war, but it was the British Government which came in the way and did not grasp the hand that India extended. They must not have forgotten all the offers made and all the statements made by responsible men, men who were in a position to speak for the nation. Let them again look into them and find out for themselves whether India really did stand out of the war, and if she did, for what reasons she stood out of it. India did not want to fight an imperialist war ; India did not want to support imperialism. But if freedom were guaranteed to India and was placed in India's hands, India was prepared to make all the sacrifices which she was capable of making. But that was not to be. It was the British Government which came in the way of India making a greater contribution than she has done.

The External Affairs Department has trotted out the argument that, constituted as the Government of India is, it can only depute official delegates and not non-official delegates. May I ask the Secretary of the Department : has he forgotten that in 1920 the same Government of India, constituted as it is now, deputed Lord Meston and Lord Sinha to the Peace Conference which was then held and to other international conferences of the League of Nations which were intended for a similar purpose in those days ? What difference has come about now which precludes the Government of India from sending representatives of the people, people who represent the nation's voice and will ?

We are not here to judge the merits of the persons whom the Government are sending. We stand here for a principle. That principle is this: if India is to be represented, she must be represented by those who are in a position to deliver the goods, who speak the mind of the nation and not the mind of some authority outside India. These gentlemen who are to go there now—if they are asked, "Whom do you represent ?", they will say, "We represent the Government of India." But, then, the question may be asked, "Whom does the Government of India represent?", and to that, what will they say ? They will have to admit that the Government of India does not represent the people of India, but that it represents some other nation living 7,000 miles away from India. Is that the position in which this delegation is to be placed ? Are Government happy over this position ? Will the delegation be able to claim sovereign equality ? The composition of this Conference, as stated by the President of the United States, is of States enjoying sovereign equality and such peace-loving States are to be organised to collaborate for lasting peace. Are the Government of India in a position to claim that they have sovereign equality ? They are not, but as they have been invited, there is nothing to prevent them, even in the present constitutional position, from nominating the real representatives of the people. The United States itself has nominated eight representatives. And after the bitter experience of President Wilson, they have now very wisely nominated four representatives from the Republican party and four from the Democratic party

[Mr. G. S. Motilal]

What is there to prevent the Government of India from adopting a similar course? If the delegates who go to San Francisco commit themselves to things which they will not be able to fulfil after they have come back, what will be their position? It will be the same which President Wilson was in. They know it, and the Government knows it as well, that if they accept certain commitments and if those commitments are not endorsed by the nation, those commitments are of no value.

Another argument that was trotted out was this—and this is a very familiar argument with this Government—that the question might be asked whether they would speak for this part of India or that—for a united India or a divided India. May I ask for what India these people who are going there are going to speak? The question of detaching any part of India or of dividing India has nothing to do with this international Conference. It is a domestic question. There is no reason to mix up this argument relating to a domestic issue with a question which concerns an international Conference.

Then, Sir, we have heard pious exclamations that they wished for the day when the Government is taken over by the representatives of the people of India. But what stands in the way? Is it the perversity of the people? I say, no. This unhappy situation in which we find ourselves is due to the fact that it is the Government which has always stood in the way of the representatives of the people taking over the Government. Did they not say that during the war there shall be no constitutional changes, and say it repeatedly? If there is to be no constitutional change during the war, why should it be said that the responsibility lies with the people? The responsibility lies solely and exclusively with the British Government in this respect. These are greater reasons, now to my mind, Sir, that when we are having a conference of this type that it should prompt the British Government to instal responsible Government in this country and not to stand in the way, and say that until the war is over, nothing doing. If there is nothing doing until the war is over, then the responsibility is solely theirs and they cannot turn round and say it is for the people; they have not taken up the opportunities; they have not made use of them and therefore they are not to be represented.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: That is what we do say.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: That is what they say but they are not able to substantiate it. What we say is this. You were never prepared to hand over responsibility to the people of India. You only said, "You just come in—"

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I do not think you are correct. They made the offer to you when Cripps came here and you rejected it.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: That is your opinion, Sir. I have expressed my opinion. We do not want—it is not the duty of any President to impose his views on the other members—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I do not impose my views. I was only trying to point out that what you said was not correct.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: This heckling is certainly objectionable. This is not a new thing we find—

(cries of "Order, order".)

