

9th March 1945

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
Official Report

Volume II, 1945

(28th February to 13th March, 1945)

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION
OF THE
FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1945



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

Mr. ABDUL QAIYUM, M.L.A.

Syed GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

Mr. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

Sir HENRY RICHARDSON, M.L.A.

Secretary :

Mian MUHAMMAD RAFI, Barrister-at-Law.

Assistants of the Secretary :

Mr. M. N. KAUL, Barrister-at-Law.

Khan Bahadur S. G. HASNAIN.

Marshal :

Captain Haji SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., I.A.

Committee on Petitions :

Mr. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A. (Chairman).

Syed GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

Mr. GOVIND V. DESHMUKH, M.L.A.

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

Sardar SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

CONTENTS

Volume II—28th February to 13th March, 1945

	PAGES		PAGES
WEDNESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1945—		FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1945—	
Member Sworn	787	Starred Questions and Answers	1238—53
Starred Questions and Answers	787—821	Unstarred Question and Answer	1253
Unstarred Questions and Answers	821—822	The General Budget—List of Demands	1254—90
Short Notice Questions and Answer	822	Demand No. 12.—Executive Council	1254—90
Announcement of Standing Orders—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	822	Refusal of Supplies—No Confidence in the Government	1254—90
Demands for Supplementary Grants—Railways	822—59	SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1945—	
The Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on consideration of clauses not concluded	850—60	The General Budget—List of Demands	1291—1311, 1312—85
Presentation of the General Budget for 1945—48	860—79	Demand No. 72.—Post-war Planning and Development	1291—1311
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced	870	Refusal of Supplies for the Department	1291—1311
The Income-tax and Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	880	Demand No. 16.—Department of Industries and Civil Supplies	1312—27
THURSDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1945—		Failure of Control Permit System and Supply of Consumer Goods	1312—27
Member Sworn	881	Demand No. 26.—Food Department	1327—85
Starred Questions and Answers	881—907	Supervision and Control of Work in Provinces	1328—86
Postponed Starred Questions and Answers	907—08	The Factories (Second Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1311
Unstarred Questions and Answers	908—13	MONDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1945—	
Short Notice Question and Answer	913—14	Member Sworn	133
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Failure to counteract Anti-Indian Propaganda by Britain and America—Disallowed	914	Starred Questions and Answers	1337—59
The Hindu Marriage Disabilities Removal Bill—Referred to Select Committee	914—30	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1359
The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Continued	939	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Composition of the Indian Delegation to San Francisco Conference—Ruled out of order	1359—61
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the Motions to refer to Select Committee and to circulate not concluded	939—46	General Budget—List of Demands	1361—98
FRIDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1945—		Demand No. 15.—Department of Industries and Civil Supplies	1361—82
Starred Questions and Answers	947—67	Cloth and Yarn Position	1361—82
Postponed Starred Questions and Answers	967—69	Demand No. 39.—Geological Survey Government Policy <i>re</i> Mineral Resources of India	1362—86
Unstarred Questions and Answers	969—73	Demand No. 26.—Food Department	1386—87
Resolution <i>re</i> National War Front—Adopted	973—96	Supervision and Control of Work in Provinces	1386—87
Resolution <i>re</i> Removal of Sections 111 to 121 of the Government of India Act, 1935—Discussion not concluded	997—1008	Demand No. 15.—Home Department	1387—95
MONDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1945—		Faucity of Scheduled Castes in Government of India Services	1387—95
Member Sworn	1009	Demand No. 23.—Department of Labour	1395—98
Starred Questions and Answers	1009—37	Labour Policy of Government of India	1395—98
Postponed Starred Questions and Answers	1037—39	TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1945—	
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1038—41	Member Sworn	1399
Short Notice Question and Answer	1041	Starred Questions and Answers	1399—1429
The General Discussion of the General Budget	1041—56	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1429
TUESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1945—		Short Notice Question and Answer	1429
Death of Mr. K. S. Gupta	1057—59	Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Information and Broadcasting Department	1430
WEDNESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1945—		Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Civil Defence Branch of Defence Department	1430
Starred Questions and Answers	1061—98	The General Budget—List of Demands	1430—76
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1068—1101	Demand No. 21.—Finance Department	1430—56
Transferred Starred Questions and Answers	1102—22	Need for Economy and for more stringent Control of Expenditure	1430—56
Transferred Unstarred Questions and Answers	1122—27	Demand No. 23.—Department of Labour	1456—62
General Discussion of the General Budget	1127—62	Labour Policy of Government of India	1456—62
THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1945—		Need for immediate <i>re</i> imposition of Ban on Employment of women underground in Mines	1462—66
Members Sworn	1163	Demand No. 1.—Customs	1466
Starred Questions and Answers	1163—95	Demand No. 2.—Central Excise Duties	1466
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Information and Broadcasting Department	1195—96	Demand No. 3.—Taxes on Income Including Corporation Tax	1466
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration	1196—98	Demand No. 4.—Salt	1466
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Civil Defence Branch of Defence Department	1198—1201	Demand No. 5.—Opium	1466
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	1201	Demand No. 6.—Provincial Excise	1466
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	1201—1205	Demand No. 7.—Stamps	1466
The Mines Maternity Benefit (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1206	Demand No. 8.—Forests	1466
The Indian Central Oilseeds Committee Bill—Introduced	1206	Demand No. 9.—Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	1467
The Income-Tax and Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1206—31	Demand No. 10.—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	1467
		Demand No. 11.—Interest on Debt and Other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	1467
		Demand No. 12.—Executive Council	1467
		Demand No. 13.—Council of State	1467

TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1945— <i>contd.</i>		PAGES	TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1945— <i>contd.</i>		PAGES
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>			The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		
Demand No. 14—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	1467		Demand No. 48—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research	1471	
Demand No. 15—Home Department	1467		Demand No. 49—Agricultural Marketing	1471	
Demand No. 16—Department of Industries and Civil Supplies	1467		Demand No. 50—Civil Veterinary Services	1472	
Demand No. 17—Department of Information and Broadcasting	1467—68		Demand No. 51—Industries	1472	
Demand No. 18—Legislative Department	1468		Demand No. 52—Scientific and Industrial Research	1472	
Demand No. 19—Department of Education, Health and Lands	1468		Demand No. 53—Aviation	1472	
Demand No. 20—Department of Commonwealth Relations	1469		Demand No. 54—Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation met from Revenue	1472	
Demand No. 21—Finance Department	1469		Demand No. 55—Broadcasting	1472	
Demand No. 22—Commerce Department	1469		Demand No. 56—Capital Outlay on Broadcasting met from Revenue	1472	
Demand No. 23—Department of Labour	1469		Demand No. 57—Emigration—Internal	1472	
Demand No. 24—Department of Posts and Air	1469		Demand No. 58—Emigration—External	1472—73	
Demand No. 25—War Transport Department	1469		Demand No. 59—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	1473	
Demand No. 26—Food Department	1469		Demand No. 60—Census	1473	
Demand No. 27—Central Board of Revenue	1469		Demand No. 61—Joint Stock Companies	1474	
Demand No. 28—India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment charges	1469		Demand No. 62—Imperial Dairy Department	1474	
Demand No. 29—Payments to other Governments, Departments, etc., on account of the administration of Agency subjects and management of Treasuries	1469		Demand No. 63—Miscellaneous Departments	1474	
Demand No. 30—Audit	1470		Demand No. 64—Currency	1474	
Demand No. 31—Administration of Justice	1470		Demand No. 65—Mint	1474	
Demand No. 32—Jails and Convict Settlements	1470		Demand No. 66—Civil Works	1474	
Demand No. 33—Police	1470		Demand No. 67—Central Road Fund	1474	
Demand No. 34—Ports and Pilotage	1470		Demand No. 68—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	1474	
Demand No. 35—Lighthouses and Lightships	1470		Demand No. 69—Stationery and Printing	1474	
Demand No. 36—Survey of India	1470		Demand No. 70—Miscellaneous	1474	
Demand No. 37—Botanical Survey	1470		Demand No. 71—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments	1475	
Demand No. 38—Zoological Survey	1470		Demand No. 72—Post-war Planning and Development	1475	
Demand No. 39—Geological Survey	1470		Demand No. 73—Civil Defence	1475	
Demand No. 40—Mines	1471		Demand No. 74—Delhi	1475	
Demand No. 41—Archaeology	1471		Demand No. 75—Ajmer-Marwara	1475	
Demand No. 42—Meteorology	1471		Demand No. 76—Panth Pipoda	1475	
Demand No. 43—Other Scientific Departments	1471		Demand No. 77—Indian Posts and Telegraphs (Not met from Revenue)	1475	
Demand No. 44—Education	1471		Demand No. 78—Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Stores Suspense (Not met from Revenue)	1475	
Demand No. 45—Medical Services	1471		Demand No. 79—Delhi Capital Outlay	1475	
Demand No. 46—Public Health	1471		Demand No. 80—Commuted Value of Pensions	1476	
Demand No. 47—Agriculture	1471		Demand No. 81—Interest-free Advances	1476	
			Demand No. 82—Loans and Advances bearing interest	1476	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Friday, 9th March, 1945

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(a) ORAL ANSWERS

FALSIFICATION OF ACCOUNTS REFERRED TO IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

856. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please state:

(a) whether any investigation was made with reference to falsification of accounts referred to on page 12, paragraph 9 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee;

(b) what has been the result of the investigation; and

(c) what action has been taken against the persons concerned?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) Investigations into the circumstances that led to the irregularities in question are in progress.

