

THE COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

VOLUME II, 1940

(19th November to 2nd December 1940)

EIGHTH SESSION OF THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF STATE



PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI
1941

CONTENTS.

	Pages.
Tuesday, 19th November, 1940—	
Members Sworn	I
Questions and Answers	2—35
Statements laid on the table	36
Message from His Excellency the Governor General	36
Committee on Petitions	37
Death of Prince Afsar-ul-Mulk Mirza Muhammad Akram Hussain Bahadur and Raja Vasudeva of Kollengode	37
Governor General's Assent to Bills	37—38
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	38—39
Congratulations to the Honourable Mr. H. Dow, Governor-Designate of Sind	39
Resolution re Mechanization of units of the University Training Corps—Negatived	40—51
Statement of Business	51
Wednesday, 20th November, 1940—	
Address by His Excellency the Viceroy to the Members of the Central Legislature	53—59
Thursday, 21st November, 1940—	
Messages from His Excellency the Governor General	61
Indian Finance (No. 2) Bill—Laid on the table, as certified	61—62
Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	62
Resolution re Construction of aircraft and automobiles—Adopted	62—63
Resolution re Private volunteer organizations—Negatived	64—97
Statement of Business	97
Friday, 22nd November, 1940—	
Questions and Answers	99—115
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	115
Statements, etc., laid on the table	115—118, 121—123, 138—139
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	118—121, 124—138
Indian Works of Defence (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	140
Indian Navy (Discipline) Amendment Bill—Considered and passed	140—142
Indian Navy (Discipline) Second Amendment Bill—Considered and passed	142—143
Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	143—146
Repealing and Amending Bill—Considered and passed	146—148
Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	149
Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	149—150
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	150

Friday, 22nd November, 1940—contd.

PAGES.

Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed . . .	151—153
War Donations and Investments (Companies) Bill—Considered and passed . . .	153—155
Reserve Bank of India (Third Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed . . .	155—158
Motor Spirit (Duties) Amendment Bill—Considered and passed . . .	158—159

Monday, 25th November, 1940—

Questions and Answers	161—172
Statements, etc., laid on the table	173
Standing Committee for the Department of Supply	173—179
Indian Finance (No. 2) Bill—Motion to consider— <i>To be continued</i>	179—225

Tuesday, 26th November, 1940—

Questions and Answers	227—233
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	233
Resolution <i>re</i> Supply Department—Adopted	233—264
Resolution <i>re</i> Supply of rifles and ammunition to military schools—Withdrawn	265—270
Resolution <i>re</i> Nationalization of essential and key industries, etc.—Moved	270

Wednesday, 27th November, 1940—

Standing Committee for the Department of Supply	271
Indian Finance (No. 2) Bill—Motion to consider— <i>To be continued</i>	271—312

Thursday, 28th November, 1940—

Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the table	313
Indian Finance (No. 2) Bill—Considered and passed	313—349

Friday, 29th November, 1940—

Members Sworn	351
Questions and Answers	351—371
Resolution <i>re</i> Nationalization of essential and key industries, etc.—Withdrawn	371—385
Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate, adopted	385
Resolution <i>re</i> Future composition of trade missions to foreign countries	385—389
Statement of Business	389

Monday, 2nd December, 1940—

Questions and Answers	391—398
Information promised in reply to questions laid on the table	398—400
Statement laid on the table	401
Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	401—404
Indian Sale of Goods (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	404
Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill—Considered and passed	405

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Wednesday, 27th November, 1940.

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

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : With reference to the announcement made by me on the 25th November, 1940, regarding nominations to the Standing Committee to be attached to the Department of Supply, I have to announce that the following Honourable Members have been nominated for election to that Committee :

1. The Honourable Mr. J. H. S. Richardson.

2. The Honourable Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.

There are two candidates for two seats and I declare them duly elected.

INDIAN FINANCE (No. 2) BILL—*continued.*

THE HONOURABLE SIR A. P. PATRO (Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, after the question has been so well discussed and ably stated in the other House by Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar and Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, who have explained in lucid terms the position of the Government in regard to many matters that have been raised—we may not agree with them, but still the position has been stated so well—it seems to me it will be a waste of time to repeat most of those arguments in reply to the points raised by the Opposition here. This Bill is mainly and essentially a Finance Bill. It is intended to raise additional revenues for purposes of the war. It is needed for the defence of India and to crush Nazism. The important object of this Bill is to expand war effort. In the speech of the Finance Member introducing this Bill several matters were raised as a background to the purposes for which this new taxation would be devoted. But I must say that none of those proposals for using this additional revenue create any enthusiasm in the country. The fact is that India wants not merely a land force to be developed, but wants her self-defence to be established on a permanent basis. So the policy of the Government of India in regard to the use of this money and similar amounts that may be raised hereafter, whether they would be devoted to making India's defence more stable and permanent and whether the Defence Department would hereafter be controlled and supervised by the people of this country, that is what the country expects with the monies raised by fresh taxation—to be devoted to the permanent benefit of Indian defence. As it is, we find that the monies raised are mostly devoted to the purpose of strengthening and improving the land army only. It is a great pity and we Indians look upon it as a great grievance that Britain did not view the military matters in India with the same interest as they were careful to give to political and constitutional questions. The point is this, even in the draft Instrument of Instructions to His Excellency the Governor General His Majesty the King has said that the defence of India must to an increasing extent be the

[Sir A.P. Patro.]

concern of the Indian people. That was drafted in 1935. In 1937 the Instrument of Instructions was altered and said that India should be so worked up in the matter of defence and other matters that she would form an equal partner in the British Empire. Now, from time to time, these instructions were issued by His Majesty in the Warrant of Instructions. The Instrument of Instructions, unlike those that preceded the present Instructions, form part of the Statute, and they do not detract from the spirit of the Act of 1935. They form part of the Act and have the force of an enactment. That has been said by the British Government as well as by the Government of India. Sir, non-Congressmen also feel that the handling of matters relating to India by the British Government after the war was declared has not been very satisfactory. Nor do we feel that the attitude of the Congress and the Muslim League is in any way more satisfactory. The point is this. We do believe in the sincerity and good faith, we believe in the honesty and integrity of the Britisher when he declares that India would receive full consideration of her constitutional status after the war then everything would be thrashed out. But in the meanwhile India's duty is that she should assist the British Government and co-operate in the war effort. To use the language used in another place, he would be a traitor who would not wholeheartedly throw himself into the war effort to crush Nazism, because I believe that India's future, political and constitutional, India's material development, all depend upon the success of Great Britain. Therefore he who endeavours to throw obstacles in the way of the war effort or he who discourages the war effort is not a true citizen of India. He is playing into the hands of the Fifth Column. He is encouraging the enemy when he says India is not with Great Britain. On the other hand, I may assure the House that so far as a few of us have gone about to see how the war effort was working in the districts and villages I would assure the House that the people do really believe in the goodness of Great Britain. For them "Whoever be the Government or Party, whoever be the ruler, all that they wanted was that their lands should yield more, that there should be timely rain and supply of war and good harvests and less taxation". That is what they wanted. That is the attitude of the peasants and the ryots, namely, he does not care for this party or that party being in power. All that he cares for is that there should be material prosperity in the country, that his fields should yield more than what they yielded before, and would be content to have it. Therefore it is not at all correct to say that India is in any way behind in war efforts. The peasants, the ryots and the cultivators do understand as intelligently as Honourable Members in this House and they know that it is very necessary for their own safety and for their own defence of their homes and villages that Britain should be supported and succeed. In this connection it is said in the speech of my Honourable friend Mr. Ramadas Pantulu, whose general attitude and whose moderate tone in this matter I welcome very much and he has so reasonably placed the case for his side, though we differ from him in many of his opinions. The Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu said that there is an amount of force used and coercion applied in the country for raising funds for war effort. I differ from him and I would draw his attention to the fact that three of us went about the villages to see how far there is truth in the charge levelled against the Government of Madras that there force was used. We found absolutely no foundation for it. It is a question of jealousy because it has been successful. The Governor of Madras has been successful in convincing the people that they must help in the war effort and it was explained to them at large gatherings of thousands. The Governor's personal efforts have influenced the people

and they have contributed to the war fund in the villages. Therefore it seems to me that it is not at all due to any force of the officers, in fact that officers were only used as merely savings banks and collecting agents; beyond that there is no truth in the suggestion made. I have asked those honourable and honest gentlemen who made those charges whether they could point out any instance or instances where such *zulum* was exercised by the officials, and they simply smiled and were unable to point out one definite case where they found such influence was used. Such have been the tactics of a particular party who claim the monopoly of all patriotism. Because they have failed in their dishonest efforts they have had recourse to such subterfuge and say that force is being used. The position in many villages show that funds have been raised voluntarily by the people and not by the influence exercised by the Governor. It is to the credit of the Madras Governor that he has been free from all such things. He is a straightforward soldier and a statesman, and I am sure that the Congressmen realize that the charges are false. Reference was made to these charges during the course of discussion in this House from the speech of the Honourable Mr. Sapru and the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu. We find that three points have been agreed to, namely, that the first and foremost agreement is that war effort is necessary, and the second is that India is inseparably connected with Great Britain and that in her defeat will be a disaster, and the third is that Britain must succeed. This Finance Bill cannot be criticized on merits. I will put it in this way that the first agreement is that the Finance Bill is accepted on its merits. Secondly, that the war effort is necessary, and, thirdly, the Nazism must be crushed. Accepting these three propositions the next question is how is Nazism to be crushed? That is the vital point. We all say and express our feelings that Nazism should be crushed and Britain should succeed; but how could Britain succeed without any assistance in men and money? Therefore, Sir, it seems to me that there is inconsistency in the position taken up by some of the Honourable Members. I quite realize the position taken up by the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu that supplies may be refused when grievances are not redressed. So far as the general position is concerned this is correct but applied to the emergency and extraordinary circumstances that proposition does not hold water. Here the position is that supplies are asked for in the interest of emergency in order to save yourselves from the cruel attack of the enemy. You have all read the reports of the great destruction and the great havoc caused by Nazism. I might with the indulgence of the House refer to the damage and the loss which our Honourable President has suffered in this matter. His beautiful house, well constructed, and one of the finest buildings in the fashionable locality has been destroyed. That is lost. Property is gone and that is before our eyes an illustration of the kind of destruction that is taking place owing to Nazi aggression. Similar aggression is near us. It is wrong to believe that war is not near us: war is coming nearer you and the danger is threatening at our door. To say that until our grievances are redressed we are not going to give any help is most criminal, nothing short of criminal. In the first place the demands of Congress changed from time to time according to the changed times. The first demand was that there should be a constituent assembly to frame the constitution. Secondly, it was modified in a way and they said that there should be independence and that independence should be established by India herself. Thirdly, that it would be enough if there was a declaration that independence later on will be implemented after the war. They wanted a declaration on paper and an assurance on paper. Later on it was modified and they said the demand would for a national government and the national government was to prepare the constitution

[Sir A. P. Patro.]

without the aid of the British Government altogether. Therefore, without British assistance or British co-operation the constitution was to be prepared by the constituent Assembly. National government was to be instituted and inaugurated immediately. How it should be composed and what are its functions and whether there is an agreement among ourselves and as to who should compose this national government are questions that were left unsolved or even indicated. I am not opposed to the formation of national government. No thinking Indian could deny the right to himself, namely, to have a national government of the country. But we shall have to see as practical politicians and statesmen how far a constructive suggestion has been made, how far this national government, without the co-operation of the Muslims and the other sections of the Hindus, could be built. That is the real proposition that we have to consider ourselves. As I started saying, they are very earnest, the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, they are sincere when they make the statement that they are prepared to keep the door always open for Indians to come to an agreement among themselves and to put forward a scheme which they will accept and therefore the burden is upon us to come to an agreement and to place it before the Parliament. But then have we come to an agreement yet on the matter? How could, therefore, a national government be run smoothly and to the benefit of the people if incongruous elements, conflicting elements, are to be there, and if conflicting claims are also present in the cabinet, is it possible that such a Government could be worked at all? Therefore, even for temporary purposes, even during the war, it would seem that such a proposition is very impracticable. A national government! It is no doubt a very happy phrase or catchword, it is a happy phrase to lure the youth of the country into saying, "Here is a national government: we want it". The youth of the country are captivated by these attractive shibboleths. The experienced men and politicians and statesmen ought to realize that in the circumstances of the country it is not possible at all to frame a practicable form of national government without agreement among ourselves first, without an understanding as to how the relevant rights, political and economic, of the various groups which constitute the Indian nation should be formulated and definitely stated. This is the position, therefore it is no use making this charge and stating that these grievances have not been redressed and therefore we will refrain from voting supplies. Another grievance that has been advanced is—and it is not so much, I am glad to say, pressed by the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu—he is very reasonable in the matter. He said, "Yes, India should not be dragged into the war without being consulted, without her consent, and therefore it is not desirable that the Congress should co-operate with such a Government which refused to take India into her confidence". Before I answer that question, namely, on the constitutional point as he has wisely relegated it to the background, I would not raise it again and say that from the constitutional point of view there are difficulties, and secondly, if the end justifies the means, if at the time there was no consultation possible and it was only by correspondence that consultation could then have been held, and it was announced in the other House that actually the Leader of the Opposition had been given intimation of what the Government was going to do. Therefore, with his knowledge of the thing, Government is not altogether to be blamed, though it would have been better if the Legislature were consulted before the matter was put through. Anyhow, there we stand, that whether consultation or no consultation, the danger is on us now. Mr. Sapru reviewed the situation yesterday at great length, the situation in the east, the middle east and the far east and the west, and so on. That

should convince him at once to vote for the Bill instead of saying that he would not vote for the Bill, in spite of his conviction, in spite of the review which he gave us of the events that are taking place in different parts of the world and that the war danger is upon us, namely, if Indo-China is taken by Japan, then Burma and Bengal will be swallowed up next. If that is the danger that India is to be threatened with, then it seems to me that it would be extremely wrong that he should not vote for the Bill. And having intelligently canvassed all events, it would be foolish of anybody that they should not be able to subscribe to this Bill. Sir, as I said, the attitude of the non-Congressmen with regard to the British handling of matters was unsatisfactory. Nor are we satisfied with the attitude of the Congress and the Muslim League in the matter. The two demands that have been put forward are that a national government and a government consisting of all sections of the people should be formed. If that is agreed to, if that is formed by us ourselves, there would be no difficulty whatever. It is not at all relevant, no doubt, for the purpose of this Bill. I started by saying that the Bill is purely a financial Bill. It is only intended to raise certain taxes to meet an emergency, namely, the war effort. Therefore, having understood that it is a purely financial measure, all other questions are irrelevant to this and do not serve any purpose. We have seen very briefly how far this national government could be practical and we have seen how far this question of the previous assent of the Legislature is necessary for the purpose of sanctioning the taking out of troops outside India and bringing India into the war. These matters do not at all go to the root of the matter and they are at present not very urgent, at least not so urgent but we have got to find money for it. It is true it has been said by the Finance Member that India has to find Rs. 20 lakhs a day, in other words about Rs. 75 crores a year, for the purpose of financing the war. He has warned us that Rs. 20 lakhs is not the limit, the last figure, but that more money would be needed for the purpose of carrying on the war. And therefore, when we have got this warning we have got to get the finances. When a poor country raises such an amount, the proposals must be full. It has been asked how this money can be spent? When India is called upon to raise Rs. 20 lakhs a day or Rs. 75 crores a year, it is asked in some quarters why Britain is spending £9 million a day and why not India make a sacrifice with her 400 million people. On the face of it, so absurd a question requires no answer. England's revenue per head is very large and cannot be compared with India's income, which is only a few annas per head of the population. And it is further suggested if the Dominions have the right of voting or rejecting supplies, why cannot India have the same right?