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: What is the reason for this cry of "Order, order"?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN: President's ruling from the Chair.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: Challenging the Chair.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: I did not challenge. I only expressed my views. I am endeavouring to express my views. We have not come here to endorse and sing the panegyrics of the Government. We have come to express the views of the electorate which has sent us here.

You say it is the Dominion practice. Why must you stick to the Dominion practice necessarily? Why can't you follow the Dominion practice in the political sphere also? On the one hand you talk of Dominion practice of sending only the representatives of the Government. That may be the practice there but there is a very great difference. Here the people are not in the Government—

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: May I ask the Honourable Member to address the Chair? He is addressing me the whole time.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: I am only addressing the Chair.

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSIL KUMAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Why does the Honourable Member think that he is addressing him?

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE: Because he looks at me.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: Is the Honourable Member speaking for the Government prepared to concede that those Provinces which now have popular Government should make the selection? He is not prepared to do that. Have they been consulted? They have not been consulted. Government assume to themselves the responsibility—they monopolise it for nomination and then they want to shift the responsibility on the heads of the people. Sir, a question was asked to which my answer is this. If we were in Government, then, I speak not only for myself but for my Party also, we would have taken representatives of every important party in the Legislature and not representatives of the two parties only.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. V. KALIKAR (Central Provinces : General): Sir, after listening to the speech of my Honourable friend Sir Olaf Caroe, I think India ought to have nothing to do with the San Francisco Conference. That was my view when I read the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I think that the members of the Assembly can be only those states which enjoy sovereign equality. India does not enjoy sovereign equality and so we have no right to sit on that body. If the argument of my Honourable friend is taken into serious consideration, I submit that India should not go and be represented at that Conference but if an invitation has been given to the Government of India, they should state openly that the Government of India is going to be represented on the San Francisco Conference. If our issues are to be decided by that Conference we shall have some interest in taking part in it. But we know that for all practical purposes, the status of India is not going to be discussed at that Conference, because it will be said that this is a domestic issue and that Britain will have to decide it. We know that the Government of India followed the practice of sending non-officials to the Bretton Woods Conference. So, I should have thought that they would have followed the same practice and sent non-officials to this Conference also. Personally, I think we should have nothing to do at all with this San Francisco Conference. We know that a defeated country like France is going to be reorganised as a great power. But, in spite of the help that we have given in men, material and money, India is still regarded and will be regarded as a subject country. I do not know what is going to happen in the future. If India is going to be regarded as a subject country, why should the representatives of the Government of India go there in the name of India? They are not representatives of India. They can properly be called the representatives of the Government of India. In an answer to a question yesterday in the Assembly, my Honourable friend said that they will be free to express their views at the Conference. I put to him a straight question. Will they be free to follow their own line of action or will they be dictated to by the Government of India and the British Government and will they have to follow the action that will be dictated by Whitehall? Under the constitutional position, as I understand it, the position of the representatives who are being sent to San Francisco is such that they will have to obey the dictates of Whitehall? I do not disagree with the constitutional position. The constitutional position is that the Government of India is a subordinate branch of the British Government and whatever action they take they are not responsible to the people of India. Whatever

[Mr. V. V. Kalikar]

they do, they must follow the directions of Whitehall. It is no use saying that they will follow an independent line. After saying that India should have nothing to do with it, I think I should not waste the time of the House more. But one or two arguments advanced by my Honourable friend for not taking representatives of the people rather appear to me to be ludicrous and therefore I have to reply to those arguments. He stated that the Muslim League and the Congress did not take part in the war effort. Here is the Hindu Mahasabha who have taken part in the war effort. Did the Government of India or His Majesty's Government ask the Hindu Mahasabha to send their representatives. My Honourable friend Sir Jogendra Singh is there and he will bear me out that the Sikhs took active part in the war—

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : May I just say a word of explanation ? As long as we talk of Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims we do not represent the nation. I for myself am a Nationalist.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. V. KALIKAR : I am very glad. I am also with you on that point. But here a definite point was raised that a particular party did not take part in the war efforts and therefore they had no right to go to that Conference. I join issues with my friend on this point. There is a particular party which had taken part in the war efforts since the beginning of the war, which has induced young men to go and shed their blood ; they knew that they were not fighting for their own country because they had no status in their own country ; still they fought and fought and lost their lives. Did this Government or the British Government consult the Hindu Mahasabha and ask them to send their representatives—