(b) and (c). The results of the investigations and the action taken will be reported to the Committee in due course.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know when the investigation started, and who is conducting it?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I understand the irregularities referred to occurred in certain depots at the time the threat of Japanese invasion of South India was imminent. It was reported that the irregularities were caused largely by the general confusion which prevailed in the areas as a consequence of the threat, and were accentuated by the fact that the officers and staff in the depots were few and inexperienced. It has also been suggested that there was no suggestion or suspicion of fraud in any of these cases. The Director of Ordnance Services has been requested to have the accounts examined further in consultation with the Military Accountant General, so that a complete report may be furnished to the Committee at the time of their next meeting.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know what is the extent of the amount involved?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am sorry I cannot say.

ALLOCATION OF WAR EXPENDITURE BETWEEN BRITAIN AND INDIA

857. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please state:

(a) whether in the years 1943-44 the liabilities of His Majesty's Government and the Government of India in war expenditure have been determined in conformity with the principles of financial settlement; or whether any exception has been made with respect to any particular item; and

(b) if so, what those particular items are, and what the financial effect of this is on the finances of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) and (b). The answer to the first part of (a) is in the affirmative. The remainder of (a) and (b) do not, therefore, arise.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: If I may make my meaning clear, may I know whether any exceptions have been recommended like the one referred to in the Public Accounts Committee's report for 1942-43?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: As far as I am aware, this can be said to be an exception which proves the rule. It is because you had this curious marginal case that the matter was brought prominently to notice in this way.

ILL-TREATMENT TO INDIAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN GREECE

858. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable the Defence Member please state:

(a) whether he was aware of the news that has appeared in page 6 of the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 11th February, 1945, that Indian troops' prisoners of war have been ill-treated in Greece;

(b) whether Government have called for information in the matter; and, if so, what the real facts are; and

(c) what action they have taken in the matter?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: (a), (b) and (c). The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given by me to starred question No. 584 and to the supplementary answers on question No. 579, both on the 1st of March 1945.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know if the persons who have been ill-treated have been released by now?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: They have been released.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Have they been personally inquired from and a report received by the Government of India?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: As I have said, the persons ill-treated have been released. We have asked the Secretary of State to make a strong remonstrance to the authorities concerned against the ill treatment.

DELHI DETENUS AND POLITICAL PRISONERS IN FEROEZPUR JAIL

859. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable the Home Member please state:

(a) whether Delhi detenus and political prisoners in the Ferozepur Jail are allowed to read Delhi papers other than the *Statesman*;

(b) whether he proposes to order the repatriation of the above political prisoners and detenus to the Delhi Province; and

(c) whether he proposes to relax the conditions of allowing writing material to the above named?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I would invite attention to the answer given to Sardar Mangal Singh's questions Nos. 102 to 104 on the 3rd November, 1944.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if while the Punjab prisoners in Ferozepore Jail can read all the Punjab papers, Delhi prisoners can only read the *Statesman*?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I do not know.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable Member inquire into the matter, and, if it is correct, allow Delhi detenus to read other papers as well?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: The question of what papers they should read, and what writing materials they should use, is one for the Punjab Government.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if the total number is about 80 detenus and 12 prisoners, and whether Delhi Jail cannot accommodate these 42 people?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: The Delhi Jail is for purposes of administration under the Punjab Inspector General. There is no accommodation for the detenus in Delhi.

EXTERMENT FROM DELHI OF PANDIT SHAM LAL SHARMA

860. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable the Home Member please state:

(a) why Pandit Sham Lal Sharma was ordered to quit Delhi within twelve hours of his release in January, 1945;

(b) whether other detenus after release have restrictions imposed upon them forbidding them access to offices or mills where they could work; if so, why;

(c) the condition of health of Shrimati Satya Vati, and the restrictions which now exist on her free movement;

(d) whether Government propose to allow Shrimati Satya Vati to live in Delhi; if not, the reasons therefor; and

(e) the nature of the restrictions on Dr. Sukh Dev and the justification for the same?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) The Order was made by the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, with a view to preventing him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the public safety and the maintenance of public order and because he does not belong to the Delhi Province.

(b) No restriction orders are made which would prevent him from earning his livelihood in a legitimate way.

(c) Shrimati Satya Vati has had tuberculosis for a long time and is now under arrest in the Silver Jubilee Tuberculosis Hospital, Delhi, after defying an order of the Central Government prohibiting her from being in the Province of Delhi.

(d) In view of the grave opinion that the doctor has given regarding the state of her health, the Government of India have decided to cancel the orders against Shrimati Satya Vati and her mother prohibiting them from being in Delhi without the Chief Commissioner's permission. The Chief Commissioner has also decided not to proceed with the case against Shrimati Satya Vati for defiance of that order.

(e) He is required under an Order made by the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi to reside and remain within the limits of the Delhi Municipality and the Notified Area of the old Civil Station of Delhi. The Order was considered necessary with a view to preventing him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the public safety and the maintenance of public order by agitation in the rural parts of Delhi Province.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: In reply to part (b) the Honourable Member said that there was no restriction on Pt. Sham Lal Sharma going to his place of business. My question is whether there are other detenus in Delhi who cannot go to their places of business.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I am afraid I did not notice that my answer did not quite cover the question. The position as regards Delhi detenus is this. Today or tomorrow we are issuing instructions to guide Chief Commissioners as regards the restrictions they should impose, and these instructions will remove restrictions of the kind objected to.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: With reference to his reply to part (e) of the question, may I know whether Dr. Sukh Dev was arrested the other day and brought handcuffed to the jail?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I have no knowledge.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: The local papers reported this.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What sort of instructions are being issued to the Chief Commissioners?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I have explained that these will remove restrictions preventing a man from going to his place of business.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know if the Government propose to issue instructions that detenus should not be asked to go to police stations to make periodical reports?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: That is included, also in the letter except as an exceptional measure.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Honourable Member will read out to the House the instructions which he is issuing to the Chief Commissioner?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: No; I hope there will be no further complaints in regard to this matter.

HEALTH OF LALA DESHBANDHU GUPTA

861. ***Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Will the Honourable the Home Member please state:

(a) the latest report about the health of Lala Deshbandhu Gupta, M.L.A.;

(b) whether he is suffering from acute jaundice; and

(c) whether the delicate state of his health justifies his detention?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: As the Honourable Member is no doubt aware, Lala Deshbandhu Gupta is no longer in detention.

Mr. Abdul Qayyum: I hope the Honourable Member is aware that when I gave notice of this question, he was in prison.

MOVEMENT OF FUNDS BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND INDIA

862. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Is it a fact that the Honourable the Finance Member has put no restrictions on the movement of funds between the United Kingdom and India to and fro?

(b) Have Government any estimate of the total amount of funds, both on capital and on current account, which have been transferred to and fro, on balance?

(c) Is there a larger movement of funds from U. K. to India or *vice versa*?

(d) Have Government considered at any time since the war any proposal for altering the exchange ratio?

(e) If so, what were these proposals and by whom were they made?

(f) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a remark made by the Governor of the Reserve Bank, when speaking at a function in Bombay, that exchange rates may have to be altered?