It is one of the greatest weaknesses of the Congress that it is not able to see beyond its own nose just as the bureaucracy of India are not able to see matters beyond their own nose. The bureaucracy of India are the greatest sinners in bringing the administration and the political situation to their present state. It is their neglect to see the real condition of things, their want of contact with the people and their failure to take the people into their confidence that has brought this country to the present state. Here you ask for money. But have you made any arrangements as to how this money should be spent? It is suggested that we have to make greater sacrifices. We are prepared to make sacrifices to crush Nazism. But the expenditure in the Dominions is controlled by the people. It is under strict supervision. Where is the opportunity for Indians, who would subscribe Rs. 20 lakhs a day for war expenditure, and perhaps more hereafter, to control the expenditure, to supervise how the whole money is spent? If the money is spent on a permanent basis and on sound lines for national defence, then there would be some satisfaction. Until such an assurance is forthcoming and the confidence of the people is

[Sir A. P. Patro.]

restored it will be difficult for the bureaucratic Government to rouse enthusiasm among the people. The people of India are anxious that Government should provide for the efficient defences of the country. Hitherto, Rs. 45 crores and Rs. 54 crores have been raised every year for defence purposes. All of which has gone, for what ? It was discovered the other day by the Chatfield Committee that India has only time-worn rifles. They had no mechanization. They had not even motor vehicles, and Indian soldiers were not sufficiently equipped and kept up-to-date. There was not an up-to-date army. The Chatfield Committee only opened our eyes. In spite of Rs. 54 crores and Rs. 45 crores having been spent on the land forces of India, most of it has gone towards the salaries of officers,—3,800 officers for the Indian Army. Therefore, the country has a right to demand that the money they vote for is properly spent for the efficient development of India's defences, and not merely spent on salaries. Only today we have begun mechanization and modernization of the Indian Army. Wisdom has dawned too late after they have spent the fortunes of India on defence purposes. We have now got to raise half a million of land army. 100,000 men were raised recently. A second corps, as they call it. The second part of the programme is going to begin now and the third part of the programme will begin later and this will come perhaps after the danger has passed away fortunately and providentially, and when we are free from the war. Till then, what is the Defence Department going to do ? The Headquarters of the Department would not listen to the reasoning and the force that has been brought upon Government ever since 1921. For 20 years past it has been pressed on the Government that they should modernize the army, and bring it up-to-date, and that it should be made more efficient and serviceable. Till recent times India had not undertaken modernization of the army. What could these 50,000 or 100,000 men do if they were simply cannon fodder in the field ? It is for this purpose that we have maintained 3,800 officers or more in the Indian Army ? Twenty long years have been neglected and today they wake up and find that it is impossible to equip them unless we give them crores and crores of rupees. This has been the attitude of the bureaucratic form of management of the Defence Department. The Headquarters think that they are Heaven-born people, that they would not listen to anything that ordinary commonsense would suggest and they would listen only to experts. We realize the danger in having trusted these people all this time. We now find ourselves in a very dangerous position. Sir, what about our Navy and Air Force ? No doubt, the Honourable the Finance Member, in his speech, has explained how the developments would take place after a year or two. Beginnings are being made. Well, a few mine sweepers and armed boats are being multiplied with a view to help the coastal trade or to spot the enemy coming into the coast. For the rest we have to depend upon the Royal Navy. The Royal Indian Navy—a very grand term—consists of seven vessels and these are escort vessels. There are only a few of these minesweepers and armed boats to protect the 500 miles of the coastal line of India. This is how we are living after paying Rs. 54 crores every year for army and defence purposes. As regards the Air Force—we are ashamed to talk of Air Force development. It has not yet begun and when it will develop, we do not know. It has been found during the war that Air Force is as necessary and effective as the Navy. Therefore, unless these two arms are properly and efficiently developed in India for the purpose of Indian defence, it is idle to say that India could defend herself. It would be a great consolation to India for paying taxes that efficient defences are provided for the country. The policy of the Government in this matter is not yet known. The needs of self-defence must, therefore, be developed and specifically stated, what Government propose to do.

Now, Sir, it is not necessary for me to go into all the matters touched on by the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu. All that I would say now is that as far as South India is concerned we know that the people are behind the war effort and that the energetic and statesmanlike Governor of Madras has been going about, coming in contact with the people, winning their confidence and establishing good relations between the Government and the people, and that the war effort is going on very successfully. As Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar said the other day—which unfortunately has been rather bitter for the Congress, to whom truth is sometimes very bitter—the newspapers have contributed to the voluntary effort. The *Madras Mail* has started a fund for helping the distressed and another fund for purchasing aircraft, and subscriptions have come in voluntarily from one anna to a thousand rupees. That is all voluntary effort and not officially inspired. Side by side with the Governor's fund this newspaper fund has developed so well that it reflects credit upon the people for their voluntary effort. The people are behind the war effort and it is wrong to say that the people do not subscribe voluntarily to the war effort.

Another thing said by my Honourable friend is that Britain is not willing to part with power and hence every subterfuge has been adopted with a view to evade the suggestions made by the Congress or by the League or by Indian Nationalists. It is true to some extent that no definite solution has been formulated by the Government of India in the matter, but that is not the whole truth. As I have said if a national Government could be formed by all classes of people coming together and making a united demand, there would be no difficulty whatever. The whole position is this. Is India so barren of statesmanship that the Congress, the Muslim League and the other minorities cannot get together and draw up a workable scheme and present it to the Parliament for approval? I am not one of those who believe that there is no such statesmanship in India. We have very wise and experienced people. The only thing is they are very nervous owing to the militant attitude taken up by the Congress in these matters. Any one who speaks about adjustment or compromise becomes at once the target of attack by thoughtless young men. Therefore people are reticent and unwilling and, I am sorry to say, even become timid to come forward with their suggestions. There are men in India thoroughly tried and experienced in administrative work. Place them together until they come to an understanding. If the country were agreed on these matters I am sure the present deadlock would be solved and India would soon get what she demands, namely, a national government. It may take time, as it has been assured that after the war the whole matter would be discussed and considered. After the war it will be possible to achieve our full aims, but in the meanwhile we may have this agreed constitution and that assurance which is demanded by the Congress. Therefore, though I believe these constitutional and political matters are extraneous to the provisions of this Bill, they have to be considered. I support the Finance Bill that has been laid before the House.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM (Bihar and Orissa : Muhammadan) : Mr. President, the Bill before us had a memorably rough passage through the other House and in this House too it has been subjected more to the consideration of the communal and constitutional situations than to the strictly financial aspects. The Honourable the Finance Member had made an excellent beginning by bringing forward the last Finance Bill without asking for favours from the Governor General as has been the case for the whole of the five years of Sir James Grigg's regime. I had expressed the hope in the discussion of the last Finance Bill that he would not be compelled to bring

[Mr Hossain Imam.]

a Bill in a certified form, because this House has often expressed its objection to that form of Bill. But here we can distinguish that this Finance Bill had come to us in its present form through no fault of the Finance Member himself. It is due more to the faults of the Government of India than to those of the Finance Department.

Sir, I could have easily followed the precedent, which has been set in the other House and by some of my colleagues, of considering this purely from the communal and constitutional aspect, nevertheless I should like to deal with the financial and administrative aspects of the Bill as well. This is the second time that we have got a supplementary Finance Bill before us during the last ten years. In 1931 when we received the supplementary Finance Bill a wealth of information was supplied to us, which is strangely lacking at the present time. We do not even know from what items the surplus which he acquired has been got. There was nothing secret about this ; no general interest of India would have suffered if we had received detailed information about the actual surplus. But it seems to me that we are to be treated like children, to be given only that much information which the nurse thinks it proper to be given to us and our satisfaction and requirements have no value.

Mr. President, the Honourable the Finance Member began his statement on the Finance Bill with the statement that he expects a short-fall of Rs. 280 lakhs in the revised estimate of the current financial year's income. But he presented to us a picture of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark. He did not say a word as to what he expects from the Income-tax and the Excess Profits Duty. Neither did he tell us whether the position will be maintained or will deteriorate or will improve. This is the way in which we are treated—as nobodies. They do not treat us like responsible and representative Indians. I find, Sir, from the statement of expected income that as regards the railway figure he expects to get a little more than what he had budgeted for. I refer to the fact that he now expects Rs. 463 lakhs as one per cent. contribution from the railways whereas in his budget statement he had expected Rs. 441 lakhs. This is capable of two explanations. Firstly, it might be due to the fact that in the nine months the capital at charge has increased by Rs. 22 crores, because in the Statement on the Financial Position these are his words " their full contribution is Rs. 463 lakhs : it is one per cent. of the capital at charge ". In the last Financial Statement it mentioned Rs. 441 lakhs. There is another explanation and I hope that the second is the proper explanation. The convention is that you receive from the railways one per cent. of the capital at charge after debiting loss on the strategic lines. Probably reduction in losses on these accounts for Rs. 22 lakhs. I should like to be assured on that head. As regards his estimate about the Customs income I personally think he is optimistic. I personally believe that he has not taken into full account of the difficulties of transport and our embargoes. The figure can go up only if army stores are being imported and that may equalize the reduction elsewhere.

Coming to the expenditure side the Honourable Member started with the statement that there was an excess of Rs. 230 lakhs in the civil estimates. The civil estimates are civil merely in name. Most of them are really defence expenditure charged to civil heads. I will give you some instances. Rs. 30 lakhs are to be spent on training pilots for the Air Force : Rs. 8 lakhs were being spent on strengthening the Frontier Constabulary and Rs. 20 lakhs on road making near the Frontier. Out of Rs. 230 lakhs he has only given details of Rs. 194 lakhs and left us guessing for the remaining Rs. 36 lakhs. I find an important item of civil expenditure is absent from the Financial Statement which

the Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly had passed. I refer to the expenditure which is going to be incurred on installing the 100 kilowatt. transmitter in Delhi. Is that money to come from the reserve fund set apart for improving broadcasting or is it to be charged to the current revenue ? If it is to be charged to the current revenue I do submit that it was not an item to be left out, and one for which strong justification must have been urged if this money is to be spent on broadcasting from the revenue account. I know broadcasting is one of the subjects in which the Governor General can act at his discretion or perhaps in his individual responsibility. That may account for its absence even from the statement made to us. If that is the reason defence expenditure too then should not have been mentioned because that is a thing in which the Government of India or the Governor General in Council do not figure. Sir, the Finance Member has given the least possible details of the increase in defence expenditure that was possible to give. He has neither mentioned on what account this excess is being spent nor what amount is being debited to His Majesty's Government, and the particular head to which it is being charged. There are absolutely no details and a bland statement is made that we are to incur, in addition to Rs. 834 lakhs, already sanctioned another Rs. 14½ crores recurring expenditure and Rs. 33 crores non-recurring expenditure. I would like to point out that he is not treating us fairly by making a crisp statement of this nature. You ask a body of people to give all help to you and to give their support to the measure and still you refuse them the least information. We have been persistently asking in our last session for the actual facts in connection with our agreement with His Majesty's Government, how much money His Majesty's Government is contributing to this defence expenditure, and we have always been told that there is the statement of the Honourable the Finance Member which says that very advantageous terms have been settled. It is sufficient we are told that so much only will be charged to India and the rest to His Majesty's Government as is not primarily in the interest of India's defence.