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : In spite of the party. They did it in spite of that party which did not co-operate in the war.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. V. KALIKAR : It is absolutely incorrect. If the Hindu Mahasabha had not asked young men to join the army, do you think you would have 47 per cent. Hindus in the Indian Army. (*An Honourable Member* "Sir Olaf Caroe's influence.") "It is not your influence. It is not the influence of foreigners that has induced the young men to fight in this war.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : I did not say it was due to the influence of anyone. The patriotism of the young men induced them to fight for their country in spite of certain other influences.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. V. KALIKAR : I am here stating that it was the influence of a particular party in India which made them to fight.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Is it the suggestion that the Hindu Mahasabha did not co-operate with the war effort ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : I never said anything of the kind.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. V. KALIKAR : What is the use of side-tracking the issue. The issue is quite clear. A particular organisation in India openly incurring the blame of certain parties took active part in your war efforts and still you have decided to ignore that organisation. My Honourable friend has said that there is no National Government and you have no right to be represented. It is stated that the Cripps' proposals were rejected by the political parties, Sir, I want to ask one thing from the Government. When they wanted to have a certain thing done, did they wait for all parties to agree amongst themselves ? I am just citing the 1935 Act which was not liked by us. It had not the support of the Congress and the Muslim League but the Act was brought into force in the Provinces. What made you not to bring that Act into force in the Centre ? If you had a mind to do a thing you would have done it. You had no mind to have it in operation in the Centre. You intentionally wanted to see that divisions were created in India on account of the Muslim League Resolution of 1940 passed at Lahore. You wanted those divisions to be encouraged. It is my charge against the British Government that they fomented the quarrell amongst various communities in India. You encouraged that fight and you nourished that fight. I need not refer to the question of separate electorate and communal award and all these things. The country knows who was at the bottom of those things.

There is no use saying now in this House you have not got a National Government, you do not unite, there are divisions among the two parties—one party is pledged to division of India and another party is for non-division of India. There are divisions. I certainly would not like to say that a particular party represents the whole of India. But if you wanted to have representation from the people of the country, as you did in the case of the Bretton Woods Conference, you ought to have consulted the interests of other parties and you ought to have asked other parties to be represented also. However, Sir, as far as I am personally concerned, I do not think the angle of vision of Britain and America has changed. Every question whether it is a question of Burma, Malaya or Java, will be shelved under the pretext that it is a domestic issue and the Conference will have nothing to do with it. I am not enamoured of this Conference. I have absolutely no faith in this Conference because I know that this Conference is not going to decide and solve my question and my question is the question of the status of India.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM (Bihar and Orissa : Muhammadan): Mr. President, the forceful and vehement speech of the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution illustrates the strength of feeling in the country on this question. All the other colleagues of mine on this side of the House have told in no uncertain terms what India feels; and the Mover of the amendment in spite of his sweet reasonableness was unable to convince the Government to his views. And that is the fate of reasonableness everywhere. Reasonableness does not pay; it is really the sanction behind the demand which matters with this Government, as it does with other Governments. They may deny us our rights today but they cannot persist in this injustice for all time.

The reply of the Government Member, Sir, was quite in keeping with the attitude of the present Executive: bellicose, unreasoning and lecturing to us on subjects on which they have no business to speak. What India has done, what India is doing and what India should do is not what we are deciding today. We are discussing the future and I ask: does it lie with the Government to throw in our face the charge that we have refused to co-operate with the Government of the country, when we have been willing and anxious to come in, provided we are allowed to function as equals and not as camp followers. *It was on this basic issue that we refused to co-operate and we shall ever refuse to co-operate as camp followers.* It is strange, Sir, that the man who injures should take advantage of the injury which he has given. First of all you refused us a share in the governance of the country and now you accuse us of having refused to come in on your terms and then deny us all rights.