(g) Who has the constitutional power to alter the exchange rates—Government of India, or the Reserve Bank?

(h) Do Government propose to give an assurance to this House that no alteration in the exchange ratio will be made until the sanction of this Legislature is taken?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) There is no restriction on the remittance of funds in either direction between the United Kingdom and India.

(b) Statement VIII of the Reserve Bank's Report on Currency and Finance for the year 1943-44 and the figures given in paragraph 25 of that publication give a fairly accurate general idea of the net movement of funds between the United Kingdom and India. Government have no information as to how much of this movement was on capital and how much on current account.

(c) There is a larger movement of funds from the United Kingdom to India than in the opposite direction.

(d) No.

(e) Does not arise.

(f) Government have seen a Press report of a speech delivered by the Governor of the Reserve Bank at the Rotary Club in Bombay in which some mention was made of the exchange rate though not in the terms suggested by the Honourable Member.

(g) and (h). The exchange rate of the rupee is at present fixed by Sections 40 and 41 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934. Any change in the rate of exchange must therefore necessarily be made by legislative process. The function of the Reserve Bank of India in this matter is limited to making a report on the subject to the Central Government in the circumstances stated in section 55(2) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Have Government seen the resolution of the Federation of Indian Industries and Commerce requesting for a guarantee that India shall not lose so far as sterling balances are concerned, should sterling depreciate?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: That does not seem to me to arise directly out of this question.

Mr. Manu Subedar: It arises out of any change in the exchange rates. I submit; and I want to know whether Government have considered the question of guaranteeing India against any loss over the sterling accumulations from any change in the sterling ratio.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: As I understand it, this question relates entirely to the relation of the rupee to sterling, and no matter is relevant unless it concerns the possible depreciation of sterling in terms of the rupee and I do not think that that is what the Federation had in mind.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If the Honourable Member does not propose to give information on that subject, may I ask with regard to (b) whether the report which he mentioned and which I have seen only this morning goes beyond 1941-42?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: This may be the latest compiled and published figures, and I do not know that we would be in a position to furnish any more up to date information in advance of the publication of the report. These figures are not easy to obtain.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Do I understand that it is two and a quarter years since the figures were given by the Reserve Bank and that the Government of India do not possess those figures, or that they are reluctant to give information to this House regarding those figures?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Government are continually keeping accounts of a really up to date character; but it is not easy to compile the results of transactions over long periods to bring those to account at any moment that may be suggested. These processes have to be done in an orderly manner for regular calendar years and I think that there are also sometimes special reasons why the information furnished should not be up to date. I do not say that I am aware at this moment of a consideration of that kind in this connection, but it does frequently so happen.

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

Mr. Manu Subedar: Does the Reserve Bank have a statutory obligation to submit this report?

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

HARDSHIP DUE TO ADVANCE PAYMENT OF INCOME-TAX

363. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Has the Honourable the Finance Member received any representations in regard to the hardship experienced by the public through the advance payment of income-tax?

(b) How much money have Government received during each completed month of 1944-45 as far as the figures are available?

(c) What is the total number of persons, firms and companies who have been brought under the operation of this law?

(d) Is it a fact that during 1944-45 every income-tax payer would have in some cases to pay three times, viz., the delayed payment for the income for 1942-43, the payment on the income for 1943-44, and the advance payment in respect of the income of 1944-45?

(e) Have Government considered that many people have to borrow money in order to make such payments?

(f) What relief with regard to the postponement of such payments have Government instructed the income-tax officers to give?

(g) Have income-tax officers any discretion in this matter?

(h) Do Government propose to apply penalty for non-payment of advance payment even when the party represents that he is unable to pay?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) I take it that the Honourable Member is referring to the provisions of the new Section 18-A of the Income-tax Act which was introduced last year. If so, a few such representations were received from assesses pointing out the difficulties that arose in their individual cases.

(b) and (c). A statement showing the required information upto the end of December, 1944 is laid on the table.

(d) There may be some such cases but they are not a large number.

(e) Yes.

(f) and (g). Instructions have been issued to Income-tax Officers not to apply the provisions of section 18A in cases of genuine hardship, e.g., where the assessee would find it difficult to raise money for payment or where owing to any previous commitment the profits have to be applied to meet such commitment.

(h) The assessing officers will have to decide this on the facts and merits of each case.

Statement showing the number of cases in which demand under section 18-A was made in the year 1944-45 as also the collection made in each month upto December 1944

Month	Number of cases in which demand made	Collections (In lakhs of rupees)
June 1944	8,572	4,78
July 1944	11,834	75
August 1944	26,662	43
September 1944	14,053	10,38
October 1944	8,225	3,38
November 1944	8,430	74
December 1944	4,849	14,63
Total	83,025	35,07

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know whether people have to borrow money in order to pay these taxes, as suggested in part (e) and if so, whether Government have made any provision for their relief or for postponement?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I have indicated that instructions were issued in cases of genuine hardship. It must be remembered that the man who happens to pay three years' income-tax in one year must have had two years in which he paid no income-tax at all.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: With reference to part (a), can the Honourable Member give us any idea as to how many people have been exempted under the instructions that he has issued?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I cannot give that information. I have not got it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Does he know that exemptions have been given?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am satisfied that relief is being given in cases of hardship.

FORMER SILVER RUPEES WITHDRAWN FROM CIRCULATION

864. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the Honourable the Finance Member please state how many Queen Victoria rupees were withdrawn from circulation?

(b) How many King Edward VII rupees were withdrawn from circulation?

(c) How has the silver accruing in this manner been used?

(d) What was the metallic composition of the one-anna and two-anna pieces before the war? What is the metallic composition of the one-anna and two-anna pieces now issued?

(e) Do Government propose to re-issue the silver two-anna piece? If so, when?

(f) What was the proportion of four-anna and eight-anna pieces issued during 1943-44 as against rupee coins?

(g) What is the amount of one-rupee notes still outstanding?

(h) Is it proposed to recall all of them?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a), (b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to part (i) of his starred question No. 99 on the 10th February 1945. Separate statistics for Queen Victoria and King Edward VII rupees are not available.

(d) Before the war the composition of these coins was 75 per cent. copper and 25 per cent. nickel; the composition now is 79 per cent. copper, 20 per cent. zinc and 1 per cent. nickel.

(e) Government do not propose to reissue the silver two-anna piece.

(f) The proportion was 36:19:45 by pieces and 14:15:71 by value.

(g) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to part (c) of his starred question No. 99 on the 10th February 1945.

(h) No.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is the coinage of rupees going on still and are all the rupees produced readily absorbed by the public?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The answer to both these questions is in the affirmative.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Are any rupees being offered back to the Reserve Bank, or does the Honourable Member expect no rupees being offered to the Reserve Bank as being returned from circulation?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Is the Honourable Member referring to the old silver rupee or the new rupee?

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that the rupee coin has an arbitrary definition which includes both silver rupees and notes, I refer to the rupee coin.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: As the Honourable Member knows it is the position that at the present time the absorption of coin is greater than the return of coin.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: With reference to clause (h), is it a war time policy or do they propose not to reissue but to withdraw the one rupee notes after the war?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: It is certainly the policy during the war not to recall the one rupee notes. What may be the policy after the war, I am afraid, is not for me to determine today.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Could we know the metallic composition of the present silver rupee?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I could not give that offhand.

EUROPEAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN INDIA

865. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the War Secretary please state how many prisoners of war of European origin there are in India?

(b) What are the arrangements made for their upkeep, and what is the amount per head which is spent?

(c) How many of them are taken over by Indian States?

(d) What is the total outlay incurred on this subject, and under which head of the Budget is such outlay included?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: (a) The majority of the 29,499 prisoners of war in India are European. In the interests of security I am unable to give the exact number.

(b) Prisoners of War of European origin in India are accommodated, clothed and fed in accordance with scales laid down from time to time by His Majesty's Government as required under Article 4 of the International Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, 1929, known as the Geneva Convention. A sum of approximately Rs. 1,200 per head is spent annually.

(c) None, Sir.

(d) The total outlay on prisoners of war in India to the end of 1944-45 is estimated at Rs. 28 crores roundly. The expenditure is borne wholly by His Majesty's Government and is not therefore provided for under any of the heads in the Indian Defence Services Budget.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is it not true that contracts have been given on Rs. 3, Rs. 5 and Rs. 7 per head for European prisoners of war both in British India and in some of the Indian States and that the rates do not work at Rs. 1,200 per year as mentioned by the Honourable Member?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: I have given the figure of expenditure, that is, 1,200 and that is correct.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the amount spent per head?