THE HONOURABLE SIR A. P. PATRO : The report is not published.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Every expenditure which is being incurred is reported to be in the interest of India and I have failed to find a single item cited by the Government of India, indicating the item of defence expenditure which is not charged to the Indian Defence account. Therefore I wish to state frankly that I believe that the Finance Department is as powerless as ourselves. The War Office is the real master and it dictates, the Government of India simply follows. While on this subject I should like to know whether our presumption is correct, that in the matter of defence the Government of India do not figure even in an advisory capacity ; they simply follow the dictates of the War Office and the General Headquarters in England. The War Office lays down the policy and the Defence Member of the Government of India is powerless. That is the plight which is over us. I was agreeably surprised to find that the conscience of even the Government of India is sometimes pricked. I am very glad that is so. Sir, as is well known, the question of the distribution of defence expenditure is a matter for the decision of His Majesty's Government. Formerly the convention was that India would be responsible for minor attacks and when a major power attacked India, then for the time that imperial forces could join, India was to be responsible for that time only. Neither the number nor the equipment that you have for this purpose was dictated by India. You have never listened to us. You cannot now blame India for her desire to reduce the defence expenditure when you never listened to us and you went on merrily. There was no

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

one to check you. How can you throw the blame on us for the unpreparedness as India has all through been powerless. It was the bungling in the War Office and the Government of India which was responsible for the state in which our defences are. I was referring to the question of our responsibility in the matter of defence. Now, after the Chatfield Report I confess we were supposed to get increased contribution from His Majesty's Government, both recurring and the generous award (which is still in abeyance) of Rs. 40 crores for mechanization. We were told, Sir, that the Chatfield Committee advocated a principle

12 Noon of joint responsibility of Great Britain and India for India's external security. To implement this recommendation,

a number of external defence troops were to be included in the establishment of the Indian Army. So far so good. But you had a fixed number of external defence troops charged to the Indian exchequer. (*An Honourable Member* : 30,000.) And what about the excess ? Every day you are changing the basis of agreement, not as a matter of mutual consent but as a dictation from the War Office. I am not prepared to believe that the Government of India was a free agent in coming to this settlement. Now, on the basis of the Chatfield award we would be entitled (since it is a recent basis entered into as late as 1939) to ask Great Britain to disburse all the expenditure of the 30,000 extra troops that are now outside India's borders. The terms were not dictated by us, so you cannot claim that we came to a settlement. It was a term dictated by the War Office. You break it and you come to us and tell us that a very advantageous settlement has been entered into with Great Britain without any proofs. How can we possibly be convinced by an argument which has neither force nor facts to prove it ? A bland statement coming from a high quarter no doubt, but merely a statement without substance, cannot be believed. And it is on these basic factors that I tell you that it is impossible for any self-respecting Indian to lend his support to you. Now, Sir, as I said in the beginning, even the conscience of this Government of India is sometimes pricked. The agreement at the moment is that our troops which are abroad are sent there for the external defence of India and therefore their ordinary charges should be borne by Indian revenues. But what about the new army that is being trained ? If this new army is being trained in the interests of India, should it not be charged on the same basis ? If there is a change, and a change made by you, by the Government of India, then it stands to reason that it is on a different footing. This army is not being raised for the defence of India. Mr. Ogilvie, Sir, replying to question No. 18 in the Legislative Assembly on the 7th of November, stated that the cost of expansion will be borne by Indian revenues but should any forces comprising it be sent for service overseas, the initial cost as well as the recurring cost from the date of embarkation will be charged to His Majesty's Government. Why this differentiation between the financial treatment of the old army and the new army ? It can only be due to the fact, Sir, that you yourself believe that the new army is being raised not for the defence of India but for Imperial purposes ! You have admitted half my claim by making this differentiation. If you are honest you should go forward and tell His Majesty's Government that your dictation about the numbers of troops required for the safety of India shall hold good, and to that extent India should now be charged with all the expenditure for armies whether it is inside or outside the country but that for any increased forces that are being raised His Majesty's Government should be charged. I will tell you, Sir, the reason why we make this demand. Primarily it was the duty of the British Government to come to our rescue if we were attacked. We

know your difficulties, we know how difficult it is to get away from England, how much England is hemmed in herself by her enemies. We appreciate your difficulties. But that is no reason why you should always say that heads I win, tails you lose. Because you cannot come to our succour, are you not going to pay for it even when you can easily pay ?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : But you don't think that, if the war is extended, the frontiers of India would be in danger ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Mr. President, what I am suggesting is that an army cannot be created overnight. It is like an insurance premium ; you go on paying it so as to get an endowment at the end of a period of years. You cannot by a magic wand create an army the day you want. It is not like the I.C.S. that you can get at once.

THE HONOURABLE SIR GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI (Leader of the House) : As one who has passed the I.C.S. examination, I can tell the Honourable Member that it takes a little time to get into the Service.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : It costs the time of the student but it costs the Government nothing ! The Government does not pay you while you are preparing for it.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : A very far-fetched argument.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Mr. President, I say that an equitable settlement, a just settlement, would be that the entire cost not only after embarkation but even before embarkation, as soon as they are raised, should be charged to His Majesty's Government and not to the Indian exchequer. If we are to believe that this statement of Mr. Ogilvie is not to be changed, as we found about the cost of commission for the Supply Department. Mr. Dow told us during the last session that we are charging so much from the British Government for the purchases which we are making on their account—3 per cent. The Government of India which came itself to the settlement without any prompting from the Opposition, changes it overnight and says that it is not proper ; is it due to the fact that it would have cost His Majesty's Government a good bit of money ? I think that you are not playing fair. Don't take the blame on your shoulders, however broad they might be, which should really go to His Majesty's Government. Go forward and be frank with us. Let us know that we and you are in the same boat. Secondly, Sir, I want an assurance that India will not be denuded of seasoned troops. I am very much afraid that if there is any conflagration in the Near East you might easily, as you did in the last war, take away all our seasoned soldiers and leave us with raw recruits. To me, Sir, the defence of my own country is much dearer than that of any other. I would remind you that His Majesty's Government did not give all the available men and material to France, but kept the better and greater part of their reserves and resources in England.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : But why do you assume that the Government of India is going to do that ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Well, Sir, from the fact that in place of 30,000 troops which were reserved for external purposes we have sent 60,000 and because of another factor that some of the personnel of the Indian Army has been sent to England and France of which there is no mention

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

in the Finance Member's statement. We came to know of it only the other day and we are indebted to Mr. Amery for the information that he has given and to the little booklet on *Facts about the Defence of India* which the Government of India has published. We have got three things before us now, the Statement of the Financial Position by the Finance Member, the booklet giving a summary of important military matters concerning the defence of India, and the statement of the Secretary of State and there is great divergence in the facts mentioned in these three documents, which have been issued during this month. I would like the Honourable the Finance Secretary to tell us if he has received a single shell from His Majesty's Government for the defence of India, and, if so, what the amount is? He could at least give us the figures for the year that has already ended. Is he prepared to give us full facts on that? It is a story of the past. It will not help Hitler a jot to know that His Majesty's Government contributed Rs. 4 crores and the Government of India spent Rs. 50 crores. Have you anything to show in that respect? I doubt very much. It is simply a tall story.

I would also like to know what amount we have received from the much advertized Rs. 40 crores for defence modernization. Here I would ask the Honourable Member to explain a statement of the Honourable the Finance Member, who says at the end of page 3 of his speech :

" Meanwhile the financial settlement with His Majesty's Government has enabled the mobilization and development of India's resources, for war to be expanded with the utmost rapidity " (mark the word " rapidity ", Sir), " at a cost to the Indian taxpayer which represents no more than a fair charge to India for her own requirements ".

What is the criterion for determining the expenditure which is a fair charge for her own requirements? The man who claims. It is Whitehall—the War Office and the India Office—and between them the two responsible Ministers of His Majesty's Government decide the matter and you follow.

I should now like to say a few words about the rapid expansion of India's resources. That is a sorry story, a story of which any Government would feel ashamed. Look what is happening. The Honourable Member advertizes a long list of articles which we as traders have supplied to the Near East and other parts of the British Empire. I am talking not of raw materials but of manufactured goods, which are cited by the Honourable the Finance Member in some detail—things like guns, shells, ammunition, and so on. Even there, Sir, we are indebted to Colonel Amery for the statement that we have made a supply of more than Rs. 3 crores, which the Honourable the Finance Member did not care to mention. We have supplied some 30,000 tanks costing more than Rs. 3 crores. We had to go to Colonel Amery for this information and we could not get this information from the Honourable the Finance Member, because it will have helped Hitler if this information had been divulged to Indian representatives! What are the efforts which India has made for her own defence? That is the basic thing on which we can judge how you have carried on your responsibility during the 15 months of the war in which you have been in charge. If you have signally failed in this, you cannot, even on the principle enunciated by Sir A. P. Patro, ask for our support. A Ministry which is unable to discharge its functions properly, there is only one fate in store, and that is the fate which was meted out in England to the Chamberlain Government. Here we are powerless to turn you out. But can you question the equity of the refusal of the representatives of the people to support an incompetent body in office?

THE HONOURABLE SIR A. P. PATRO : Who says incompetent?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : I am going to ask you, Sir A. P. Patro, to judge. You will be my judge. Nobody else. Look at what they have done ? A statement is made that out of 40,000 items which constitute the requirements of the war machine, 20,000 are being manufactured in India. It is a thing of which they can very easily be proud of. But come down to brass tacks and tell us exactly what are the new items which you have started to manufacture ? Have you started manufacturing anti-aircraft guns yet, after 15 months of the war ? Mr. Satyamurti said the other day that Madras was blessed with two anti-aircraft guns out of which one was out of order. Is that the measure by which I would show that you have done well by the Government of India ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR A. P. PATRO : They were old ones, not new ones.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : That further strengthens my argument that this Government is incompetent. I had full belief that the judgment of the Honourable Sir A. P. Patro would be in my favour. There is no mention by the Honourable the Finance Member of anti-aircraft guns. You cannot at the present moment consider any country prepared for war without starting the manufacture of such elementary things for the defence of the country or importing thousands of them—I will not say hundreds, but thousands—if they were not able to manufacture them. We are told by the Defence Department that they have started a Rs. 7 crore expansion scheme. This was decided upon after the close of the last session,—nearly 10 months after the beginning of the war. It was probably in June. I am not positive. After 10 months of the war you decided on an expansion scheme which will ultimately result in the manufacture of anti-aircraft guns in this country. You had enough money to buy 30,000 motor vehicles. You had enough shipping space to import these vehicles. But you had not enough money to buy these essentials for the safety of India. If you have not learnt any lesson from the defeat of Poland, if you are not wiser after the collapse of France, God help you.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : But who is in a position to know better regarding the safety of the country, the Military Department or yourself ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : If the Military Department were free agents I might have every trust in them. But the Honourable the Finance Member said that the Finance Department was the handmaiden of defence ; and I venture to say the Defence Department of the Government of India is a subordinate branch office of His Majesty's War Office and the General Headquarters. It has no initiative. I have got the facts stated by the Government of India to substantiate this claim. Here are the words of the Honourable the Finance Member which lend support to my argument :

" A large number of service aircraft for training purposes are being supplied by the United Kingdom, and as soon as further supplies of aircraft are received we shall be in a position to make immediate use of them ".

Fancy, after 15 months of war, after the collapse of France, you can think of nothing better than make this statement, that His Majesty's Government will send in God's own time aircraft. When the war is ended for good or evil these supplies will be available ; and in the meantime you must continue to work as an arsenal for others and do nothing for yourself ! Our dollar resources are placed at the disposal of His Majesty's Government. Do we not require dollar resources for our own needs ? Is not England getting machine tools

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

every day from America ? Why not we ? That is why you did not send an Indian to the United States, because it would have exposed the position, that we are working there as subordinate agents of His Majesty's purchasing commission. If there is any excess from His Majesty's Government's requirements and it cannot be utilized by any other self-governing Dominion, Indian might come into the picture, and that even is not sure ! It might come into the picture if surplus dollars are available. That is exactly your position ; and all that is due to two causes, one is the constitution and the other is the lack of support of Indian public opinion.

Sir, I could have dilated at length on the points of their unpreparedness, but as it is the general desire of the House to conclude this debate I am not going to use all the materials which I have before me, and I shall now proceed with the communal and the constitutional aspects of the matter. But before I do so I should like to say one thing more. It would be impossible for any man, not even Sir A. P. Patro, to pass over the shabby treatment of India's air defence. There is no other word for it. You say bluntly that the Royal Air Force here has not been expanded. I am quoting from the statement which has been placed before us by the Finance Department :

" No expansion has taken place in the R.A.F. The Indian Air Force has been expanded ".

But what a magnificent expansion for the expenditure of Rs. 33 crores initial and extra Rs. 22½ crores recurring which the Government of India has incurred. For an extra expenditure of Rs. 55 crores initial and recurring the expansion of the air force is remarkable. We are told,

" The initial establishment of the Indian Air Force under the expansion scheme is now proceeding. There will be three squadrons consisting of four flights each ".

This is the magnificent achievement of the Government of India on the basis of which they want that the whole of India should support them unstintedly ! Their record is, if anything, worse than that of the Chamberlain Government, and it is only in a country constituted as ours that a Government of this nature can continue in power. That is due to the constitutional position, and it is for that reason that the constitutional aspect overshadows all other considerations.

I should now like to refer first to the communal aspect and then I shall deal with the constitutional aspect of the matter. My friend the Honourable Mr. Mahtha asked us some questions as to what would happen if the Parkistan scheme were accepted. He did not follow Mr. Sapru in declaring his vehement opposition to the scheme itself. As it appears to me that his inquiries are more in the nature of a genuine search for information I would like to say to him that when two people have to compose a difference it is essential for them to study the literature and papers of each before saying that anything is wrong. When we come to the Legislature we look up Government's case and it is then that we can question their action. I would therefore earnestly request him to write to the Muslim League for its literature, and he will then find a reply to all his questions. If he will write to the Muslim League office they will send him the full literature for one or two rupees.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : A subscription for the Muslim League !

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : I shall be proud to receive it from Pandit Kunzru. My Honourable and dear friend Mr. Sapru, who is essentially a man of moderation and of goodwill, was strangely excited the other day and his cool arguments were altogether absent. He went on hammering the point that the minorities—although we refuse to be called a minority, we claim to be a nation—demanded a right of veto. I say it is no good shouting slogans. If we do not have the veto, who will have it ? You will have it, you claim it ; or the Britishers will have it. They claim the right of veto. Abolish the veto and let everything be settled by common agreement ; no veto, no majority. The difference, Sir, between the Mahasabha and the Congress is only this, one is wise and the other is a little foolish, but they are essentially one and the same. They know full well that they constitute 68 per cent. of the population of India, as the Honourable Mr. Mahtha pointed out. Knowing full well that even if the Europeans, Parsis, and the Muslims and the rest combined all those would still remain 32 per cent., the Congress paraded nationalism ; it meant nothing but Hindu rule, Hindu culture and everything Hinduized. It is really a thing for which I feel very sorry. Without having evolved anything of a common nature, the majority community were trying to parade everything Hinduized as nationalism. Sir, it is no pleasure to me to parade all these differences which exist between ourselves. It is unfortunate that India has not been able to settle its own differences ; but the party at fault used vehement language. I am not going to indulge in any heat, although the Honourable Mr. Sapru took advantage of his non-belief in the non-violence stunt of the Congress and was sufficiently belligerent to say that India was indivisible and the Hindu India will fight it out just as Abraham Lincoln fought it out, and because Abraham Lincoln was successful he presumed that that item was also correct, and unexceptionable for a country to have its freedom and not to divide up. He knows that Ceylon did form part of India, and Burma was separated in our time. Could he cite to me any instance of even half a century if not of a century when the present geographical India continued to be under the domination of one power ? It was never so in past history. The Asoka government that existed could not be called in any sense a united government : it was all in name. Mr. President, it is the gift of the Englishman to bring about the concept of a united India. Did that concept exist before ? They had no concept of a united nationality. The Congress thought India to be a nation in the matter of self-expression. Even now you hear from the Congress benches the voice for the division of Madras into three parts. Mr. Sapru will be surprised perhaps to know—he may know but he has not stated—that the demand for the separation of Sind came not from the Muslims for the first time. It was put forward in the Congress by a Hindu gentleman of Sind for the first time 25 years ago. (*A voice* : For administrative purposes.) Whatever the purpose I say this, we did not start it.