Sir, I should like to mention some of the principles according to which I think that this present Government has no *locus standi* to send a delegation to San Francisco. In the first place, Sir, as has been repeatedly stated by other colleagues of mine this is a Conference of sovereign nations. Does Government of India enjoy sovereign status? If it does not, then we are masquerading, Sir. I say that the Government is masquerading. Why deceive the world? You are a subordinate branch of His Majesty's Government and, Sir, this has been amply proved in other Conferences. I would remind the Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe that in Bretton Woods India was not allowed a seat on the permanent body merely due to the fact that it happened to be subject to England. It is a well-known fact and has been admitted even by Government. There are other Conferences, Sir, where we have fared badly due to the fact that the delegation of India is led by the nose by His Majesty's Government.

Now, Sir, if we are to go there we cannot, as agents, have greater power than the principal. That is a fundamental basic principle of law. The principal at the moment, Sir, is sitting in Whitehall. The Governor General in Council is not an independent body. It is subject to the control and direction of the Secretary of State for India. Being subject to that, how can the delegation which this body is sending be independent of the control of His Majesty's Government? The fact that it is not selected by the Governor General acting in his discretion does not in any way give it a greater status than by being selected by the Governor General in Council. Both are subordinate branches of His Majesty's Government, *I would*

[Mr. Hossain Imam]

illustrate it, Sir, in the military vocabulary by saying that a King's Commissioned officer, however junior he may be, is always superior to the oldest V. C. O. The Honourable Members are V. C. Os. and His Majesty's Government are the King's Commissioned officers and as such the smallest man from out there can command and give orders to the veterans of the first Great War.

The Honourable Sir Olaf Caroe raised the great question as to what has been the contribution of these Parties in the war efforts. May we ask what was the contribution of Syria, Lebanon and half a dozen Central American Republics who are all being invited to this Conference? Have they contributed a single soldier and yet they are eligible to be members of this Conference, elect their delegates as they like but in India we cannot.

Sir, De Gaulle was not functioning as the Government of France when it was invaded and overrun and even before November 1943 when the Americans liberated North Africa they did not form the Government of France and yet they are being invited.

Sir, I ask "Do the present Executive wish us to believe in His Majesty's Government and its promises or they teach us not to rely on whatever His Majesty's Government might say?" Sir, it is patent that if His Majesty's Government is to be believed, then this Government must admit that it is *functus officio*. It has no place in the future of India if there is any truth in what Mr. Churchill and what other people have been saying that India after the war will get Dominion Status or freedom or whatever they might give. The exact form I cannot stress, I cannot say because it is their claim, Sir, that India has been offered freedom. If freedom is to come, then what is the position of the present Government?

Is it not a fact that Sir Stafford Cripps under directions from Whitehall asked political Parties to form the Government? If they were representative enough in 1942, do you mean to say that now this Government has become representative of the people and those who were regarded by His Majesty's Government as representing the public opinion have ceased to be so? Where is the consistency? The fact remains, Sir,—as was really given out by the Honourable the Secretary for External Affairs in his speech when he enquired if those who do not hold any position in the present Government go to this Conference what will be their credentials,—that if those people go all the put-up show of the Government would crumble down to the ground. *It will be known to the public and to the world that the Government of India represents nobody.* It is because they are frightened of this issue. They know that by sending representative Indians to the San Francisco Conference they will be exposing themselves; therefore, they are refusing to associate representatives of the people.

I ask, Sir, how is it that the Government is able to give directions now without consulting even any of the Policy Committees which it has constituted for post-war affairs. You will remember that the decisions reached at Bretton Woods were placed before the General Policy Committee. This matter has not been placed before any of your post-war Committees. This Government does not represent the public opinion of India. You do not even consult your own nominees whom you have selected to advise on post-war affairs. You do not consult public opinion. Then how are you briefing these people? What will they do when they attend the Conference? That Conference is not going to decide the fate of the British Empire—whenever the liquidation takes place, as it is bound to take place. Whether we will have two Indias or one India is not going to be decided at San Francisco. I wish it were to be decided; it would be a better place than Whitehall to decide that matter. To bring out the question of Pakistan or Akhand Hindustan in this discussion was singularly unfortunate, and it was intended not only to side-track the issue but to create a split among us.

I know, as has been said by my other colleagues, that the two Honourable Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council have had great experience. But they are only agents; they cannot have greater power than the principal, and they cannot go beyond the brief which will be given to them in London at the Commonwealth Conference which will precede the Conference at San Francisco.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : No brief is given to them in London. If a brief is given to them, it will be by the Governor General in Council.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : With due respect to the Honourable the Leader of the House, I must say that this matter cannot be decided by him ; it is for higher authorities than any resident in India—as is very well-illustrated by the fact that the Viceroy has gone over to London. That illustrates how little influence the Government of India has in any of the decisions which are connected with high policy.