Mr. O. M. Trivedi: I said Rs. 1,200 per head annually.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is nothing more spent on these prisoners of war beyond the 1,200 mentioned by the Honourable Member? Is the 1,200 merely for the direct upkeep or does it also include the overhead charges?

Mr. O. M. Trivedi: I was asked what arrangements are made for the upkeep and what is the amount per head spent. I shall look up the details of this amount and let the Honourable Member know.

BASIS OF FUTURE PLANNING

366. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Has the Honourable Member for Planning and Development come to any decision as to the basis of planning which he is making for the future?

(b) Do Government propose to assume direct responsibility for the employment of every adult person in India? If not, why not?

(c) If the reply is in the affirmative, what are the means by which Government propose to reach this result?

(d) Do Government propose to establish a minimum standard of life in this country and to see that such minimum is enforced by Government as well as private employers all over the country?

The Honourable Sir Ardeshir Dalal: (a), (b), (c) and (d). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to Part I of the Second Report on Reconstruction Planning in which the general objectives in regard to planning have been outlined and to Chapter 3 of Part II which deals with post-war employment. Provincial Governments as well as Departments of the Central Government are now engaged in preparing draft five-year plans on the general basis of the Second Report.

Mr. Manu Subedar: The scheme does not contain mention about employment. I am very anxious to know whether the Government of India in their planning have as an objective that no man shall be unemployed in India under their plans?

The Honourable Sir Ardeshir Dalal: Chapter 3 does deal with this question of employment, if my friend will look at it. It is given in considerable length on page 18 of the Second Report on Reconstruction Planning.

REVISION OF SALARIES OF CLERICAL STAFF OF INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT, BOMBAY PRESIDENCY

367. *Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether the salaries of the clerical staff of the Income-tax Department of the Bombay Presidency excluding the Bombay city have been revised;

(b) the scales of pay of such staff of the Income-tax Department of the Bombay Presidency before such revision and after it;

(c) whether any discontentment has arisen among the said clerical staff on account of such revision of the scales of pay of the upper grade staff;

(d) whether Government propose to reconsider their decision about the revision of the scales of the clerks and allow them to draw old scales which they were already drawing before the introduction of the revised scales; if not, why not; and

(e) whether it is not a fact that the said staff had to suffer on account of the policy adopted by the Government of India in not confirming the Government employees?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) Yes, in so far as the posts borne on the upper grades are concerned.

(b) I lay a statement on the table.

(c) Not as far as I am aware.

(d) Government will be prepared to reconsider their decision if they are satisfied that taking the staff as a whole the disadvantages accruing from the revision out-weigh the advantages.

(e) I am not aware of any hardship peculiar to this staff.

Statement

The pre-existing and the new scales are the following :

	Pre 1931 scale	Post 1931 scale	Scale introduced in January, 1945.
First grade Head clerks	110-8-150	100-5-150	} 60-5-80 (E.B.)— 5-120 (E. B.)— 5-150.
Second grade Head clerks	80-5-105	80-4-100	
Senior clerks	105-5-140	100-5-125	
First grade clerks	85-5/2-100	85-5/2-100	

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Has the Honourable Member not received any representations to say that those clerks that were raised have been demoted, so far as the pay is concerned?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I dare say that certain individuals had some reasons for discontent. I understand that Government are considering sympathetically many individual cases of hardship on their merits.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am not asking about individual cases but with regard to the junior clerks who were raised to senior clerks very shortly and afterwards their pay was so adjusted that they were again demoted.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I will be frank with the Honourable Member. I know less about it than he does. My pre-occupations are such that I do not have the time to master the details of these petty establishment cases.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am not in a position to answer supplementary questions.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: What are we here for then? These are questions which should be answered.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I deprecate all questions of this kind. I do submit, Sir, that it is not possible for an extremely busy Member of Government at a time like this to master the details in such a way as to be able to answer further supplementary questions that may be asked. It is physically impossible.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: There is good reason to refuse supplies on these grounds.

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

INCONVENIENCE TO GOVERNMENT STAFF OWING TO NON-CONFIRMATION.

868. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state whether it is not a fact that the policy of not confirming the Government staff, specially in the Income-tax Department, has caused much inconvenience to them with regard to their leave, revision of scales and pension?

(b) Do Government propose to discontinue this practice? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) Some inconvenience to the staff in question arises as the result of the general policy of Government not to confirm, during war time, officiating men against permanent vacancies and to continue temporary posts on a temporary basis. The Income-tax Departments are, however, not alone in this respect. This policy is dictated mainly by the decision, again as a matter of general policy, to reserve a certain percentage of permanent and quasi-permanent posts for war service men and in so far as temporary posts are concerned by the difficulty in deciding during the period of the war how many of such posts created during this period will really be required in peace time on a permanent basis for normal work.

(b) In view of the reply to part (a) this does not arise.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I ask the Honourable Member to issue a circular to these people that they should keep quiet until the war is over?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I think the establishments in question are aware of the reasons why they have to be maintained on a temporary basis.

CONTROL OF APPELLATE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INCOME-TAX.

869. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state whether the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax are working under the control of the Commissioner of Income-tax?

(b) Have the said Appellate Assistant Commissioners to look to the Commissioner of Income-tax for their confirmation?

(c) Is it a fact that Appellate Assistant Commissioners at the time of hearing appeals have to send cases to the Income-tax Officers for re-examining the disputed points?

(d) Does the Honourable Member propose to see that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners are provided with their own examiner of accounts for re-examining the disputed points? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax are under the Commissioners of Income-tax only for immediate administrative purposes. It is the Central Board of Revenue that exercises direct administrative control over them.

(b) Appellate Assistant Commissioners are appointed and confirmed by the Central Government.

(c) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to Section 31(2) of the Income-tax Act.

(d) No. Government do not consider it necessary to do so.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: With regard to (c), is not the system of sending the appeals to the Income-tax officers prejudicing the decision of the higher officers?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: No, Sir. It is not a fact.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I suggest to the Honourable Member that in view of his pre-occupations and pressure of work during the next ten days it will be better for him to ask his Secretary to answer the questions and the supplementaries?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I am quite prepared to consider that.

DIFFERENTIATION AS REGARDS PENSION OF DAFTARIES OF CERTAIN OFFICES

870. *Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to say if it is a fact that the scales of pay of Daftar es attached to the offices of, (i) the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs and Auditor General, and (ii) the Accountant General, Central Revenues, and Chief Controller of Supply Accounts are identical and the duties and responsibilities of these classes of Daftaries are similar? If so, will the Honourable Member kindly state the reason for treating them differently in regard to pension admissible to them?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the replies which I gave to starred questions No. 192 on the 25th February, 1943, and No. 704 on the 21st November, 1944, on this subject.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In view of the fact that in the present day, the salaries of other Departments are being raised, why these poor daftaries are left alone?

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

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am not arguing. I am asking a question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Under the guise of putting a question, the Honourable Member is arguing.

PROVISION FOR MINISTERIAL STAFF WORKING IN TEMPORARY WAR VACANCIES

871. *Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Will the Honourable the Home Member please state:

(a) the measures contemplated to provide employment to the ministerial staff of the Government of India employed at present in temporary war vacancies and who will be thrown out of employment at the end of the war;

(b) whether it is proposed to absorb them permanently in the regular Secretariat services;

(c) whether the services of the staff so employed are to be counted as war service; and

(d) if the answer to part (c) is in the affirmative, why the new scales of pay for the temporary personnel have been fixed at a lower level recently?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) and (b). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the Home Department *Press Communiqué* of the 7th September, 1943, wherein provision has been made for the absorption of those temporary Government servants who are otherwise suitable and eligible for permanent appointment in 90 per cent. of the vacancies filled on a temporary basis during the war.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise.

FORCIBLE REALIZATION OF MONEY FOR DEFENCE DRIVE FROM CERTAIN PERSONS IN NAINI TAL

872. *Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: (a) Has the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member been drawn to the article of Lala Mohan Lal Sah, M.L.C., (Rais and Banker of Naini Tal) published in the *Leader* of Allahabad in its issue of the 21st February, 1945, under the caption 'National Savings Drive' regarding the forcible realization of money for the defence drive from his *thikadar*, his *Sajbi* and from the Munshi of Mohan Lal?