Mr. President, justification for the partition of India are more than enough. Look at the treatment meted out by the Aryan conquerors, the caste Hindus to the indigenous people of India, the depressed classes. We were prepared in the minority provinces to accept representative government, but Raja Narindra Nath asked at the Round Table Conference that no reforms should be given to the Punjab. It was reserved for Raja Narindra Nath with a minority of only 44 per cent. against 56 per cent. to say that he did not feel secure. He demanded that there should be no reforms ; but we who are 12 per cent. in Bihar never raised any question of this kind. Bihar Muslims had worked successfully for 12 years with the Hindu party to which Mr. Mahtha belonged : when he was a member of the Bihar Legislature and belonged to the United

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

Party. I had worked with the Progressive Party for seven years in this House. I would now refer to a responsible person, Dr. Moonje, who occupies the position of the working President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha. He was called by the representative of His Majesty's Government for consultation on the expansion of the Executive Council. What does he say? He says plainly that what India wants is not the Congress type of nationalism which my Honourable friend to my immediate right preached, but a government which will be nearer to the heart of my friend to the extreme right. Dr. Moonje showed his audience that what India wanted was *Hindu self rule* and not any other self rule. This statement was made as late as 18th November in Calcutta. It is the Hindu raj which he wanted and no other self rule and he assures us that under Hindu nationalism and Hindu raj they would live as brothers. I am sure he meant the same brotherly treatment as Hindus give to the Harijans, and that similar treatment will be meted out to us. He found three hindrances in the way of establishing Hindu self rule, Hindu democracy and Hindu culture. The first hindrance is Mahatma Gandhi's creed of non-violence, second, place is given to ourselves, and thirdly—very minor—to my Honourable friends the Britishers. They are the least hindrance to the establishment of Hindu rule. Would anyone be surprised if we declare our attitude and our inability to submit to it? I may say that the Hindu Mahasabha are foolish while our friends of the Congress are wise. They demand the same thing under the garb of democracy and nationalism. (An Honourable Member : What is your opinion about the Muslim League?) Just the common man.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU (United Provinces Southern : Non-Muhammadan) : With their intelligence as poor !

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : A man is the mirror of others ; so you may think what you like of us. If any further argument is required I would invite the attention of the Honourable Members to a statement—unchallenged statement—which Mr. Jinnah made only recently at the Arabic College in which he said that Mr. Savarkar is reported to have said that the Indian Muslims were like the Jews in Germany and should be treated as such. Then do you think we are unreasonable in demanding something that will keep that fate away from us ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Where has he stated that ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR A. P. PATRO : That is incorrect.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Mr. Jinnah made that statement four days ago. No one has contradicted it. It was open to Mr. Savarkar to rebut it. I said obviously the Hindu Mahasabha is a little foolish. The Congress have the same object in view but they are wiser. Our friends of the Progressive Party do not want to weaken the Congress and are the link between them and the Hindu Mahasabha.

Sir, I have got very little time left and therefore I shall not say any more on this subject. The communal question is not one which is pleasant to discuss. I would appeal to Honourable Members to follow the lead which was given by the Leader of the Congress Party in this House. The least that a self-respecting man can do is not to encourage or provoke bitter feelings by bringing this matter always to the fore in the Legislatures. Mr. Jinnah has given a lead in practice, as he did not make a condition precedent of joining the Viceroy's

Executive Council that his claim for Pakistan should be accepted. But the Congress, even Mr. Satyamurti, could not be content without asking as the first item of Mr. Amery's *bona fides* that he should repudiate Pakistan. Look at the difference. Think over the matter a little dispassionately and you will find that the provocation does not come from us. We are in the minority, we are small in numbers. It is you who do not trust us, because your own conscience is not clear. You want to crush the Mussalmans in the minority provinces and therefore you are not prepared to put any Hindus under the rule of Mussalmans. That is the plain and simple explanation of the matter.

Now, Sir, as I said, if I went on with communal bickerings, it would take up all my time. I shall refer to the constitutional aspect of the question. As I said in the beginning, what was the Government's offer which Indians have refused and for the sins of which we are for ever to be deprived of any share in shaping the policy of the Government. The sin is that we were not job-hunters enough. The tempting bait of Rs. 80,000 a year was not enough to rope in four or five persons. Since then the Honourable the Finance Member has taken good care to reduce it by Rs. 2,000 a month by way of income-tax and surcharge, so your object has been attained. The Rs. 80,000 has dwindled down to Rs. 56,000 net.

Mr. President, the present position of the Viceroy's Executive Council is that it is a glorified body which has even less power than it had before the 1935 Act. The 1935 Act provided that there were certain departments in which the Ministers would be fully responsible to the Legislature and others in which the Governor General should have the entire responsibility. Indian States were excluded. External Relations we had no voice in. Defence we did not figure in. And Finance we were of no account in. In other matters we were to be free. And I was surprised to find, Sir, that Broadcasting also came into this all-embracing category of the Governor General's responsibility. And the present form of the constitution is that the Government of India or what is properly and technically the Governor General in Council are only to function where the Governor General is not responsible in his individual capacity or the matter is not one which he can decide in his discretion. It is only in these matters that the Executive Council functions as a body having majority rights. In all the rest, the Governor General can and would disregard the opinion of the Governor General in Council. Many of the items out of the five which I have cited, I doubt if they would come before the Governor General in Council. We had an example, Sir, in the other House of how this works out in practice. A debate was stifled merely on the ground that the summoning of the Legislature was not the function of the Governor General in Council—which means that the Executive Council cannot do so. This is the body to which you are inviting us, which has not a voice in this primary requirement of a Government that it should have the right of summoning the Legislature. This is the glorified body in which Indians were promised a majority and which has been brought before us as a tempting bait by Mr. Amery. Sir, it is not enough that we are promised nothing for the future, but even for the present your offer is so vague, so unsubstantial and so dilatory that it is not worth looking at. As I said, Sir, Defence is a sealed book so far as matters of policy relating to equipment and other things are concerned. It is only when a matter is decided upon that execution has to be done by the Governor General in Council, that we may have a finger in the pie. Primarily, it is the War Office which dictates what should be done and what should not be done and the War Office has during the 15 months of this war shown sufficiently that it cares nothing for India's defence needs. I am not willing to trust and to allow this Government to function with my help

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

in this inaction. Mr. President, the fact cannot be lost sight of that we are working under a constitution which is one-sided. Although the part of the 1935 Act which would have given us power is still in suspension, the Government of India cannot suspend that power which gives swaraj to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State. The Viceroy and the Secretary of State continue to have greater powers than they enjoyed under the 1919 Act. Is that a fair division? Now, Sir, some reflection might be made on the fact that the Muslim League had made the unreasonable demand of equality of share in the Government of India. May I cite to my friends the example of Canada? The Legislature consists of equally divided seats between Frenchmen and Englishmen.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Am I to understand that there is separate representation in Canada and that the French have got 50 per cent. seats and the English have got 50 per cent. seats? That is news to those who have read something of the Canadian constitution.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : 50 per cent. seats are for the French Canadians.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Where have you got this from?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Look at our literature. I was saying that even among the Hindus there are people who do not see anything unreasonable in this demand of ours. I have before me—

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : There are always renegades in every community.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : A very literary person, in charge of a University, has made this statement and he comes from the country of the Honourable the Leader of the Congress Party. He is Dr. C. R. Reddi.

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras ; Non-Muhammadan) : He is not a Congressman. He is anti-Congress.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : He is a Hindu.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : He is a renegade Hindu.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Every one who goes against you is a renegade.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : There are plenty of Muslims who are against the Muslim League point of view.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : I do not call them renegades. That is the difference between you and me.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Will you please address the Chair?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Dr. Reddi in his statement has said that the League and the Congress should come together on the basis

of national Government in which the Muslims will have a half share, which is not very far from Mr. C. Rajagopalacharar's policy. (*An Honourable Member* : Why not two-thirds ?) Here comes the acid test. Was the sporting offer of Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar mere kite flying or was it sincerely made ? If it was merely a good cry, a newspaper propaganda to show the reasonableness of the Congress it has perhaps achieved its purpose. But if there was any sincerity in it, you should not object to the Muslims' demand for a half share in the government of the country as long as we remain united and as long as the future is to take care of itself. But there is something else which Dr. Reddi says which I appeal to Government to listen to. However that may be, he says, the reconstruction of the Central Government should not be made dependant on the creed or mood of any party or postponed to the Greek Kalends under one pretext or another. Your offer, which has been kept open, is nothing more nor less than your saying, "You come on my terms or you get out". I can retort and say, "I come on my own terms and none other. Don't blame me if I do not support you." In no Government support is pledged without agreement. You are allowing the Assembly, which is out of date, to go on. You cannot hold the elections. Whereas Canada, with all its war efforts, can hold the elections, whereas Australia, with all its war efforts, can hold the elections, you cannot hold the elections because it is against the public interest. And yet you say that this House is unrepresentative. Here is a golden opportunity of getting public opinion and finding out whether India is with you or is condemning you for your action—I will not say, action, because you have done nothing—I will say, your inaction. Are you prepared to go to the country for their verdict ? If not, the presumption will be that you have got a black record.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Are you not going to leave any time to other speakers ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : As I have said before, I am going to impose a self-restraint and I shall take no more than the allotted time. I have perhaps exceeded by one or two minutes.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : You have already exceeded the allotted time by 10 minutes.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : I am bringing my remarks to a conclusion, Sir.

Sir, there might be people in India who, like Mr. Satyamurti or the young man whose story was cited by Mr. Sapru, may be indifferent to the future of India, and there may be many reasons for their being indifferent. When you have no voice in shaping the policy, when you are denied the right to participate in any discussion, what interest can you take ? The Honourable Mr. Parker has asked why the Indian leaders did not go up to the Viceroy and offer their services. I say, we have not denied help. Even Mr. Gandhi said that he will advise his cabinet to give unqualified support to His Majesty's Government,—

THE HONOURABLE MR. R. H. PARKER (Bombay Chamber of Commerce) : He has not done it.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : His cabinet did not approve of it.

[Mr. Hossain Imam.]

Mr. President, as I was saying, it is not we who have not co-operated. It is the Government which is non-co-operating with us. It is not prepared to give any real responsibility to the Indian Ministers except to make them glorified clerks—if I may put it so—on high salaries. It is for that purpose that they are being invited, and I am strengthened in this conclusion by the fact that in addition to this expanded Cabinet, you are going to have a Defence Advisory Council. What is the idea ?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : You quarrel among yourselves and throw the whole responsibility on Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : Sir, it was the inaction of the previous Government which brought about the ruin of France and God forbid, it is your inaction which will bring about your ruin, and it will not be our fault. We are powerless ; you have power, and you are misusing it because you are dictated to by the War Office. Your primary duty is to act, formerly as the supplier of raw materials, and now as the arsenal of supply for other theatres of war, not caring for the defences of India. In no country would a government, which has done so little for the defence of its own hearth and home, remain in office except in this benighted country. You cannot blame us Indians if we do not feel in sympathy with this Government and are not prepared to lend their support to it.

THE HONOURABLE LT.-COL. SIR HISSAMUDDIN BAHADUR (Nominated Non-Official) : Mr. President, I have listened with regret to the inopportune outbursts from the side opposite. After the proceedings of the Central Assembly the unwarranted criticism of the side opposite in this House is not at all surprising. The voting on the Finance Bill in the Central Assembly regrettable as it is has a moral of its own. No knowledgeable man in this country or abroad will look on it as evidence that India is fundamentally opposed to the war efforts. The narrow majority with which the Congress Party won the division in the other place does not represent the true feelings in the country which is definitely in favour of the maximum support for the prosecution of the war. But in this House I would appeal to the good sense of the Honourable Members opposite to remember that in the hour of trial and anxiety political opponents must rise to a supreme effort of highmindedness. Let us realize the realities of the situation. The recruits are coming forward in large numbers to join the army. Voluntary contributions of money and material are pouring in. The Indian States are offering money to the tune of lakhs, and their military forces. Prayers are held in the country for the success of British arms. I have often heard Members indulging in tall talk about the military. May I humbly suggest that as laymen they are incapable of appreciating the military situation. Pray leave it to the military authorities who are the best judges of matters purely military. There was a reference about democracy. Do they mean the democracy preached and practised by the political leaders in India today who are no less than dictators ?

Sir, coming to the international situation, it is needless for me to recapitulate the events that have taken place. To quote His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal—

1. P.M.

“ I must ask all true Mussalmans to remember that the Axis powers have shown themselves to be the implacable enemies of Islamic countries and peoples. Italy has ruthlessly wiped out the Muslim Kingdom of Albania. Her conquest of Tripoli is as black a chapter of horror as has ever been written in the pages of history. She has invaded Egypt. She has bombed the cities and towns of Islamic countries and has shed the in-

noent blood of women and children. Let us not be blind to the fact that the attack on Greece is but the vanguard of an assault by Italy and her ally Germany on the liberties of the Islamic countries that lie between the frontiers of India and the Mediterranean. This is indeed the Battle of Islam and those who fight it, must bear in mind the injunctions of the uran :

“.....what has happened to you that you do not, in the cause of God, fight for those helpless men, women and children who are praying “ O Lord, deliver us from this place the inhabitants of which are oppressing us.....
.....”.”

Hitler and Mussolini have designed aggression, and let me assure the Honourable Members that Hitler & Co. will simply be disillusioned when the heavy knocks of the British Empire which are too strong for words to tell but are awaiting to strike at the root instead of the branches at the right time. The victory here and there may have some momentary advantage for Hitler & Co. But remember he laughs best who laughs last.

Honourable Members would join me in paying tributes to the men, women and children of London in their hour of trial and distress. London in spite of the heaviest air attacks is firm like a rock and under the leadership of that eminent personality, I mean the Right Honourable Mr. Winston Churchill, is returning the blows with greater severity than ever. The personal visits of Their Majesties the King and Queen to the houses of the victims of Nazi aggression are encouraging Londoners to face the calamities more bravely and we in India simply adore the feelings of Their Majesties towards their people.

Honourable Members, coming to the Bill itself now I have a word for the side opposite. In the address of His Excellency the Viceroy, after the rejection of the Finance Bill in the joint session of both Houses, a positive hope appears and it is for the realist to realize than for the dreamer to dream. His Majesty's Government has kept in abeyance its proposal regarding the expansion of the Governor General's Executive Council and formation of the War Advisory Committee. The door is still open and it is for us now to present our demand and profit by this offer which takes us much nearer towards the goal in a way. The speech coincided with the speech of Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons who in his lucid speech declared in clear words :

“ What is the offer which is still open to the leaders of political opinion in India ? It is that they should come to the Viceroy's Executive Council not as mere adviser, but as Ministers responsible for great departments of state and to come into that Council in such numbers as to constitute a substantial majority over the European members of the Viceroy's Council ”.