I was referring to the reason why we want our people to go to the Conference. The reason is because it means pledging of India's future. You are at the moment putting the cart before the horse. *What should be the post-war shape of things to come is going to be decided at the San Francisco Conference. Therefore if there was any real intention behind His Majesty's Government's offer of self-government, then it was we and we alone, I mean the representatives of the parties, who could represent India.* If these gentlemen go, I must state that they cannot pledge the future of India. India will not be bound by any decision that may be taken by the unrepresentative deputation which is going. I would have much preferred that India had remained unrepresented than that India should be misrepresented.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN (Leader of the House) : Sir, I was rather amused to hear both my Honourable friends Saiyed Mahomed Padshah and Mr. Hossain Imam saying that if representatives of the Muslim League and the Congress went to San Francisco they would solve the political deadlock. We all know, Sir, that three or four months ago Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah met for days in Bombay but were not able to solve the deadlock. So, it is a novel idea to say that you will be able to solve the deadlock at San Francisco if you send the representatives of the Muslim League and the Congress there. Further, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru appointed a Conciliation Committee. The Muslim League said they were not going to co-operate with that Committee. That being the case, I cannot understand the argument that if Muslim League and Congress representatives are sent to San Francisco, they will be able to solve the Indian political deadlock.

Sir, often we hear the word "subordinate"—that we are a subordinate branch of the British Government. The very fact that two of our distinguished colleagues are going to this Conference shows the great advance that India has made during the regime of the present Executive Council. And if we have not made further progress the responsibility lies with the Opposition. They refused to co-operate owing to religious differences. Times without number Lord Linlithgow tried his very best to bring both the major parties together. They could not see eye to eye. The Cripps offer was rejected. If anybody is responsible for the present political situation, it is the Congress Party and the Muslim League.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL : Misrepresentation.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : I have been here in the Government of India for about three years. I have yet to see an instance in which the Secretary of State had overruled the Executive Council. The Executive Council's decisions are supreme. On no occasion did the Secretary of State overrule the Executive Council. In the running of my Department, my voice is supreme. The Viceroy never interferes. There is no point in saying, "You are not independent. You simply carry on as dictated to you from the top". In my Department, the Muslim League members know that long-standing grievances of the Muslims have been redressed by me in a short time. That shows what power a Member of Government wields in the running of his own Department.

My Honourable friend Sir Gopalasami Ayyangar spoke of the defeats which the Executive Council had in the Legislative Assembly. All these defeats will be forgotten in a short time. What will not be forgotten is that the present Executive Council, by co-operating with the Allied Powers, have brought about the defeat of Germany and Japan and saved India from the horrors of war. Nobody can question that.

[Sir Mahomed Usman]

My Honourable friend Mr. Motilal says that when Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar and Sir Firoz Khan Noon go to San Francisco, people will ask them, "Whom do you represent?" My reply is this. They will be proud to say: "We represent a very large number of people of India who are responsible for raising the biggest voluntary army in the world, that they represent a Government who, by co-operation with the Allied Nations, have brought about the defeat of Germany and Japan and saved India from the horrors of war."

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Will you face an election?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MAHOMED USMAN : Hang the election on the nearest tree!

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : On a point of personal explanation—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member has already spoken.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : The Honourable the Leader of the House has levelled certain charges against us, and I wish to reply to those charges.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : He has not levelled any charges. He has expressed his opinion. He has as much right to express his opinions, as you have to express yours. The Honourable Mr. Thirumala Row will wind up the debate now.

THE HONOURABLE SIR OLAF CAROE : May I say at this stage that I do not want to speak again?

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : Mr. President, I shall try to be very brief, and shall also try to address, as far as possible, only the President so that the Honourable Member may feel comfortable in the consciousness that the Congress Party will not care to look much at his Department or his doings.