(b) Was, as the article goes on, the Munshi of Mohan Lal called to the Tehsil abused and threatened with getting the locks of his hair pulled out and that he was detained and not allowed to go until he promised to bring some security for payment of this money?

(c) Has the Honourable Member enquired into these allegations in view of his recent promise on the floor of the House that he would do so if specific cases were brought to his notice? If so, with what results?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The matter is under investigation.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: How long will this investigation take? Will it be dealt with in this Session?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I cannot say.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable Member place the results of the investigation on the table of the House as answer to supplementary question?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I dare say that a reply would be given to any question that is asked.

873* and 874*. [Cancelled.]

RUPEE NOTES AND COINS IN CIRCULATION

†875. *Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: (a) Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state the amount of rupee notes issued by the Government of India and in circulation as on the 31st of January, 1945?

(b) What is the amount of rupee coin in circulation on that day?

(c) What is the cost of paper and printing of a rupee note?

(d) What is the cost of silver and alloy in a rupee coin and its minting charges?

(e) What is the estimated average life of a rupee note, a five rupee note and a ten rupee note and a rupee coin?

(f) Do Government propose replacing the rupee note with a rupee coin out of the silver obtained from U. S. A. under lease-lend?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) and (b). The number of rupee notes and coins in circulation is almost equal at present.

(c) The average cost of paper and printing of a rupee note is 2/3rds of a pie.

(d) At present market price the cost is:

Silver	Rs.
Alloy	·638
and Minting cost	·011
	·008
	·657

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

(e) Under present conditions it is difficult to estimate the average life of one, five and ten rupee notes. The average life of a rupee coin is estimated at 50 years.

(f) No, but it is our policy to improve the proportion of coin to notes as far as possible.

MUSLIMS IN SUBORDINATE ACCOUNTS SERVICES OF POSTAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT

876. *Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please state:

(a) the total number of posts of Subordinate Accounts Services sanctioned for each Postal Audit Office;

(b) the number of posts held by Muslims, Hindus and other minority communities in each Postal Audit Office;

(c) the percentage of Muslims in the Subordinate Accounts Services of the Postal Audit Department fixed for each Audit Office;

(d) whether he is aware of the fact that the percentage of Muslims in the Subordinate Accounts Services referred to above either by promotion or direct recruitment is meagre as compared to the ratio fixed for the recruitment of clerks in different cadres;

(e) if the answer is in the affirmative, what steps Government have hitherto taken to keep up the percentage of Muslims in the Subordinate Accounts Services; and

(f) in view of the inadequate representation of Muslims in the Subordinate Accounts Services, whether the Honourable Member proposes to see that the percentage fixed for the recruitment of Muslims as clerks in each Audit Office is also maintained in respect of promotions to the Subordinate Accounts Service Cadre from that of the clerks who are eligible for promotion after passing out the departmental examination and that due share is given to Muslims in the Subordinate Accounts Services?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) and (b). I lay a statement on the table of the House.

(c) Subordinate Accounts Service posts are at present being filled only by the promotion of clerks who have passed the Subordinate Accounts Service Examination according to a seniority list based on the date of passing the examination. As no direct recruitment is being made the communal rules do not apply and no reservation is made for any community.

(d), (e) and (f). In view of the answer to part (c) these questions do not arise.

Statement

(a) The number of Subordinate Accounts Service posts, permanent and temporary, sanctioned for each Postal Audit Office is:

	Permanent	Temporary
Calcutta Audit Office	32	3
Delhi " "	24	2
Madras " "	11	..
Nagpur " "	18	4

(b) the number of posts held by Muslims, Hindus and other minority communities in each Postal Audit office is:

Calcutta Audit Office	Hindus	33
	Muslims	..
	Other minority communities	2
Delhi Audit Office	Hindus	22
	Muslims	3
	Other minority communities	1
Madras Audit Office	Hindus	10
	Muslims	..
	Other minority communities	1
Nagpur Audit Office	Hindus	22
	Muslims	..
	Other minority communities	..

MUSLIM CANDIDATES FROM POSTAL AUDIT OFFICE, NAGPUR, ETC., FOR 'A' GRADE EXAMINATION.

877. *Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please state:

(a) the total number of candidates who appeared from the Postal Audit Office, Nagpur, and Army Postal Pay and Accounts' Office, Nagpur, for the "A" Grade Examination held in October, 1944;

(b) the total number of candidates who have been declared successful in that examination from Nagpur;

(c) the number of Muslim candidates who appeared from both the offices;

(d) the number of Muslim candidates who were declared successful in that examination;

(e) whether he is aware that some seats are reserved for the Muslims in all the competitive examinations; if so, the percentage of posts reserved for the Muslims in the above "A" Grade Examination; and

(f) whether he proposes to see that a sufficient number of Muslims are promoted to the "A" Grade to make up the percentage of the reservation?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) to (d). I lay a statement on the table of the House.

(e) and (f). Promotions to grade "A" are made exclusively through departmental tests and are purely on merit. As there is no direct recruitment to grade "A" posts, the communal orders do not apply and no reservation is made for any community.

Statement

(a) and (b) The number of candidates who appeared from the Postal Audit Office, Nagpur and the Army P. and T., Pay and Accounts Office, Nagpur, in the departmental test for promotion to grade "A" and the number of candidates who were promoted on the results of the test are as follows

Name of office	Number of candidates	Number promoted
Nagpur Audit Office	53	24
Army P. and T., Pay and Accounts, Office, Nagpur.	15	7

(c) and (d). The number of Muslim candidates who appeared from both the offices and the number promoted is:

Name of Office	Number of Muslims appeared	Number promoted
Nagpur Audit Office	1	Nil
Army P. and T., Pay and Accounts Office, Nagpur	3	Nil

DEBIT OF INCOME-TAX ON HOUSE AND WATER TAXES PAID TO MUNICIPALITIES
IN UNITED PROVINCES

878. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please refer to his reply to starred question No. 666 on November 21st, 1944, and state:

(a) what action he has taken, in view of the Allahabad High Court ruling in that behalf, to debit income-tax charged on the amounts paid as house and water taxes to the municipalities in the U. P.; and

(b) if the taxes have been and are being recovered during the current year?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) In cases where the tax was paid before the High Court ruling, without the assessee having taken any steps to appeal against the assessment, the assessment became final and conclusive under the Law. No action of the nature suggested by the Honourable Member is therefore legally possible in such cases. In cases, however, where appeals or revision applications were filed in time, instructions have been issued to revise the assessments in due course in the light of the decision of the Privy Council, an application for leave to appeal to that body having already been filed.

(b) Instructions have been issued to postpone recovery of income-tax due on the amount of the taxes paid pending the decision by the Privy Council.

REVISION OF INCOME-TAX MANUAL

879. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please refer to his reply to starred question No. 667 on November 21st, 1944, and state what progress, if any, has been made in the preparation of an up-to-date Income-tax Manual?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The Manual has been compiled and is being printed.

PERSONS EXEMPTED FROM RECEIVING CERTAIN INCOME-TAX NOTICES

880. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable the Finance Member please refer to his reply to starred question No. 696 on November 21st, 1944, and state if there are any classes of persons exempted from the necessity of receiving such notices, requiring them to attend income-tax offices with account books, etc.; and, if so, under what law?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: There are no such classes.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: In view of the fact that the section of law to which the Honourable Member referred before clearly states that such notices will be issued only in case the Income-tax Officer is not satisfied, may I know if it is a fact that the Income-tax Officer issues such notices as a matter of routine or does he examine each case on its merits before issuing notice?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I suppose if he is required to issue notice in cases where he is not satisfied, that he does not issue them as a matter of routine in all cases.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact—I mean no offence—that Income-tax Officers issue such notices, only to non-officials and that high officers of State are exempt from receipt of such notices?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I do not think that is what the law courts call ratio discriminis.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Without trying to be impertinent in the least, may I ask if the Honourable Member himself receives such notice and whether he had to cool his heels in the verandahs of the Income-tax office on the date specified from 11 A.M. till 5 P.M.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I do not remember having received such a notice, but I have had to enter into quite an irritating correspondence.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member issue some instructions that at least

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

BAN ON ENTRY AND PUBLICATION OF BOOKS BY KARL MARX, ETC.