It further reiterates that—

“ Once the principle is established that the Viceroy's Council must consist of the majority of Indian members that principle naturally remains ”.

Now I leave it to the side opposite to profit by the sincerity of the proposal.

I may remind the House that dark days may be ahead for India. Sur-charged as it is by the malicious ambitions of the Axis powers and Japan and Russia it would be short of prudence to lose sight of hard facts. The war effort must be doubled cent. per cent. The youth of the country should come forward still in larger numbers and join the army and every possible sacrifice in men, money and material should be made as it is in the interest of Indians themselves to take an active share in the successful prosecution of the war against the common enemy.

Sir, Germany and Italy, the twin disciples of force and of the gospel of aggression, are determined to force upon the world their doctrine of life which

[Lt.-Col. Sir Hissamuddin Bahadur.]

denies to the individual liberty of thought, and to the nation the right to live its independent life according to its own genius and tradition. That doctrine they are enforcing by blotting out of independent existence any nation or people however peaceful and non-violent it may be, which wishes to live its own life quietly and without interference. With this danger confronting us, is there any one with any sense of responsibility, I ask, who is prepared to advocate the role of neutrality, of supine inaction and of non-violent onlookers while the tragic fate which has befallen more than half a dozen nations in Europe that have essayed this role, is written in letters of blood before our eyes. These are the patent facts and no right-thinking man can shut his eyes and go on labouring under misunderstandings and misapprehensions. The sum asked for in the Finance Bill is not even the fraction of the expenditure involved and India with its splendid record of goodwill and loyalty should extend its whole-hearted support to the measure before us. The Honourable the Finance Member has been very modest and cautious in the proposals for taxation which he has put forward for raising additional revenue to meet the expenditure of the life and death struggle in which we are engaged. The proposed increase of taxation is not likely to entail serious hardship for any section of the people. He appears to have sought to enlist the support of all classes of the people for the prosecution of the war according to their capacity.

Sir, with these words I support the Bill.

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

The Council reassembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU (United Provinces Northern: Non-Muhammadan): Mr. President, the situation is of such a character that we can hardly discuss any domestic question today without reference to the international position. Events have taken place owing to the war which are of profound significance to the world at large. One of their results is that India in common with many other countries has to face dangers which she scarcely dreamt of a few years ago and the dangers are not merely greater. It is possible that they may come upon us much more quickly than the most far-seeing among us can judge. It is necessary therefore that in such a position we should devote all our attention to the security of India. We are discussing today not the financial question but quite a different question. The real question before us is how to make the future safe for ourselves and for our country, and our experience has taught us that association with England by itself is not sufficient to enable us to achieve this purpose. The war has taught us that defence, if I may say so, must be decentralized. Even small countries today are adding to their military strength because they cannot depend entirely on the support of their more powerful neighbours or distant allies. India must make a similar effort. The war has shown the danger of depending entirely on England for our security. Unless India takes this lesson to heart she will soon find herself in a much more defenceless position than that which she occupies today. The situation requires a change in the Government of India and very different political arrangements from those that exist in this country at the present time. I cannot express my own point of view better than in the words of a memorandum which a Liberal deputation had the honour of presenting to His Excellency the Viceroy in August last. After pointing out that Indians will have to depend very largely on themselves for their protection in future it says:

"The cataclysmic changes that have occurred during the last few weeks should revolutionize our ideas of what the defence of the country requires. The situation imperatively requires that a bold and co-ordinated programme should be drawn up and vigorously pursued. To carry out the programme it will be necessary to mobilize all the resources, both moral and material, of the country. The patriotism of the people must be stimulated, young men of all classes trained to serve their country when danger threatens it, and the nation roused to make the necessary sacrifices in order to render the country self-reliant in matters of defence as quickly as possible. The fulfilment of this task will only be possible under national leadership. The situation calls for an Indian Defence Minister and an Indian Government at the Centre. Only in this way can a policy based on the fullest trust in Indians be formulated and unreserved co-operation between the Government and the people secured. Delay in the establishment of such a Government may vitally injure the best interests of both India and England. If, however, the country is made to feel that it is called upon to decide its own future, it will not merely offer its whole hearted help for the rapid execution of such measures as may be necessary to safeguard its own interests, but fight alongside Great Britain with all the energy that self-rule can generate for the cause of democracy and freedom".

I strongly hold, Sir, that the experience of Englishmen themselves and the experience of Indians alike confirm this belief that the country cannot be roused to make the full effort that it is capable of unless it is made to feel that its destiny is in its own hands. Bold and courageous steps are required in order to convince Indians that Government mean to place wholehearted trust in them to enable them to be the future leaders of their country. How have the Government tried to secure this prerequisite to full national effort? I shall doubtless be told, as His Excellency the Viceroy told us the other day, that the offer made by him on the 8th August still stands and that if Indians can only compose their internal differences they will be admitted into the Executive Council as representatives of the political parties to which they belong. Sir, the offer has been described by Mr. Amery as one that was recognized as generous not merely by the United States of America and some other foreign countries but also by a large body of public opinion in India, which is not represented by the Congress. Indian views regarding it may be at a discount, but I will draw the attention of the House to the opinion expressed by Viscount Samuel when the Viceroy's statement was debated in Parliament. He said it was the duty of the Government to balance the treaty rights of the Princes and the moral rights of their subjects, the rights of the majority and the rights of the minorities, and expressed the opinion that nothing should be done to make any minority feel that it could place an effective obstacle in the way of further advance except on its own terms. I shall also, Sir, venture to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Viceroy's offer did not merely lay stress on the communal question but also referred to what he called the "historic obligations" of Great Britain in this country. Mr. Amery, after the publication of the Viceroy's statement, dwelt on the same subject and, speaking in Parliament, tried to draw a distinction between the functions and status of a Dominion India. In order to show Sir, what effect it created on moderate opinion in this country, I can do no better than read out the Resolution passed by the Council of the National Liberal Federation on this subject:

"The statement of Mr. Amery," said the Council, "in which he draws a distinction between the status and the functions of a Dominion with reference to India has caused great apprehension in the minds of the people of the country that what he called British obligations in India may permanently stand in the way of India achieving the same freedom as the other Dominions enjoy. A clear assurance is therefore needed that the contemplated free and equal partnership of India is not subject to any such qualifications".

Mr. Amery has since then delivered many speeches in which he has appealed directly or indirectly to the people of India to accept the hand of fellowship held out to them by the Government but he has never directly and categorically given us any assurance on this point. We have been told that India is to be a Dominion in the sense of the Westminster Statute and at the same time subtle

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

distinctions have been drawn between functions and status. The onus of reconciling these two statements lies on the British Government and this onus has not yet been discharged.

Apart from this, Sir, let us consider the offer itself. I will not dilate on its terms here because they are well known to every Member of the House. I will only ask whether, in the opinion of any Honourable Member, it compares favourably with the power that a Central Ministry would have enjoyed, had the Federal constitution come into force. The task of statesmanship today is not to offer a bit here and a bit there and even this when it is too late, but to do something which will appeal to the imagination of the people of India. If the British Government were serious in their efforts to conciliate India they should have offered something more substantial than the Government of India Act. But instead of that, they made an offer which would actually have given us much less than the power that we would have enjoyed under the Federation had it been established.

Sir, we have been exhorted so often to take an unprejudiced view of the Viceroy's offer, we have been told so often that the Indian Members of the Executive Council would be like Ministers in charge of important portfolios, that it is necessary to point out to our critics, frank and well-intentioned or otherwise, that their efforts were of a kind which they must have known were foredoomed to failure. I cannot believe, Sir, that any serious politician could ask us to accept an offer which compares unfavourably and very unfavourably with the Federal part of the Government of India Act. The Government of India Act itself is open to very serious objections. It enables the British Government to retain the ultimate constitutional power in its own hands and it refuses to yield an inch, practically, in respect of the Indianization of the army or the Indianization of the Indian Civil Service. Yet it seems to me to be better than the offer made by His Excellency the Viceroy.

Sir, I am afraid that, notwithstanding the fact that serious changes have taken place in the world situation during the last 15 months, the attitude of the British Government is still that embodied in the Preamble to the Government of India Act, 1919. They will be the judges of the time and manner of each advance. It is only when we fully satisfy them that we are good boys, when we assure them that we shall act in a manner approved of by them that they will yield real power to us. This belief, Sir, is confirmed by the attitude of the British Prime Minister. During the last war, the British Ministers, and particularly the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, frequently referred to the desire of the British Government to make the world safe for freedom and democracy. Those words are seldom used at the present time. Perhaps, finding that the language in which their war aims were expressed in 1914 proved inconvenient to them afterwards, they are taking care now to use language which is carefully restricted so as to raise no hope in any of the countries under British sway which occupy a subordinate political position. Mr. Churchill, defining Britain's war aims in reply to questions put in Parliament, said that at the moment he could define them only as the defence of England and the right of the smaller nations to live their own lives. There is no reference here to freedom or democracy or to the rights of the bigger nations whose destinies England controls. It has been said, and the statement has not been denied, that when Mr. Amery, in response to a question put in Parliament whether he would make a fresh approach to the Indian problem, said "No", it was Mr. Churchill that was speaking through his mouth. It is most unfortunate that the British Prime Minister who has shown himself possessed of an intellectual vigour which perhaps few of his contemporaries can boast of

and who has shown a rare capacity to rise above narrow-mindedness in respect of European problems should not have taken a higher view of his responsibility in regard to Indian affairs than he has actually done. Had he shown a little imagination in dealing with India, I am quite certain that in time to come India, at any rate in the East, would have been a source of far greater security and strength to England than America with all its wealth and resources and military preparedness can be. I do not know what the future holds in store. But it looks as if in practice there were going to be between the United States of America and England an alliance of the kind that Mr. Churchill offered to France. Here is India, which is already associated with England, and which, if she could only be made to feel that the war would result in her own freedom also, could render help which no Dominion can and for which Britain need make no special efforts through her diplomatic representatives. It is a tragedy of the situation, Sir, that the parties whose interests are so closely related should, at the present moment, be divided by serious differences. The Congress speak of independence, the Muslims of Pakistan, and the British Government of the expansion of the Executive Council. I wish, Sir, that we could free ourselves from the tyranny of words and say something which would reach the hearts of the people and solve the present tangle. It cannot be solved by arguments. There lies no salvation in dialectics. Only the transfer of constitutional power to the people can end the present tension and draw England and India close together.

Mr. President, I shall now pass on to consider the problem of defence specifically. The Honourable the Finance Member, in closing the debate in connection with the Finance Bill, said that he was by his Bill asking India to co-operate in the attainment of her own security, and it is from this point of view that I shall consider the measures so far taken by Government and the position in which India finds herself today. Sir, as the Liberal deputation I have already referred to venture to say to His Excellency the Viceroy, nothing, I believe, could so powerfully affect the imagination of the people and so fully convince them of the *bona fides* of the British Government as the appointment of an Indian Defence Member. That would be a sure sign that the British Government wanted to pursue in the field of defence a genuinely national policy. That seems to me to be the very least that the British Government can do in order to create an atmosphere favourable to itself in this country. His Excellency the Viceroy has referred repeatedly to his readiness to expand his Executive Council. He deplures that representative support is not forthcoming for it. I cannot, Sir, understand why in order to expand the Executive Council, in order to have more Indians in it, in order to entrust a vital portfolio to an Indian Member, it is necessary to have the consent of all political parties? Surely, you will not make the Indianization of the army or the Indian Civil Service dependent on the support of any political party? You will do it if you feel inclined to do so, believing that its natural effect is bound to be to influence public opinion in favour of Britain. Why cannot, for the same consideration, more Indians be appointed to the Executive Council? Why cannot, on the same ground, an Indian be placed in charge of the defence portfolio? No one can indulge in any prophecy, but I venture to think that if this step were taken it would show that in one vital respect at least the British Government were prepared to trust Indians and to rely in future on their voluntary help when they were in need of it.

The next thing that the Government can do in order to appeal to the imagination of the people of this country and to prepare India for her defence is to Indianize the Indian Army. Our soldiers are already Indian. A great deal of war material

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

is being manufactured here. But this by itself is not sufficient to give us a national army. We cannot have what we want unless we have Indian officers to lead Indian soldiers. What has been done in this respect so far? It was stated by the Honourable Mr. Williams the other day that, including the I.M.S., 516 Indians had been granted emergency commissions. He let it be known yesterday in reply to one of my questions that 419 Indians had been granted emergency commissions in the I.M.S. Of these about 300 had, I understand, been granted commissions by the 1st October, the date to which the figure of 516 relates. Well, if we deduct the figure relating to Indian I.M.S. officers from the total of 516 we find that only about 200 Indians have been given commissions as combatant officers. There are I know more Indians under training, but the fact remains that the Government of India have prepared us for our defence during the last 15 months by granting emergency commissions to about 200 Indians only. Sir, I should like the House to compare with this the number of British officers obtained by Government during the same period. I believe that about 300 Europeans were given emergency commissions in this country, excluding the I.M.S. I believe I am right here, but I cannot be absolutely certain as full information on the subject is wanting. In addition to this, as they have informed me in reply to a question of mine, 239 officers have been imported from England for appointment as officers in the Indian Army. Apart from this, 322 officers of the Special Unemployed List have been recalled and about 24 warrant officers have been given commissioned rank in the Indian Army, excluding the Auxiliary Forces. Thus, Sir, in addition to the Britishers to whom they have granted emergency commissions in India, the British Government have appointed in connection with the war about 550 British officers. Now it is perfectly true that they had a lien on the services of the officers placed on the Special Unemployed List in 1935. I understand that they had not been retired. Let us suppose that they had been put in cold storage, and that they have been taken out for use on the present occasion. I would venture to say that if the British Government had a reserve of British officers available to them it was their duty to pay the greatest attention to the need for training Indians as officers quickly and granting them a substantial number of commissions. Yet, even so far as appointments made in India are concerned, more commissions have been given to Britishers than to Indians. This clearly shows that Government are still determined to grant commissions to as few Indians as possible.

Now, Sir, I should like to say one word with regard to the manner in which the recruitment to the army is being carried on. It was announced some time ago that nine and a half new Indian Territorial Force units were going to be raised. One would have thought that an opportunity would be given to people of all classes to join these units as the I. T. F. is meant to provide military training to the ordinary citizen, but according to the messages published in newspapers, this has not been done. Some of the minor sub-class distinctions, according to an A. P. I. message from Simla of July 23, have been removed. Some opportunity has been given to a few other classes to enlist in the Territorial Force. I think that of the new units the Mahratta Light Infantry and a battalion each from Madras and Bengal have been recruited from the populations of those provinces but the rest of the units have been recruited from the Rajputs, Jats, Dogras, etc., in other words from the usual sources of recruitment in the Rajputana and the Punjab.