But one thing I may tell you. The Honourable Member's attitude was anything but fair in replying to the points raised by this side. He has tried to side-track the whole issue by lecturing to us that we did not accept the Cripps proposals and join this Government on very humiliating conditions which had been imposed by His Majesty's Government. Let us examine what the Cripps' proposals were. Cripps came in a spirit of take it leave it. He came with whatever could be contained in one document—maximum or minimum.

THE HONOURABLE SIR JOGENDRA SINGH : Is it relevant to the discussion to go into the Cripps proposals?

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : The point is raised this way : "If you had accepted the Cripps proposals, you would have been in the Government of India today and sent your own representatives, and the problem of your Resolution would not have arisen." From that point of view I am going to deal with the argument raised. Did not the whole Congress Committee sit here, week in and week out? Did not the President of the League stay in Delhi? The object was somehow to come to an agreement with Cripps and accept his proposals. Was there any possibility of an agreement? Were not the high officials aware of the systematic attempts that had been made from responsible quarters to sabotage the Cripps proposals? Was there any possibility left? It was always a question of you give and I take : it was never a question of I give and you take. The Congress President, Pandit Jawaharlal and Mr. Rajagopalachari had a conference with the Commander-in-Chief and other responsible British officials here and tried somehow to come to an agreement and see that the constitution was worked without any major constitutional changes being effected. But it was absolutely impossible for them to come to any agreement; the Government of India made it impossible for them to enter the agreement. I do not want to go into details at this stage. It is the responsibility of the British Government—

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : If you will allow me to correct you, you insisted on the Defence portfolio being in your hands and on that your party refused to accept the Cripps' offer.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW : They were willing to hand over Defence in a very circuitous and very insincere way. They wanted to hand over the running of cantons, recruitment and all those minor things. We said that if this country is to take up this war as the country's war, if it is to be turned into a national war, then there must be greater responsibility vested in the popular representatives in order to evoke in the country national enthusiasm for the war. I do not wish to say more about this. I think that Cripps came with a determination to come to some arrangement with the popular representatives here but he was defeated. There was interference and dictation from Whitehall. There was a higher purpose in stabbing Cripps in the back. The Conservative Party discredited him and ultimately he was sent out as a mere manager of an aircraft factory. It is all a big game in British politics in which poor Cripps was made a cat's paw.

With regard to general principles, my Honourable friend tried to bypass me. I cannot bypass him. Today, they are sitting very heavily like an incubus on the chest of this country. They are always present in our minds. He says that we are suffering from frustration. Even at this Conference where the whole world is supposed to devise a new constitution for the safety and freedom of the world, you do not allow popular leaders of the country to sit as your equals there. Therefore, we cannot avoid you. It is frustration that has been brought upon the country by this irresponsible Government and this will lead to more serious results. Let me here quote the words " a high British official in India at the outset of the present century who expressed the conviction which was shared by every Englishman in India from the highest to the lowest, the conviction in every mind that he belongs to a race whom God has designed to govern, the coloured races " and so on. Every word which has fallen from the Government Member in reply to this debate justifies this condemnation against the present British Government, which is mainly manned by the Britishers and undermanned by the members of the Executive Council.

Then, Sir, he has given us a peculiar argument that the citizenship rights which were about to be recognised in America have been shelved on account of the propaganda carried on by some irresponsible people from India. What is the propaganda that the British Government have been carrying on all along about India ? Have they not misrepresented the Congress and Mahatma Gandhi as pro-Japanese ? After some time, the whole myth was blown up when the Secretary of State came with the story on the floor of the House of Commons that the British Government had never charged Mahatma Gandhi with complicity or any sort of countenance of Japanese invasion. They then ate their own words. But in those hectic days of 1942 they were carrying on a nationwide propaganda that he was a pro-Japanese man. Who is responsible for all these things if Mrs. Pandit or Mr. Kunzru or any other person who personally do not depend on British favours speaks the truth before American audiences ? I think it was the *Daily Mail* correspondent who stated that Mrs. Pandit was a menace. If one word of truth in America is a menace to the existence of the British Government in India, you can understand on what weak ground the British Government exists in this country. Sir, it is always the conscious superiority of the white mind in America that puts him off. The Republican senator who is opposing this recognition of rights is afraid that these coloured people will sweep the country and bring down the standard of living there, as is the case in South Africa, in Canada, and in Australia. Therefore, there is no use of talking about all these things which are not directly connected with the present issue.