881. *Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: Will the Honourable the Home Member please state:

(a) if Government have placed a ban on the entry and publication in India of books by Karl Marx, Engels and Lenin and on books on Soviet Russia and the last Spanish Civil War; and, if so, the names of these books and the reasons for the ban;

(b) if Government have placed a similar ban on any book on the American War of Independence; and

(c) if Government pay any subsidies to persons in India or abroad to publish commentaries in accordance with their views on books referred to in (a); and, if so, the amounts of these subsidies and the persons to whom they are paid?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) The entry into, and publication in, India of books of these types, have been banned only in the cases of "The Paris Commune" by Lenin and "Civil War in France" by Marx (for reasons given in my answer to Mr. Abdul Qaiyum's starred question No. 348 on 19th February, 1945); and "The Revolution of 1905" by Lenin, because it contains instructions in the tactics of violent revolution.

(b) and (c). No.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Are these books banned in U. K.?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I have no knowledge.

Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: Are any publications from Russia banned from entering into this country?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: Not, as far as I know.

Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: May I know if the Government do not fear that publications on the American War of Independence will promote revolution in India?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I cannot answer that.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: Is there not a treaty between Russia and England? Why should these books be banned here?

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

PAY, ALLOWANCE, ETC., OF BRITISH AND INDIAN SOLDIERS

882. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will the War Secretary please state:

(a) the pay of Indian sepoy and British soldiers, separately;

(b) the allowances, if any, allowed in any and all circumstances to Indian sepoy and British soldiers, separately; and

(c) the costs of uniforms and other articles of use supplied to Indian Sepoy and British soldiers, separately?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: (a) and (b). I lay a statement on the table.

(c) The initial cost of uniform, necessaries and equipment issued to Indian soldiers is Rs. 125-11-0 and to British soldiers is Rs. 135-10-0. When entitled to an extra issue of warm clothing, both British and Indian soldiers receive the same articles which are valued at Rs. 54-13-0.

Statement showing Pay and Allowances admissible to British Other Ranks and Indian Sepoys

(A) Pay and Allowances admissible in India

I. Pay	British Other ranks *Pay of rank Rs. p. m.	I. Pay Sepoy.	Indian Sepoys			Total Rs. p. m.
			Pay of rank Rs. p. m.	G. S. Pay/ Prof. P. y Rs. p. m.	S. P. P. Rs. p. m.	
<i>Private Class II.</i>						
Under 6 months' service.	68-7	On enlistment.	18	18
With 6 months' service.	68-7	After 6 months' service.	18	1	3	22
With 1 years' service.	79-14	vice.				
With 2 years' service.	91-4	After 1 years' service.	18	3-8	5	26-8
With 3 years' service.	96-15	After 3 years' service.	18	3-8	5	26-8
<i>Private Class I.</i>						
With 6 months' service.	79-14					
With 1 years' service.	91-4					
With 2 years' service.	102-11					
With 3 years' service.	108-6					
<i>Private Class I-A.</i>						
With 3 years' service.	114-1					

Plus batta in field service areas ranging from Rs. 8 to Rs. 21 per mensem.

*Converted at 1s. 4d. to the rupee.

II. War Service Increments and Japanese Campaign Pay

War Service Increments.

After 3 years' War Service from 3-9-39. For each subsequent year's War Service upto a maximum of 6 years.

II. War Service Increments

After 3 years' War Service from 3-9-39. For each subsequent year's War Service upto a maximum of 6 years.

British Other Ranks.

Rs. 22-13 p. m. Japanese Campaign Pay.
Rs. 22-13 p. m.

Sepoy

Rs. p. m.
4

Rs. p. m.
2

British Other Ranks (British Service only)

British Other Ranks.

III. Married allowance admissible under Indian Regulations to families in India.

(i) Family Allowance.

Wife. Wife + 1 child.

Wife + 2 children.

Wife + 3 children.

Rs. p. m.

Rs. p. m.

Rs. p. m.

Rs. p. m.

All Ranks. 30

86

136

181

Each additional child Rs. 45.—

(ii) Separation Allowance at Rs. 18 p. m. for all ranks when the husband is separated due to the exigencies of the service.

(iii) Families receive free accommodation and all ed services or compensation in lieu up to a maximum of Rs. 50 per mensem.

NOTE.—British Other Ranks whose families are ex-India receive married allowance under separate code.

Statement showing Pay and Allowances admissible to British Other ranks and Indian Sepoys.

I. Pay		British other ranks		Paiforce		Indian Sepoys	
Private Class II.	*Pay of rank.	*Total.	*Col. Allowance.	*Pay of rank.	*Total.	Pay of G. S/ S. Prof rank.	*Total.
Under 6 months' Service	60-13	67-9	60-13	18-9	79-8	18	79-8
With 6 months' "	60-13	67-9	60-13	18-9	79-8	18	79-8
With 1 years' "	71-0	77-12	71-0	18-9	89-9	18	89-9
With 2 years' "	81-2	87-14	81-2	18-9	99-11	18	99-11
With 3 years' "	86-3	92-15	86-3	18-9	104-12	18	104-12
Private Class I.							
With 6 months' service	71-0	77-12	71-0	18-9	89-9		89-9
With 1 years' "	81-2	87-14	81-2	18-9	99-11		99-11
With 2 years' "	91-4	98-0	91-4	18-9	109-13		109-13
With 3 years' "	96-5	103-1	96-5	18-9	114-14		114-14
Private Class I-A.							
With 3 years' service	101-6	108-2	101-6	18-9	119-15		119-15
NOTE :—This statement does not include deferred pay which is 6 d. per diem for B. O. Rs., and Rs. 3 per mensem for Indian Sepoys.							
II. War Service Increments and Japanese Campaign Pay.							
War Service Increments.							
After 3 years' war Service from 3-9-39							
a maximum of 6 years.							
Rs. p. m.							
11-7							
British Other Ranks.							
22-13							
@ Japanese Campaign Pay.							
British Other Ranks (British Service only)							
Rs. 22-13 p. m.							
III. Married allowance admissible under Indian Regulations to families in India.							
(i) Family allowance.							
Wife.							
Rs. p. m.							
30							
Wife + 1 Child.							
Rs. p. m.							
86							
Wife + 2 Children.							
Rs. p. m.							
136							
Wife + 3 Children.							
Rs. p. m.							
181							
All ranks							
Each additional child Rs. 45 p. m.							
(ii) Separation allowance at Rs. 18 p. m. for all ranks when the husband is separated due to the exigencies of the service.							
(iii) Families receive free accommodation and allied services or compensation in lieu up to a maximum of Rs. 50 p. m.							
NOTE :—B. O. Rs. whose families are at-India receive married allowance under a separate code.							
* Converted at 1/6 d. to the rupee.							
† Japanese Campaign pay is admissible to entitled personnel serving in Ceylon and eastwards to longitude 180 degrees (excluding U. S. S. R. only).							

Notes :—1. Batta has not yet been sanctioned for Cylon
 2. Indian troops serving in Assam, including Indian States under the jurisdiction of the Government of Assam, and the Bengal Presidency east of Brahamputra, Jamuna, Padma, and Meghna Rivers and the whole of Chittagong civil division receive batta.

For each subsequent year's War Service up to a maximum of 6 years.

For each subsequent year's War Service up to a maximum of 6 years.

Mr. Manu Subedar: How much of this goes to recruiting agents? May I know whether these figures are separate for different military personnel?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: Nothing. It is not included here at all.

RECRUITS FROM BIHAR

883. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will the War Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of recruits, combatants and non-combatants, from the Province of Bihar, district by district; and

(b) if the appointments in (a) have been made permanently or only as a war measure?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: (a) No statistics of recruitment by districts are maintained at General Headquarters. As regards the total recruitment from the province of Bihar, I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to starred question No. 784 on the 6th March, 1945.

(b) The appointments have been made as a war measure.

Mr. Manu Subedar: How much per head was paid for the Province of Bihar for recruitment? What is the scale of payment per head to the recruiting agents for each man they capture?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: I repudiate the insinuation by the Honourable Member that these men are captured. It is entirely on a voluntary basis that these people are recruited.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know if the Honourable Member is aware that in the answer referred to by him, only recruits from the Province of Bihar are mentioned. The question asks district by district?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: No statistics of recruitment by districts are maintained at General Headquarters. As regards the total recruitment from the province of Bihar, I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I gave a few days ago.