THE HONOURABLE LT.-COL. SIR HISSAMUDDIN BAHADUR: That is not correct.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : An Honourable Member says this is not correct. All I can say on the point is that this statement has not been contradicted. I think therefore that I am safe in regarding this information as substantially correct. The defence of India requires two things : the training of Indian officers in such numbers as to enable Indians to lead their army, and secondly, the creation of an army representative of the country in general. In neither of these respects has anything been done by the Government. If my Honourable friend Mr. Williams objects to what I have said I will say hardly anything has been done in respect of these questions. We are asked frequently to do our best for the prosecution of the war, but how are we to give the help that is needed ? You are not training us rapidly as officers. Do you mean then that we should help you merely in a subordinate capacity ? Had Government placed more trust and confidence in Indians than they have done so far I have not the slightest doubt that help would have been more willingly given to them than has been the case. In respect of defence they have not treated India fairly. They have shown more solicitude, I venture to say, for the security of Canada and Australia than for that of India. When the war broke out the British Government took steps in consultation with the Dominion Governments concerned to have factories laid down then for the manufacture of aeroplanes. We all know the progress that has been made in this respect both in Canada and Australia and a recent message indicates that Canada will be able to manufacture engines also with the support of His Majesty's Government. Sir, it seems to me that the British Government concentrated all their efforts in the Dominions and ignored India for two reasons. They felt a greater sense of security in having the production of aeroplanes arranged for in Canada and Australia ; and—I hope I am not unfair to them—they cared more for the safety of Australia and Canada, the people of which are their kith and kin, than for the security of India.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Don't you think of Canada's proximity ?

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : The proximity of Canada is a fact, but so far as the eastern theatre is concerned the position of India is of cardinal importance. Secondly, Australia is certainly not more favourably situated from the point of view of distance than India. If the British Government could make vigorous efforts to bring about the manufacture of aeroplanes in Australia, why could they not do the same thing in India ? I venture to repeat that even in this war they have shown more regard for the interests of the Dominions than for those of India. They have added to the security of the Dominions in a vital matter but so far as India is concerned they want to convince us that they are doing all they can to assure its safety by expanding the manufacture of munitions and recruiting more Indian soldiers. While on this subject of munitions I should like to draw the attention of the Government to a statement which was made by Sir Philip Chetwode in 1936. It is contained in a pamphlet on the defence of India published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs on 10th August, 1940. He is stated to have said in this pamphlet that—

“ India already made over 90 per cent. of the requirements of armed forces, guns, shells, machine guns, rifles, munition, boots, clothes, saddlery, harness, vehicles and almost everything except motor cars and aeroplanes ; and these would come soon ”.

This statement was made by Sir Philip Chetwode four years ago. Has the manufacture of munitions in this country been expanded only to increase the supply of munitions for Egypt, Palestine, and other countries, or has the expansion in any way, not mentioned by Sir Philip Chetwode, enabled India

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

to produce what it did not four years ago ? If we are still where we were in 1936, then I am afraid that the Government of India are not entitled to the credit which they have received for their efforts in connection with the enlargement of ordnance factories during the last 15 months.

Sir, just one or two words more before I pass on from the subject of Defence. The aptitude of Indians for flying has been generously admitted by the Secretary of State for India. Speaking the other day in Parliament, he said :

" There is great enthusiasm for the Air Service in India and young Indians with their quick minds and sensitive hands take naturally to flying ".

What is the use that the British Government have made of the Indian aptitude in this respect ? What steps have they taken to draw on Indian help in this matter ? The Indian Air Force is ridiculously small. It may be difficult to obtain more aeroplanes at the present time for this country. But there is a large Air Force in England. Pilots are being trained for it in large numbers in Australia and in Canada. One gathers from newspaper reports that about 25,000 pilots are being trained there. Well, if the British Government wanted Indian help could they not have drawn on the material available in India ? Could they not have made special efforts to have Indians trained not for employment in India but for the R.A.F. ? They ask us to give them the utmost help in connection with the war, yet themselves decline to take the help that Indian young men would willingly, nay onthusiastically, offer if they were called upon to give it. This is the manner in which the British Government exhorts us day in and day out to co-operate fully with them in the war. This is the way in which it proposes to convince us of its sincere desire to assist in the rapid achievement of constitutional freedom in India.

Sir, in India itself, apart from the officers of the Indian Army, the Indian Government seems to have taken good care to appoint only Britishers to positions of responsibility in departments connected with the prosecution of the war. I referred to the Supply Department yesterday and I do not want to say one word more about it today. But I cannot help referring to an instance in connection with the Office of the Master General of the Ordnance which has recently come to my notice. One Mr. J. E. Foster has been made a Major and appointed Deputy Assistant Director of Mechanization on Rs. 1,430 per mensem. Government have admitted, in reply to a question of mine, that he has not passed any public examination and that he does not possess a degree of any University as his studies were interrupted by the Great War of 1914—1918. But they say he has experience of 20 years as a ground engineer and that he was employed as an electrical and mechanical engineer by Messrs. Jessop & Co. and Martin & Co. Sir, incidentally the appointment of such a person by Jessop & Co. and Martin & Co. throws some light on the manner in which officers are appointed in these companies. But I am for the time being concerned only with the Government of India. Mr. Foster was certainly a resident engineer with the Agra Electrical Supply Company on behalf of Martin & Co. I have my ancestral home at Agra and go there very frequently. I ask my Honourable friend Mr. Williams who answered my question, to ask the United Provinces Government why Mr. Foster had to leave Agra.

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. DOW (Nominated Official) : Sir, I don't know whether the Honourable Member is aware that Major Foster is not even now in the Supply Department. He is still in Army Headquarters, in the headquarters office of the Master General of the Ordnance. It is not a supply matter at all.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : I did not refer to the Supply Department. I referred to the Master General of the Ordnance.

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. DOW : I was only clarifying the matter because the Honourable Member prefixed his remarks by a reference to the Supply Department, which in the circumstances seems to be quite unnecessary.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : I don't know what remarks of mine the Honourable Member regards as unnecessary, but I will not retort by paying the same compliment to him. I don't object to the statement that he has made, although it was wholly unnecessary.

Sir, the second appointment that I want to refer to is that of the Director of Public Relations in the Defence Publicity Section. This gentleman is described as Lt.-Col. Jehu. Well, many of us must have known him till recently in quite another capacity. When I came to know that he had been made a Lieutenant-Colonel, I rubbed my eyes and asked myself whether the military authorities attached any value to military rank ? There are, Sir, two other officers in this section but both of them are Britishers. There is not a single Indian officer in the Defence Publicity Section. This is another eloquent indication of the trust that Government have in us and of the sincerity of their desire to give us free and equal partnership in the Empire after the war. Sir, these appointments call for some explanation and I hope that my Honourable friend Mr. Williams will be able to give us some answer which will show that even in the army a new policy will be followed and that our role will not be merely that of hewers of wood and drawers of water. I feel indignant, Sir, at the manner in which Indians have been deliberately excluded from positions of trust and responsibility by the Government. The attitude of Government is such as to make even the mildest amongst us turn against them. That they should even at this time be acting in such a way shows how far one can believe in their professions.

Sir, one may well ask oneself whether if the Congress Ministries had continued to remain in office, the political situation would have been today what it is ? I for my part feel that our position would have been vastly better had the Congress not committed the serious unwisdom of compelling its Ministries to resign in seven provinces.

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras : Non-Muhammadan) : You state how.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : If you have a little patience, I will come to that. The Pakistan movement, in the first place, would not have been used by Government to block Indian advance as it is being used at the present time. If Congress Governments had been in power, the British Government would have thought not merely of the Governments in three or four provinces or of one community but of all provinces and the whole of India. I do not believe in the sincerity of the British Government's statement that it is only communal differences that stand in the way of political advance. Who accepted the Government of India Act ? Did the Congress accept it ? Did the Liberal Federation accept it ? Did the Muslim League accept it ? No organized political party in India accepted it. Yet, it was passed and His Excellency the Viceroy did his best for three years to put its provisions into effect. In the face of this fact how can we believe that it is only the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims which prevent the Government from carrying out their earnest desire to place

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

Indians in full charge of their affairs ? But there is no doubt that the resignation of the Congress Ministries has added to our difficulties. Sir, the attitude of the British Government has long been clear to us. It should have been apparent to those who were parties to the resignation of Congress Ministries that the situation in the future would not be rendered easier by their action. Apart from this, Sir, I do feel that if there were responsible Ministers functioning in all provinces, more organized pressure could be brought to bear on Government in order to place political power in Indian hands. The demand for constitutional change would have come from sources which could not be lightly treated and the importance of which could not be disregarded by Government.

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU : What are the remaining four provinces, which are still functioning, doing ?

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : If there are 10,000 men fighting in the field and 9,000 men run away, is it for them to ask what the remaining 1,000 are doing ? They ought to be ashamed of their flight, instead of asking what other people are doing in the field. Apart from this, the question is not valid at all. The Congress Ministries, while they were in office, never regarded the Ministries in other provinces as on an equal footing with themselves.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Did they ever regard anybody as equal to themselves ?

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : They regarded themselves alone as the spearhead of the movement for Indian freedom. Is it not futile, then, for my Honourable friend Mr. Pantulu to ask me what the remaining provinces are doing ? What were they doing when his Party was in office in seven provinces ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU : We felt helpless and therefore we resigned.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : You did not resign because the Governments in all the 11 or 12 provinces were not your own. You resigned for an entirely different reason.

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU : What was the reason ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : You were victims of a slogan.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : The reasons, I will not discuss here. Otherwise, we shall be discussing them till the evening

(An Honourable Member : What are they ?) If you do not know even what your own Party has done—

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU : We know.

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU : If you do not know the reason I cannot in a few minutes enlighten you on the subject. (An Honourable Member : There are other Members in the House who would like

to know.) Sir, it is this unwise, and supremely unwise, action of the Congress that is responsible for the Pakistan movement assuming its present proportions. I do not propose, Sir, to deal with what was said on one side or the other in respect of the Pakistan scheme. I will only say that the remarks which fell from my Honourable friend Mr. Hossain Imam on the subject seemed to me to be unworthy of a self-respecting person. In order to justify the Pakistan scheme he asked whether we remembered any long period of time during which all the provinces of India were constitutionally united together. What does he mean? Does he mean by his question that as the British Government during the last 150 years have given a formal unity to India, we have no right to ask that India should for ever be united? Why does he remind us of the days when we were weak? Why does he take pleasure in telling us that we were once divided amongst ourselves? Does he want us to be in the same position in which we were say, 200 years ago? I am perfectly certain that nothing was further from the intention of my Honourable friend than to suggest that we had no right to demand freedom. But the remarks that he made seemed to me to be exceedingly unfortunate. In any case, Sir, the position of every nationalist on this question is clear. A friendly understanding between all communities is not only possible but highly desirable, and I still venture to think that it is not beyond our capacity. But the dismemberment of India can never be agreed to by us in any shape or form. We are firm on that point, and I am quite certain that a large body of Muslim opinion itself does not want the partition of India.

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM: Would you abide by the decision of the Muslims?

THE HONOURABLE PANDIT HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU: I cannot, on the question of the entity of India, allow any community to contract itself out of its obligations. When every country is attempting in regard to its external affairs to act in such a way as to add to its security and power, we cannot allow people living within this country to follow policies which would make us vitally weak. That is an elementary fact which everybody of the position and knowledge of my Honourable friend Mr. Hossain Imam should understand. To ask us to agree to the partition of India is to ask us to agree to a stab in our backs. Sir, I do not propose to say anything further on this subject, for, to use the words of the Finance Member, I sincerely believe that those who have made extreme remarks today on this subject will feel heartily ashamed of them very soon.

Sir, there are many other important subjects that I could have dealt with, but I do not propose to prolong my speech any more. I must nevertheless deal with an objection which will certainly be advanced against the position that I have taken up. I shall be told that in voting against the Finance Bill I would be voting against the security of India. Sir, I have dealt with the question of defence at considerable length already. I will not repeat what I have said on the subject, but I would ask Honourable Members to bear with me, while I deal in broad outline with the helpless position of India at the present time. Both in the South East of Europe and in the Far East events are taking place which are of serious import to India. In South Eastern Europe the gallant resistance of the Greeks is the only silver lining to the clouds that we can see. I admire, Sir, the courage and tenacity of Englishmen and the bravery of their forces, and I must pay a special tribute to the Royal Air Force which has put up a magnificent fight against overwhelming odds. Its achievements call forth our sincere admiration. From the point of view of psychology

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

also our sympathies are entirely with England. There is no Indian who can for a moment wish victory to the cause espoused by the totalitarian powers. But at the same time every thinking Indian, every patriotic Indian must reflect on the situation of his own country. Our task today is to reconcile British and Indian interests. So far no section of Indian opinion has hampered the war effort of Government. Yet the enthusiasm that the British Government wanted to call forth has not been generated, because Indians feel that their own position is such that they cannot do the best that they are capable of. We are taunted when we vote against Government measures of being oblivious of the vital interests of our own country. I ask these critics to place themselves in our position and to say what they would have said had they found themselves as defenceless as we do. Our hearts bleed when we think of our helplessness. We feel that we have been reduced by England to such a position that we can do nothing but play a subordinate role. Is it any wonder that in this situation we, thinking of the defence of our own interests along with larger questions, insist that speedy measures should be taken in order to place that power in the hands of Indians which will enable them to guide their destinies and to make their future secure. I hope that the British Government will soon see the wisdom of not tying itself down to a phrase and prevail upon itself to utter the words of hope and create a national government in India and thus send a wave of enthusiasm all over the country and radically alter the situation. I can only hope that they will have the wisdom to follow such a policy, I cannot influence their policies, but at the present time those who are dissatisfied, and in my opinion rightly dissatisfied, with their policy in respect of India have no option but to register their protest by voting against the Bill that is before the House.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB (Nominated Non-Official) : Mr. President, while getting up to intervene in this debate at the far end of the day, I assure you that I will not weary the House by making a long and tiresome speech. Mr. President, no body in this House, not even the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill, will deny the fact that the provisions of extra taxation incorporated in the Supplementary Finance Bill are very hard and that they will carry the hands of the Tax Collector very deep into the scanty pockets of the people of this country. In normal times, a measure like this would not have received the slightest support from anybody in this House or elsewhere in the country. I am sure that the Government of India also would not have launched upon such an unpopular measure if the abnormal conditions created by the war would not have compelled them to have recourse to it. Mr. President, the intensity of the war is not unknown to the whole country. Almost the whole world is ablaze with the flames of a devastating war. Although, thanks to the might of the British Navy and her very strong and elaborate organization, India is yet free from the actual grips of horrors of war ; but the huge conflagration like this cannot leave our country untouched and unmolested for a long time if the fire is not soon extinguished. As a wise and prudent people it is therefore our duty to exhaust all our resources, and strain all our nerves, in making an effort that the fire of war may not extend to India, and India may be saved the horrors from which other unfortunate countries in Europe are suffering. That India is every day nearing to the zone of danger cannot be denied. Aden and Bahrein, both on the frontiers of India, have been bombarded more than once, and the high flames of the fire of war can be seen from the top of our houses. That India is quite unprepared and

undefended is also axiomatically true. (*A voice* : Whose fault ?) My fault, your fault and the Englishman's fault. It is this unholy trinity of the three elements in India which is responsible for this plight. On intervening in the budget debates, in the other House, for several years I pointed out to the inadequacy of our military budget, but no heed was paid to it and it was a voice in the wilderness, and under the influence of the Congress politicians, who always gloried in criticizing the Army budget, we find today that our equipment and our military organization is much inferior to those of even small countries in Europe. Mr. President, the future historians of England will blame the late Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Baldwin for neglecting the armament of their country which brought about the calamity of the present war upon England, and the future historians of India would blame the Government of this country for attaching too much importance to the Congress utterances and for yielding to their demands.