I want to say one thing more and I have done, Sir. You have sent other Indian delegates to other conferences. You sent Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai to the Hot Springs Conference. What have you achieved there ? He has presided over some committees. That has been broadcast all over India. You have given Rs. 8 crores to that Conference, but you have no voice or control in the management of the

[Mr. Thirumala Row.]

U.N.R.R.A. When we applied for food when there was famine in Bengal, they refused to help India. They did not want to do anything. To the Bretton Woods Conference you sent Sir Jeremy Raisman and two non-official Indians, Sir Shanmukham Chetty and Mr. Shroff. Did they have any freedom in influencing the decisions of that Conference? India has been denied a place in the World Monetary Conference. They refused to allow us a place and these people have come out here and explained the difficulties. You have been boosting up the Imperial War Conferences to which you sent Sir Firoz Khan Noon and the Maharaja of Kashmir. You remember the reports about these War Conferences. These gentlemen were asked to wait in the ante-rooms of that Conference. They were called in only whenever the question of India came up. They were called in for consultation whenever the British Prime Minister thought fit to take them into confidence in very minor matters. They have complained after coming here. This is the status of delegates who are nominees of Government and who go abroad to plead the cause of India. The same fate, I have no doubt, awaits Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar and Sir Firoz Khan Noon. There is no use of exulting over the glorified heads of Departments who are called Executive Councillors today. It may be that the Honourable the Leader of the House is in charge of a Department, in which he can redress the grievances of a particular community within two months. He must feel glad over that. But he has no hand in shaping the policy of the Government of India or the British Government with regard to Indian political affairs. I know he has no hand in it. They are only taken as mere "yes men" to carry on and show a united Government to the outside world.

I have one more point and I have done. I am surprised at the great praise bestowed on Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar by my Honourable friend Sir Gopalaswami Ayyangar. I have no quarrel personally with Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar or Sir Firoz Khan Noon. Judged by standards on which representatives of nations who have got some self-respect and freedom on the world are judged, these people will certainly be found wanting. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar may be a clever man. I do not deny that. Otherwise, he could not have been in the Executive Council longer than any other Member here. He has played many a role on behalf of British Imperialism. He has played the drummer boy of this Government in many a conference, in many a land, to the discredit of this country. There is, however, one point. In the debate on the Supplementary Finance Bill of 1940 when the Congress Members attended for the last time before they were put in jails, he said, "I am perfectly certain, many of my countrymen are perfectly certain, that at this time, anybody who does not stand by the war effort, anybody who does not join the war effort, is a traitor to the country". Looking at the Congress Benches where I was sitting opposite to him in the Congress Benches, he has addressed this compliment 'traitors to the country'. If we are traitors in our own land, we deserve the punishment for treason. Every traitor who betrays the cause and the honour of his country will have to pay at one time or another for his treachery. That is the character of this gentleman who is going to represent this country, Sir. The House can judge how far he deserves compliments from this House or from any assembly of gentlemen.

Only just now I received a telegram. It has also been sent to the Government of India from the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation.

"Urge expansion personnel delegation to include non-official elements representing main political parties in the country, also industrial, economic interests as such, cultural, educational aspects of national life and so on".

The San Francisco Conference is not going to be a merely political or world security conference. It is also going to be an economic conference. It is also going to be a conference where the world's raw materials will be assessed and equally distributed among the nations in order to eliminate the one fruitful source of conflict and war in this world. Every aspect of the whole world will be dealt with and to such a conference we have every objection to the deputation of these two gentlemen not on personal grounds but on grounds of public policy and constitution. You

may say that the Congress is anxious to get into it. The Congress is always anxious to replace the foreigner in this country and to bring the country into its own. The duty of the Muslim League and the Congress would be to make India independent with the co-operation of the British if possible, if not without their co-operation. They know it. There is no use twitting it. You say we have not joined in the war effort. Has anybody who has joined the war been given an undertaking that his wishes will be respected? In 1942 where were you? You were in such great difficulties. According to the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer England has borrowed 2 million thousand pounds and England has sold away her assets in America to the extent of 2 million thousand pounds. England has now become a third rate power. When you were in such great difficulties, it is America and India that have come to your rescue. They are facts. America has given millions; India has given a large number of people. Whether they are rice soldiers or voluntary or patriotic soldiers, I am not going into that discussion for want of time. I tell you India has given you 25 lakhs of people and large amounts of money and material. She has stood by you when you were being Dunkirked on the shores of Dunkirk. If that is the reply you are going to give, I challenge you if any of the Executive Councillors will carry out a gallup poll among all the soldiers and officer of the Indian Army and see which of the Indian leaders will command the confidence of this Indian Army.