884*. [Cancelled.]

COLLECTION OF EXCISE DUTY ON ARECANUT IN CERTAIN AREAS

885. *Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde: Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether arecanut in the hands of traders and growers on the 31st January, 1944, were subjected to excise duty in the areas comprising South Kanara District, Bengal, North Kanara, Malabar, Nilgiris, and Coorg;

(b) the total duty collected in the district of South Kanara on arecanut stock found on the 31st January, 1944;

(c) whether any representations were received with regard to refund of that duty from the growers and traders; if so, what orders have been passed;

(d) the conditions imposed for the refund;

(e) whether any representations were received with regard to the difficulties to fulfil the conditions imposed;

(f) what steps have been taken to relieve the distress of the assesseses;

(g) the rules regarding arecanut taxation first published; and

(h) whether the Honourable Member is aware that Inspectors who have been recruited to enforce the collection of duty have been issuing certificates to some traders and growers showing that the stocks were old and not liable to excise duty; and whether they are empowered to issue such certificates.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The information is being collected and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

886. *[Cancelled.]

NON-OBSERVANCE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF KING'S REGULATIONS IN THE CASE OF INDIAN FORCES

887. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Has the attention of the War Secretary been drawn to the fact that provisions of paragraphs 585 and 586 of the King's Regulations have remained unenforced in the case of His Majesty's Indian forces raised for the duration of war from amongst the inhabitants of India, that soldiers have suffered to be arrested by police or by Warrants of Criminal

Courts instead of by summons and that no officer had been detailed to watch the proceedings in the Civil Courts?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will he please state the authority for the non-compliance of the provisions of King's Regulations?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: (a) and (b). The Honourable Member is presumably referring to paras. 598 and 599 of the King's Regulations, 1940, which have replaced paras. 585 and 586 of the King's Regulations, 1935. King's Regulations apply to personnel of the Indian Army only when they are not at variance with the Regulations for the Army in India. Rule 383 of the Regulations for the Army in India provides for the arrest of a soldier by the Police for a cognisable offence, and Rule 388 of the same Regulations provides for the defence in civil courts of soldiers charged with criminal offences, but contains no direction that an officer should attend the trial.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Does the same procedure apply to British soldiers employed in India?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: Yes, Sir.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY

888. *Mr. K. O. Neogy: (a) Will the Honourable the Home Member please refer to his reply to part (a) of starred question No. 687 of the 21st November, 1944, and state the nature and extent of the subversive activities of which the organization known as the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society has been known to be guilty of?

(b) When did these subversive activities first come to the notice of Government, in which parts of the country were such activities carried on, and who were the principal culprits? Were these culprits put on trial for participation in these activities? If so, with what result, and, if not, why not?

(c) What are the reasons for which a ban was imposed on the importation into, and publication in, India of all publications of this organization, and what are the reasons for the subsequent removal of the said ban?

(d) Is it a fact that certain restrictions on the movement or other activities of some members of this organization imposed during the period of the aforesaid ban, still continue in spite of the withdrawal of the ban? If so, for what reasons?

(e) Has the literature seized from the office and individual members of this organization been restored to them since the withdrawal of the ban?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) to (e). The Society's doctrine is generally pacifist and opposed to any temporal authority. That is the reason why its publications were banned in December, 1942 and presumably also the reason why in a number of cases the ban was defied. As the Honourable Member was informed in my reply to his question No. 686 of 21st November 1944 the ban has now been removed. No further action has been taken by the Government of India against the Society.

The action that was taken to enforce the ban was taken by Provincial Governments. For such information as I have I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave on 21st November 1944 to his question No. 687. I have no information whether Provincial Governments have found it necessary to take any other action against the Society or whether they have returned any literature that may have been confiscated by them.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: Then may I take it that there are no actual charges against this organisation of having indulged in any subversive activities to which reference was made by the Honourable Member in reply to my question in November?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: No legal charges can be framed against a Society. It is a question of suspicion of the sort of thing they do or might do.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: Then do I take it that the individual members of this organisation were not guilty of any subversive activities?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I have told the Honourable Member that in some cases they defied the ban.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Society suspected of any Pacifist activities?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: That is what I said.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if the members of this Society have changed their religious beliefs since the ban was lifted?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I believe not.

PAY, ETC., OF WORKERS IN FENCHUGANJ WORKSHOPS

†889. ***Dewan Abdul Basith Choudhury:** (a) Will the War Secretary please state whether the workers in the Fenchuganj Workshop of the I.G.N. and B.S.N. Company in Assam are employed on a monthly basis or on daily wages? How many workers are being employed on monthly rates of pay and how many on daily wages?

(b) What pay or wages are being paid to these workers?

(c) Is any dearness allowance paid to them? If so, at what rates?

(d) Does any provision for overtime work exist in the Workshops? What amount of overtime has been prescribed under the Factories Act, and are the workers being paid on the same scale as is laid down in the Factories Act?

Mr. C. M. Trivedi: With your permission, Sir, I shall answer starred questions Nos. 889 to 893 together.

The points raised in these questions are the responsibility of the Provincial Government.

SUPPLY OF ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES AT CHEAP RATES TO WORKERS OF FENCHUGANJ WORKSHOPS

†890. ***Dewan Abdul Basith Choudhury:** (a) Will the War Secretary please state whether any arrangement exists for supplying essential commodities at cheap rates to the workers of the Fenchuganj Workshops? If so, what commodities have been made available to them, and at what rates?

(b) Is the Honourable Member aware that the quality of commodities supplied is very poor and the price at which rice is supplied is higher than the market price? If so, does he propose to consider the desirability of bringing this to the notice of the Managing Agents of the Company?

QUARTERS FOR WORKERS OF FENCHUGANJ WORKSHOPS

†891. ***Dewan Abdul Basith Choudhury:** (a) Will the War Secretary please state whether any quarters have been provided for the workers of the Fenchuganj Workshops in Assam? If so, will he please state whether (i) there is any verandah attached to these quarters, (ii) separate latrines have been provided in these quarters, (iii) there is any provision for drinking water inside the quarters, and (iv) three families are housed in a block of three rooms?

(b) If these amenities have not been provided in these quarters, does he propose to consider the desirability of doing so now?

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF WORKERS OF FENCHUGANJ WORKSHOPS

†892. ***Dewan Abdul Basith Choudhury:** Will the War Secretary please state whether any arrangements exist for the medical treatment of the workers of the Fenchuganj Workshops and the members of their families? If not, why not?

LEAVE FOR WORKERS OF FENCHUGANJ WORKSHOPS

†893. ***Dewan Abdul Basith Choudhury:** (a) Will the War Secretary please state whether any provision for leave, medical or otherwise, exists for workers of the Fenchuganj Workshops?

(b) Is it a fact that wages for Sundays and holidays are not paid to the workers?

(c) Is it a fact that the expenses in connection with the medical treatment of these workers are borne by them and not by the Company?

†For answer to this question see answer to question No. 889.

(d) Is it also a fact that there is no provision for old age pension, provident fund, gratuity or bonus for the workers of the Workshop?

(e) Is it also a fact that there is no security or stability of service for the workers of the Workshops?

(f) Does the Honourable Member propose to consider the desirability of bringing the grievances of the Fenchuganj Workshops to the notice of the Managing Agents of the I.G.N. and R.S.N. Company, Limited, with a view to their being redressed?

SUPPLY OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES TO LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MEMBERS IN JAIL

894. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

(a) if the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly are regularly supplied to Members of the Legislative Assembly at present confined in jails;

(b) if Mr. Shri Krishna Dutta Paliwal, a Member of the Assembly at present confined in the Bareilly Central Prison, United Provinces, is supplied with such proceedings;

(c) if it is a fact that the jail authorities refuse to deliver packets containing these proceedings to Mr. Paliwal and, if so, under what law this is done; and

(d) if he proposes to make enquiries and ensure the delivery of the packets to Mr. Paliwal?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) to (d). The Government of India are advised that Honourable Members of this House, who are detained as security prisoners, have no right as such to communicate with the Legislative Assembly Department or the Office of the Council of State, if the rules under which they are detained do not permit of such communication.