THE HONOURABLE MR. P. N. SAPRU : Too little importance to your utterances !

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB : Mr. President, whatever my friend Mr. Ramadas Pantulu may have said about the good intentions of the body to which he belongs I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that for years the Congress has been working as the emissary of Hitler and they are the fifth column in India. (Laughter). Since the beginning of the war the Congress has been lending strength to the Axis Powers and in return, every day, they are being eulogized by the Nazi officers. Those of us who have taken care to listen to the broadcast from Germany will bear me out that the anti-British activities of the Congress are being eulogized every day and very wide publicity is being given to it by the radio in Germany.

THE HONOURABLE MR. RAMADAS PANTULU : Also to Mr. Amery's speeches.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB : Although my friend Mr. Pantulu says that the Congress has no intention to harass the Government, the matter of the fact is that from the very beginning of the war the Congress attitude has been definitely hostile towards the British and they have been deliberately seducing the people from giving any help, in men and money, for the prosecution of the war. I am very much puzzled at the attitude of Mr. Gandhi in this respect. His utterances have been a source of great surprise to me. He has been self-contradictory all the time. At the commencement of the war when Mr. Gandhi saw His Excellency the Viceroy at Simla he is reported to have shed tears at the idea of the bombardment of the Westminster Abbey and the Houses of Parliament. But what do we find ? When bombardment actually came, not only of Westminster and the Houses of Parliament but also Buckingham Palace was deliberately bombed several times, the crocodile tears of Mr. Gandhi took the form of non-co-operation and civil disobedience. Mr. President, it is a pity that certain English journalists, and some of the mercenary hirelings of the Congress, in England attached too much importance to the utterances of the Congress, being ignorant of the underground currents and the motive which are responsible for the activities of the Congress, and not knowing that by doing so they are striking at the very root of the British Empire and that they were thus cutting their own throats. Mr. President, what is the position of the Congress today ? The position of the Congress is that it never represented the Muslim point of view. Then the Hindu Mahasabha and the newly-born Hindu League have disowned the Congress on behalf of Hindu

[Sir Muhammad Yakub.]

India. The non-caste Indians have declared that they are not represented by the Congress and Congress never represented their point of view. The businesslike Parsi community of India never had a soft corner in their hearts for the Congress and lately the Sikhs have also severed their connection with the Congress. Whom does the Congress, therefore, represent, may I ask my friend Mr. Pantulu ? It represents only a few followers of Mr. Gandhi whose unpatriotic attitude, unwholesome policy and hypocrisy have been exposed by advanced politicians like Mr. M. N. Roy and Mr. Bose. (*An Honourable Member* : Do you disown the Muslims who are in the Congress ?) There are Muslims in the Congress, but there is no flock in which there are no black sheep. They are the black sheep in the Muslim flock. Therefore, Mr. President, it would be an impertinence and sheer impudence on the part of the Congress to claim that it can speak on behalf of the country.

Mr. President, although India as a whole, both the Princes and the people of India, are thoroughly supporting the Government, in this hour of their trial, and voluntary subscriptions and contributions are pouring in from all parts of the country, despite the efforts of the Congress to the contrary, still it is unfortunate that the political parties in the country could not come to an agreement with the Viceroy because he was unable to accede to their demands *in toto*.

Now, Sir, let us examine, for a minute, what is the genesis of these demands. The Congress wanted unrestricted and uncontrolled sway over the whole country. The Congress demand was what would be the demand of Hitler and Mussolini if the British were defeated in the war. Having tasted the fruits of Swaraj in the Congress Provinces during the last two and a half years, the Muslims shuddered at the very idea of being placed under the domination of the Indian Nazis, namely, the Congress. And the Hindu Mahasabha and the Hindu League, as representing Hindu India, wanted nothing less than the pre-Islam Hindu Raj in the country, in which there was no room for any nation or any other community to breathe. May I ask, Sir, was it under these circumstances possible for the Viceroy to accept any of these demands ? Not only the bigger communities but even smaller communities like the Sikhs, a handful of Sikhs in the Punjab, have demanded that they should have their military domination over India in order to establish a Sikh Raj in the country. The Viceroy found a *via media*, and credit must be given to His Excellency the Viceroy for his patience and for his solicitude to meet all the parties halfway, but on account of, shall I say, the curse of democracy established in India and on account of the scarecrow of elections always haunting the minds of our political leaders, no settlement could be arrived at. Mr. President, His Excellency the Viceroy has not yet withdrawn his offer and it is yet open to the so called leaders of the country to come to an understanding among themselves. Mr. President, my complaint against the Government is that they are losing the sympathy and support of their friends in order to pacify and appease their irreconcilable opponents and enemies. Mr. President, this policy of appeasement brought about the calamity of the present war upon England and resulted in England's losing the support of all her friends and allies and she is fighting today in Europe single-handed. It also brought about the downfall of poor Mr. Chamberlain. In the same way, Mr. President, I wish to give a warning to my European friends on the Treasury Benches—and I hope they will take it in the spirit in which it is given and they will communicate it to their masters in Whitehall—that if they will any more follow this policy of appeasement they will meet with the same fate which their bosses have met in England and they will soon lose the sympathy of both the Indian Princes and the people

and find themselves ploughing their lonely furrow in this country. Mr. President, a good deal has been said during the last two days about democracy. My friend Mr. Pantulu says that Congress wants that they should be assured that there will be a democracy of the western type in India before they can join the Government in support of the war. Well, Sir, my friend Dr. Kunzru just ventured to make a prophecy, and I hope you will excuse me if I also venture to make a prophecy and it is this that, if Englishmen persist in establishing the western type of democracy in India without giving any consideration to the conditions prevailing in this country, they will bring ruin upon my country and ruin upon my people and ruin their country and their people also. Although I may not be alive to see the disaster, and I wish I were not alive to see the disaster of my country, but the future generation of English people would curse the present politicians in England for not listening to the advice of their friends which was sincerely given to them.

Mr. President, I have told you I will not make a long speech but there are one or two points to which I must briefly refer. One point, that was raised by Mr. Pantulu, has already been refuted by my friend Sir A. P. Patro. I must also join with him in refuting the charge of coercion which has been brought by the Congress in making collections for the war. So far as the United Provinces are concerned, Sir, I can make bold to say that all the subscriptions and contributions in the United Provinces have been voluntary and spontaneous and no kind of pressure or force was exercised upon anybody. Our present Governor, His Excellency Sir Maurice Hallett, who is well-known to this House, has been making extensive tours in the province, meeting good many people and creating enthusiasm amongst them, and to this is due the success of the war efforts in my province.

Mr. President, I was amused this morning when my friend the Honourable Mr. Hossain Imam, with his long and pointed moustaches, with red eyes and over-swollen face, in a roaring voice, attacked the Government for not taking Indians into confidence. All the time he was addressing the House as "We". I could not understand, Sir, what he meant by "We" unless he was speaking in the language of Kings. (*An Honourable Member*: Royal We). This exhibition of his wrath was given to the House after he had waxed his eloquence upon the communal question and in prosecuting the Congress and my other friends among the Hindus, for not doing justice to the Muslims in India. And yet he says that Government does not take the Indians into confidence. May I ask my Honourable friend which Indians are they whom Government can take into confidence? If they take Mr. Jinnah into confidence today, tomorrow Dr. Moonje will come and say to the Viceroy, "Well, you have given two interviews to Mr. Jinnah and only one interview to me, and therefore I will not co-operate with you."

THE HONOURABLE MR. HOSSAIN IMAM : The Liberals have not refused yet.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB : The Liberals have always stood on the fence. They, in the words of the late Akbar of Allahabad, are neither males nor females. *Na hion men na shion men*. They are opportunists. They abuse the Government at one time and the Congress at the other. They have got no fixed policy of theirs. Therefore, why speak of the Liberals? My friend the Honourable Dr. Kunzru also made a complaint why an Indian was not appointed as Defence Minister. He complained that very few Commissions have been given to Indians in comparison with Englishmen. Well, Sir, if I also may be allowed to state some hard facts, I will say that my complaint is that amongst the Indians who have been taken in the Army, very

[Sir Muhammad Yakub.]

few Commissions have been given to the Mussalmans by the unsympathetic and non-Muslim Boards which were appointed for selection of candidates, and all the Muslim candidates were ruthlessly rejected. Only the other day, Sir, six Muslims out of a large number of candidates were selected at Ambala by a Board consisting of a majority of non-Europeans, on which there was no Muslim. Six Muslims were selected for the Air Force. They were sent to Delhi to be trained under a Hindu and what was the result ? All the six of them have been rejected. Not a single Muslim could be found who had an aptitude for flying. Well, you say that an Indian should be appointed to hold the portfolio of Defence. To whom would you give this portfolio ? If it is given to Dr. Moonje, no Muslim will be satisfied ; if it is given to my Honourable friend Mr. Hossain Imam, there will be a hue and cry in the country that a fanatic Mussalman has been appointed Defence Minister who will declare *jehad* over the infidels in India. That being the state of affairs in this country—an unfortunate condition—it is no use crying that the portfolio of Defence has not been given to an Indian.

Mr. President, it is very unfortunate that conditions in India are such as they are today. I do not say that we have no grievances against the Government. No country under a foreign rule can expect to get all that they want. But, whatever our grievances may be—is there any country on the surface of the earth where there are no grievances ? Is there any Government in any country where some people are not satisfied with the conditions in which they live ? But, considering that there is no country in the world—

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR SRI NARAIN MAHTHA (Bihar : Non-Muhammadan) : Is there any country in the world where there is no difference of opinion between the people ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB : There is no country in the world in which such differences exist as there are between the Hindus and the Mussalmans in India. I challenge it. I have always stated from the top of my voice that no constitution can be framed for India on the lines of any constitution in any other country in the world. You will have to frame a constitution for India which would be an Indian constitution itself and not a copy of the constitution of any other country.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR SRI NARAIN MAHTHA : Long live British rule in India.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB : I was only saying that whatever may be our grievances, having regard to the danger through which we are passing, and having regard to the extreme conditions of the war which threaten the country, howsoever heavy the burden of taxation may be and howsoever great the sacrifices may be, we must submit to them ungrudgingly and we must be prepared to incur still greater sacrifices and heavier taxation in order to save our country from the clutches and subjugation of the inhuman tyrants of the Axis Powers.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) : Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Finance Bill. My objections to it are of two types. One relates to larger constitutional issues and the other relates to points of defence and administration. It was in March last that the Finance Member imposed further taxation of about Rs. 11 to Rs. 12 crores. That was

the additional taxation imposed on India after the declaration of war. Railway fares were increased to the tune of Rs. 5½ crores and by enacting the Excess Profits Tax Act—I am not complaining against it ; I am only referring to it—the burden was increased to the extent of Rs. 3 crores. The excise duties were also increased, sugar contributing about Rs. 2 crores, and the motor spirit about Rs. 1½ crores. Now, within eight months of that, we have to deal with a Supplementary Finance Bill which wants more money—an expenditure of an additional Rs. 6 crores in a full year by taxation. In the remaining four months what is intended to be collected from this taxation is Rs. 2 crores. But we are clearly told that additional expense and taxation is still awaiting us, and we have been told that it is required for defence purposes. In the Financial Statement the Finance Member has given us some figures of what he requires but he has not given us the details of what the money is required for, beyond the fact that it is required for meeting the defence requirements of the country. We are told that an additional recurring expenditure of Rs. 16 crores is needed and that an initial expenditure of Rs. 30 crores will also be wanted. All this so far as this year is concerned he does not wish to raise by taxation. It is only a part he is raising by taxation and the other part will be met by loans. Now, Sir, he has told us frankly that we will have to face this additional expenditure when he comes before us a few months hence and he will probably have to ask for additional money. Now, the question I want to ask is, is all this money required for the defence of British India alone or is it required for the defence of India as a whole, that is, for all those parts of India which are red as well as yellow ? And do the advantages of this defence which this Government provides accrue only to the people of British India and not to the people of other parts of India ? If you keep on raising the burden only on the people of British India you should remember that the enterprise, capital and industry would naturally shift from British India to those parts which at present are not liable to such taxes. What is the Government of India doing to have a fair burden of taxation on every part of India which gets protection through the forces of this Government. Have Government any arrangement about this in mind or have they not ? If they have, what is it and how do they propose to secure a contribution from every part of India to India's defence ? The question becomes all the more important since Federation has been scrapped. What was being contemplated for years has been put into cold storage for the moment and this question stands out prominently. I looked up the papers which Government have supplied with this Bill but I could not find the slightest indication as to how that was going to be done.

Sir, we have to remember that this is a certified Bill. This is a procedure which by itself is outrageous, and it is no valid excuse to say that the constitution is such. If the constitution is such, it is of their own making. It is open to the British Parliament to alter the constitution any moment they like. They have done so even after the Act of 1935. Some of the powers of the Provincial Governments were by an amendment of that Act taken away by a stroke of the pen. The Government of India is to my mind a misnomer, and we have ever to bear this fact in mind in granting money when they ask for it. The defence of India is a worse misnomer than the Government of India. What is this defence of India I ask ? The defence of India in the administration of which we have no part or lot. It is the defence of India only for the purpose of letting the people of India find the money, which those in whose hands our destinies lie are to use in a manner contrary to the wishes of the people of India. Though the question of Indianisation has been in the forefront for a number of years, yet there has hardly been any progress worth the name in this direction.