THE HONOURABLE BRIGADIER SIR HISSAMUDDIN BAHADUR (Nominated Non-official): Quite wrong.

THE HONOURABLE MR. THIRUMALA ROW: I make that challenge today. Let them take a poll from all officers and men of the Indian Army and see whom they want to be representatives at the San Francisco Conference.

With these remarks, I close.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Honourable Members, it is in my discretion either to put the amendment first to the vote or the original Resolution. I have decided to put the amendment first:—

Resolution moved:—

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that to the Delegation he has already selected for representing India in response to the invitation extended to the Government of India to take part in the Conferences to be held shortly in London and San Francisco on the world security organisation, he do add an elected member each of at least the two major political parties in the Central Legislature”.

Question put and Motion negatived.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I will now take the original Resolution:—

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that representation be made to His Majesty's Government to secure adequate representation of the non-official representative opinion of India at the Conference of Allied Nations proposed to be held on 25th April 1945 at San Francisco, U. S. A.”.

Question put: the Council divided:

AYES—15

Ali Asgar Khan, Hon. Maulvi.
Ayyangar, Hon. Sir Gopalaswami.
Chattiyar, Hon. Mr. Chidambaram.
Girihardas, Hon. Mr. Narayandas.
Hossain Imam, Hon. Mr.
Kalikar, Hon. Mr. V. V.
Kameshwar Singh of Darbhanga, Hon.
Maharajadhiraja Sir.

Mahtha, Hon. Rai Bahadur Sri Narain.
Mitha, Hon. Sir Suleman Cassum Haji.
Motilal, Hon. Mr. G. S.
Padshah Sahib Bahadur, Hon. Saiyed
Mohamed.
Roy Chowdhury, Hon. Mr. Susil Kumar.
Row, Hon. Mr. Thirumala.
Sapru, Hon. Mr. P. N.
Sinha, Hon. Kumar Nripendra Narayan.

NOES—24

Assadulla Khan Raisani, Hon. Sardar
Bahadur Nawab.
Banerjee, Hon. Mr. R. N.
Caroe, Hon. Sir Olaf.
Charanjit Singh, Hon. Raja.
Chinoy, Hon. Sir Rahimtoola.
Conran-Smith, Hon. Mr. E.
Das, Hon. Mr. M. L.
Devadoss, Hon. Sir David.
Ghosal, Hon. Sir Josna.
Gibbons, Hon. Mr. J. M. B.
Hissamuddin Bahadur, Brigadier the Hon. Sir.
Jogendra Singh, Hon. Sir.

Jones, Hon. Sir Cyril.
Khurshid Ali Khan, Hon. Nawabzada.
Lal, Hon. Mr. Shavax A.
Lal, Hon. Mr. Shamaldhari.
Mahomed Usman, Hon. Sir.
Menon, Hon. Sir Ramunni.
Muhammad Hussain, Hon. Khan Bahadur
Mian Ali Baksh.
Mukherjee, Hon. Sir Satya Charan.
Patel, Hon. Mr. H. M.
Roy, Hon. Sir Satyendranath.
Sen, Hon. Mr. B. R.
Sobha Singh, Hon. Sir.

The Motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION *RE* COTTAGE INDUSTRY OF DYEING AND PRINTING (COTTON CLOTH)

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT (to the Honourable Mr. Hossain Imam): Please read your Resolution. It is an important Resolution and I will allow you to read it in order to give it priority on the next occasion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan) : When will be the next meeting ?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The meeting is tomorrow. I do not know when the Resolution will come up.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : I have inquired because tomorrow is a non-official day and I have priority for my Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : That rests with the Leader of the House who will arrange with the Secretary.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM (Bihar and Orrisa : Muhammadan) : Sir, I formally move that :—

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to help the cottage industry of dyeing and printing (cotton cloth) and save it from unfair competition ”.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 22nd March, 1945.