[Mr. G. S. Motilal.]

A few more officers here and a few more officers there, but it is just a drop in the ocean. How are the Defence forces to be used? Who is to determine it? Not Indians; their representatives have not even a voice in it. They have failed altogether to influence the policy of the Government in this respect. When Indian forces are to be transferred to far off theatres of war, the people's representatives are not even consulted. Their opinion is not of any consequence. Whether they agree or not, Indian forces are transferred to theatres of war beyond their frontier. Last night I was reading the pamphlet which the Defence Department has issued and I came across a very significant passage. It was to the effect that there had been for long an arrangement made with the British Government that India was responsible only for the protection of her frontiers and the maintenance of her internal security, while Great Britain had undertaken full responsibility for the protection of India against attack by any great Power. Then came the Chatfield Report. It made some recommendations. These recommendations have been a sealed book to us. Only some extracts from it were given to us. I do not know why the Government disclosed a part of it and suppressed the other. The people of India do not know, they are not even now allowed to know what all the conclusions were of the committee which was said to be a very important Committee and dealt with matters of vital interest to the country. The Committee made some recommendations and before the ink was dry another arrangement has been made by the Government of India with His Majesty's Government and that arrangement is described in the following words :

"In such cases India's defence would clearly be most effectively ensured by co-operation in the defence of points outside India which are strategically essential to her security".

In other words, under this arrangement India, which formerly was to defend her own frontiers, has now undertaken the responsibility of defending the frontiers of other countries. May I ask whether similar arrangements have been made with the Dominions? Have the Dominions said, "Our frontiers lie in India"? Or is it only India whose frontiers can be stretched to any length like India rubber? India has no real power and responsibility. If she had that real power and responsibility, she would not have agreed to an arrangement like this. If Egypt or the Middle East is attacked, our army is to be sent there. How can India shoulder the responsibility of defending not only herself but other countries under British occupation on the pretext of their strategic importance, while those countries themselves have said that so far as they are concerned they will stand by their treaties and have not taken any active part in the war? It was a very important statement which the King of Egypt recently made in the Egyptian Parliament. King Faruq said that Egypt has executed treaty of alliance and friendship with Britain and has at the same time sought, wherever war has not had repercussions, to maintain tie of serene friendship with the other Powers. On the other hand Indian armies have been sent there without the consent of the people of India. One can well understand why the British Government are not prepared to transfer real power to the people of India. Further taxes, sanction for which is now being sought, are to be used for this very purpose. The army is to be expanded. Its present strength, which is two lakhs, has to be increased to five lakhs, or half a million in English expression. Now such will be the external defence of India. So far it was confined to the frontiers of India. At one time Aden was a part of India administratively. You maintained some force there because India had to defend Aden, but after it has been separated from India you still say not only Aden, but even Egypt and the Middle East must be defended by India. I could very well understand if the British said that they were in

dire difficulty, could not spare their forces, had got a formidable foe, and had therefore asked the people of India to come to their aid and send some of the Indian troops to their far off possessions. Some men of those countries pretend to be very friendly and talk in friendly terms as some of our friends in this House do. Some of those countries so far as words go are sympathetic and use all sorts of expressions of sympathy ; but when it comes to action they will not use their men or material for the defence of British interest in those countries. We are told that war is very near us. I believe war is spreading. We have also to bear in mind the attitude of those countries in regard to the war as also of the Government in regard to Indianization. I say, Sir, that a few officers are Indians and most of them are Europeans in the Indian army. No country can give its assent in voting money for such an army. Even now we are not told as to how many Indian officers will be taken in the proposed expansion of the army. Liberal praise has been bestowed and showered on the Indian officers serving in the army. The argument that has been advanced so far by the Defence Department was that they wanted to see how Indians will fare in the Indianised units in a major war. They have now been tested in a major war and we have now Government's admission about their efficiency and capacity to lead the forces. Let Government now make up their mind that so far as the new units are concerned they will be officered entirely by Indians. But I don't think it is in Government's mind yet. We want a national army and if every Province of India is to give money for the purpose, each one of them should have its adequate representation in a national army. I am not saying that any Province should be excluded, but what is the proportion in which men and officers from different Provinces, like Madras, Bengal, Bombay, the Central Provinces, the United Provinces, Bihar and others, will be recruited ? Will they have a fair share of it or not ? It is no use persisting in the best material argument. That theory is unacceptable. You must realize that every wrong theory which you advanced has exploded. Your pet theory of limiting Indian officers to Indianized units has also exploded. All that for years you hugged to your bosoms you have given a go-by. The theory of suitable material is also incorrect. If Indian youths from every Province are taken into the army, they will become fit material for it. But if you deny them the opportunity, you make them unfit for being good soldiers. May I cite the instance of a friend's son who went into military service and holds a commission. I had seen him before he joined the army. And, Sir, about a year ago he came to see me as he was spending his holiday in Bombay and he was so changed that it was difficult to recognise him. His physique had developed, his health had improved and he looked in every way as good as any other officer. So, Sir, unless they give Indians the opportunity and take them into the army, but instead keep on pleading their specious arguments which they can continue to do to the end of the day, they will never be able to carry us with them.

Sir, there has been in fact a policy of discrimination against Indians in their own country in every sphere of life. Several instances have already been mentioned, but I will mention one more which comes uppermost to my mind sitting in this House. We see the Honourable Mr. Dow here whom we congratulated the other day on his being elevated to the Governorship of Sind. I do not grudge him that elevation, Sir, because I am happy to think that a Member of my House has been so elevated. But there have been distinguished Indian Civilians and not one of them has yet been made a Governor. Is this not discrimination against the Indians ? I know they have been as loyal, perhaps more loyal to the British rule than an Englishman. (*An Honourable Member* : Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai would do quite well.) Not that this much

[Mr. G. S. Motilal.]

alone would satisfy me. It is one of the attributes of Dominion Status, apart from constitutional freedom. In the Dominion of Canada, for instance, Canadians are appointed Governors and the Governor General there is appointed with the consent and approval rather on the nomination of the Prime Minister of the Dominion.

Sir, our main grievance is that in the last war we were told that the war was being fought for democracy, for the liberation of the world, but in this war no such declaration has been made. No such noble purpose is now held out. That was the reason why in the last war there was great enthusiasm in India to support the British Government, but this war, it has been declared, is being fought for the freedom of European countries,—only European countries, and by implication India is excluded. Now, Sir, let them put themselves in our position. I want Englishmen to have some imagination and to use it. India today is a vast prison and every Indian stands behind the bars. If you tell him, "My dear fellow, I am fighting for the freedom of the man in the moon, come along with me and fight my enemies", what would the answer be? Would he not say, "Let my chains and fetters be first removed: let me first have my freedom and enjoy it, then and then alone I can think of fighting for the freedom of some one else"? If you want to fight for the freedom of Poland, or any other land, should you not give me my freedom which you have snatched from me? I was sorry to see that Major Attlee had also joined Mr. Churchill's ranks. We read today that even a Labour Leader like him said that they were fighting for the freedom of their country and of Europe. May I ask Englishmen: Are not Indians equally entitled to fight for their own freedom, even against you?—and to fight with all the resources at their command? You are fighting for the freedom of somebody else and can have our sympathy. But you must remember that there is a difference between sympathy and active support and that you cannot ask a man to be always shut behind the bars of a prison and then expect him to give you his active and whole-hearted support. As a representative of the people of India chosen by a section of them and sent to this House to express their views, I assert that the support which you are getting is not whole-hearted support. It is not possible under these circumstances to give you our whole-hearted support. I now came to the offer for the expansion of the Executive Council of the Central Government. It is claimed that real power would have been transferred to Indians by it. I submit, Sir, that this claim does not stand the true test by which we can judge transfer of real power to the people of India. Even Mr. Brailsford said the other day that what was in effect offered was the status of distinguished civil servants to the Indian Leaders. Obviously the Indian Leaders can not accept this position. Can Indian Members now on the Executive Council of the Viceroy, for whom we have every respect, say that they are the instruments of the will of the people of India and not of the people of England? Can they say that they are free to follow the policy which the people of India want? In and out of time they have been saying that the constitutional position is different from that of the Dominions. Unfortunately, in this country, a great deal of importance has been attached to the letter of the constitution. The power has not been used for the growth of constitutional practice and usage which brought the Cabinet system into being in England. If under the constitution the power belonged to the Viceroy or the Secretary of State, he must exercise it to the detriment of similar growth. Twenty years have gone by since the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms were introduced, and only three Indian Members have been in the Viceroy's Executive Council, and they too not from the Legislature some being distinguished public men and some distinguished public servants

Even if they had been given real responsibility, and the Council had been gradually expanded and constitutional practice of ministerial responsibility adopted, the position today would have been different. Such an attempt has never, however, been made by those in power. It is too late to satisfy us with inclusion of Party leaders in the Executive Council. If Government are prepared to form a Cabinet responsible to the Legislature, let them say so clearly. I know there has been much in the past responsible for the suspicion which exists on either side. You may feel that if real power is transferred to Indians today, they may not help the British Government in the war as effectively as the bureaucratic Government is doing. But statesmanship requires that a new chapter should be opened in our relations. It is within your power now to do it. I do not know what the position will be tomorrow. It is not given to me to prophesy. But, while there is time, you can win India to your side. If you have suspicion in your mind about our attitude, tell us very frankly what you want. We do not want to bargain. Our claim is not a new one. We say that India wants to be an independent nation and she shall have her freedom and responsible Government. You might say we are bargaining. I do not think there is anything to be ashamed of even if we bargain. What are Governments doing every day when they enter into treaties with one another? It is nothing but bargaining, giving and receiving mutual undertakings. If you have any suspicion, tell the leaders frankly. Once they promise you they would stand by their word. As one who has friends among the Britishers, I feel that it is up to all of us—though it rests with you and not with me—to do our best to have a new chapter opened which will set at rest Hitler and his Goebles and their propaganda. What an impression you would create in the world if you tell the whole world that you are fighting for the freedom of various countries but deny it to India, whom you can set free today without firing a single shot, without losing a single soldier and without spending a single farthing? No one can believe you. Hitler is fighting for his hegemony and you for your safety through balance of power and for your Imperialism. Such must be the conclusion. No wonder that the German radio carries on a vigorous propaganda against you and you have no answer to it. I have no answer to it. Some of our friends here abuse us. I have been provoked to say that, if England, the richest country in Europe, with all her vast possessions, can produce a few Lord Haw Haw's, I should also be prepared to have a full share of my own Lord Haw Haw's who will run us down and say that the Congress does not represent anybody. Others say that the Muslim League does not represent the Muslims. Is there any single party in any country in the world which represents the whole nation. Take England herself. Do they not have a Conservative Party? Have they not got a Labour Party and the Liberals, leave alone the other sections? Were there not several parties in Germany? In France, a most democratic country, how many parties were there? 20 parties. Would you say that France should not have self-government and that England should occupy that country?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB: None of these parties claim to represent the nation or the country.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. MOTILAL: I have not claimed to represent the nation. I represent a majority party. The Congress and the Muslim League are the most representative parties in India. When the Congress leaders approached Mr. Jinnah, unfortunately he took up an impossible position. He said, "You must recognize that the Muslim League is the only representative body of the Muslims of India". The Congress was prepared to say that it is the most representative body of the Muslims. It would have been a patent untruth to say that it is the only body which represents Muslim opinion in India. This is how the negotiations broke down. My Honourable

[Mr. G. S. Motilal.]

friend Mr. Hossain Imam has given us credit for being wise and called the Hindu Mahasabha foolish. I wanted to know to which class he belonged, wise or foolish. I did not get an answer but I worked my mind and thought that he belonged to a class which was neither wise nor foolish. I admit there are differences in this country. But has there been any country in which there were no differences? I say there are genuine differences. I do not say it is a stunt. You want Pakistan. You sincerely believe in the virtues of Pakistan. I think you must give me the credit for feeling that Pakistan will be a disaster, not only to me but to you also. Pakistan means the Balkanisation of India. You know the fate of the Balkan States for many years past, and also the fate of Europe. If Abraham Lincoln had not fought for the unity of the American Continent and brought it about, America would have been a warring camp similar to Europe. We feel honestly that the division of India on a communal basis will be still worse. This devastating European war is the result of lack of unity there. There are advantages both to the Hindus and to the Muslims in the Pakistan scheme, but the disadvantages to both communities are surpassing. If you allow fury and passion to run their course, they will not allow you to solve these problems in a cool and collected frame of mind which alone ought to be brought to bear. My Muslim friends will repent the day if Pakistan is ever brought about in India. My friend Mr. Hossain Imam said that Mr. Savarkar had said that he will treat the Muslims in free India as Jews have been treated in Germany. I can assure Mr. Hossain Imam with all the emphasis I can command that we should be untrue to our culture if any Hindu ever did it. We shall lay down our lives before any Muslim is ill-treated. It is not in our culture. I would ask the Honourable Mr. Hossain Imam to read "The History of the Civilizations" in the University Series. You will find that the author who has deeply studied the problem tells you that the Hindus are the most tolerant race on earth. When Jews were ill-treated in other parts of the world, they sought asylum in India. So did the Parsis and even the Muslims. Religious persecution is unknown to this country. We do not believe in the theory that a man who follows a different religion from ours is a sinner and ours is the only road to salvation. We believe in perfect freedom to each person to follow his own religion. We have no quarrel with followers of other religions. Mr. Hossain Imam made a reference to the depressed classes. He said, "How have you treated the depressed classes? Is that the sort of treatment you will mete out to us?" Sir, does he know the history of the depressed classes? No doubt today the treatment is unjust, but the genesis of it lay in giving them more humane treatment than hanging for capital offences. For certain heinous crimes, e.g., the killing of a father or a Guru and offences like that, we did not behead people in those days. They were kept apart from society, and that is how these depressed classes have grown up. (*An Honourable Member*; Certainly not.) You find that in the Hindu books of law, the Shastras, and it is an irrefutable fact. Their sons and daughters lived with them. That is how the depressed classes have grown in this country. But you cannot expect that we shall treat you in the same way, because we are now amending our ways. We do not want to treat them in that way any longer and are trying our very best in the matter. Sir, I do not desire to take more time of the House and finish my speech by saying that I oppose this Bill.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The debate will stand over till tomorrow, when it will be resumed.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 28th November, 1940.