The United Provinces rules do not, however, prohibit the receipt by security prisoners of the proceedings of this House and should Mr. Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal wish to receive them the Government of India will raise no objection. The decision, however, rests with the Government of the United Provinces.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it the opinion of Government that the Legislative Assembly proceedings are so revolutionary and subversive that they ought not to be received by detenus in jails?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: That is not what I said. I said the Government of India would have no objection if Mr. Paliwal wished to have them.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Are the Government of India prepared to recommend to the U. P. Government that they should not interfere with the receipt of these books by Pandit Paliwal?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I have answered the question fairly clearly.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it a fact that the Legislative Assembly office does actually send these proceedings to Pandit Paliwal and that the same are not being delivered to him in jail?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I presume they do send it to all Members.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: What are the rules of the Government of India themselves for security prisoners who are detained by the Central Government?—Are such proceedings received by them or not?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: Those detained by the Central Government are kept in Provincial jails and the rules of that Province apply.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: In the case of a person detained at Deoll, for instance, do the rules of the Government of India prohibit his receiving Government publications?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: They are Japanese, Chinese, Malaysians; and as to whether they can receive the proceedings of this House, I should require notice.

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

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Sir, we should be permitted to ask further questions because the privilege of the House is involved.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: There are no privileges here.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should not make that kind of remark; it is a reflection on this House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I submit that the question of privilege is involved here because we have been denied the right of receiving the proceedings of this House while we are being kept for years under detention.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has got the answer that it is for the Provincial Government to see that the rules they have laid down are complied with.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I submit that the Legislative Assembly Department is a part of the Government of India and it is the duty of the Government of India to see that every Member of this House gets a copy of the proceedings of this House wherever he may be kept, even if he is kept as a detenu.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has said that so far as this particular case is concerned they have issued instructions.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: No, Sir; I said that we have no objection.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is about Pandit Paliwal. What about other detenus who are detained elsewhere?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member wants to raise any question of privilege he can do so by an appropriate motion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Sir, the Honourable Member has not assured us that he has issued any instructions in this behalf even to the U. P. Government.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I understood the question to be this that Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal wished to receive these proceedings and did not receive them, and that is why this question was asked. I have informed Mr. Sri Prakasa that if Pandit Paliwal wishes to receive them we have no objection whatever. But the decision rests with the U. P. Government who have detained Mr. Paliwal and who have made rules under which he is detained. I do not think anything can be more clear.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: But may I inform the Honourable Member that when I wanted to get into communication with the Secretary of the Legislative Assembly with regard to the proceedings, the letter was not allowed to be sent by the jail authorities?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: That was the Government of Madras.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Yes, but the Government of Madras is today under the Government of India, being under section 93, and they have to comply with the directions of the Government of India.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: If Prof. Ranga should go back to jail I shall have no objection to his receiving the proceedings.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am not going to oblige the Honourable Member.

UNSTARRED QUESTION AND ANSWER

INTERNMENT AND PROSECUTION OF MISS HEILMAN

84. Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: (a) Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state under whose orders, the Provincial or the Central Government, Miss Heilman, a European lady educationist and social worker and a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi (now known as Sarla Ben) residing in Kausani, Almora District, U. P., was first interned and then prosecuted and jailed for one year?

(b) What were the charges against her?

(c) Is it a fact that she is not a political worker, but only a social worker?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: (a) No action was taken against this lady by the Central Government.

(b) and (c). I have no information.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now discuss the Demands for Grants.

I understand that the time-table agreed to by all the Parties and Unattached Members in regard to the moving of Cut Motions has been circulated to Honourable Members.

As regards the time-limit for speeches, I suggest that, as usual, the Movers of cut motions will have twenty minutes, and the Government Member replying will have twenty minutes or even more, if necessary. Other speakers will be limited to fifteen minutes.

I take it that this will suit Honourable Members.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): In this time-limit for speeches, Sir, I should like to point out that there is nothing about Leaders of Parties.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards cut motions there is no special provision for Leaders of Parties, but if an arrangement is made among the Parties themselves I may be informed beforehand.

DEMAND No. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,96,000 be granted to the Governor-General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of the 'Executive Council'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,96,000 be granted to the Governor-General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of the 'Executive Council'."

Refusal of Supplies—No Confidence in the Government

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: General): Mr. President, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced to rupee 1."

Sir, this is a direct censure motion against the Government of India as at present constituted. In the brief time of twenty minutes, which is at my disposal, it is very difficult to cover even the important points dealing with the many acts of omission and commission of the Government of India. I shall therefore try to content myself with giving the main heads of the various charges which I hope will be absolutely self-explanatory.

The first charge which I wish to make against the Government of India is that the present Government of India in spite of the promises made to the people of India and to the people in other countries still remains irresponsible and irremovable. Sir, this is not only a vote of censure against the present Government of India because after all they are the agents of His Majesty's Government in Great Britain. It is something more. This is in a way a moral vote of censure against His Majesty's Government because it is they who have constituted and set up a thoroughly unpopular Government in this country. It is His Majesty's Government, which has never been tired of explaining to the world that they are fighting this war in order that democracy should be vindicated, that free Governments should be set up in different countries in the world, and yet we find that in India, where about 1/5th of the human race lives, they have set up a thoroughly undemocratic Government almost on the Nazi pattern.

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions, Non-Muhammadan Rural): It would be an insult to the Nazis to compare their Government with this.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: If you look at their record, you will see that it is thoroughly undemocratic. Sir, when I gave the analogy of the Nazi pattern, I was not very far wrong. The Nazi regime in our estimation and in our view is associated with concentration camps; when we think of the Nazi regime, we

think of the concentration camps where thousands of people are arrested at the dead of night and detained for years on end without even a trial. And what do we find in this country? The fair face of India has been blackened and disfigured by the numerous concentration camps which have been set up by this Government where the very best of our countrymen have been detained without any trial, without any charge having been brought against them, and Heaven knows how long their detention is going to last. Sir, this is a Government which professes to fight for freedom, for four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear and freedom from want—and yet we see the type of regime, the reign of terror which they have set up in this country. They are absolutely unresponsive to the popular sentiment in this country; they are actuated by the feelings of mistrust of the Indian people.

Now, Sir, let us look at the Defence expenditure. The estimated expenditure for the year 1945-46 has mounted up to something like 412 crores. It is far beyond the capacity of a poor country like India to pay or to withstand. I have said that the present Government of India works in a spirit of mistrust of the Indian nationals. I can give an instance, and a very direct instance to the point. Here are two-and-a-half million men recruited in this country ostensibly to defend India, but at present to conquer other countries so that British Imperialism and British trade might prosper and might thrive as a result of our sweat, our money and our blood. Now, Sir, what happens? Thousands of our soldiers have been taken out from this country to different theatres of war to fight in Italy, in France, in Africa, in so many distant countries, at a time when the Eastern Frontier of India was threatened by the Japanese. Why were they taken away? How could the Government, which pleads for the absence of shipping space for ordinary imports into this country—the case of the Government is that we cannot bring capital goods in this country because there is no shipping space—how could they, in the midst of a gigantic war when the German submarines were so very very active and playing havoc with the Allies' shipping, how could they afford to find shipping space to transport these thousands and thousands of people to different theatres of war to fight the battles of the British Empire? I believe that any National Government in this country would have seen to it that the entire Army on the Eastern Frontier of India was cent. per cent. Indian, but it is that spirit of mistrust which has resulted in the present Government importing soldiers from abroad—Americans, British, East Africans, West Africans, Chinese, and all these big forces have been brought into this country—because the Government of India and their masters in Great Britain are haunted by a feeling of mistrust of the people. We have absolutely no voice or say in the organisation, in the control and in the direction of this huge military machine which has been set up in this country at our expense and at our cost. Promises have been made that at some time or other in the distant future—God knows when—the Army in India is going to be Indianized and defence is going to be handed over to a minister responsible to the Indian people.

I now come to the next charge, namely, the malicious and tendentious propaganda which has been carried on by the Government of India and their agents in the United States of America to slander the great people of this country. They have set up their Agent-General there to do this. The other day the Honourable the Leader of the House, when I put a question to him, stated, that 1/10th of what was stated in the article was true. This was an article about British propaganda in the U. S. A. The Honourable the Leader of the House forgot, and conveniently forgot, that 9/10th of what had been stated in that article was no other thing but a repetition of the propaganda which is being carried on by the agents of this Government in the United States. Therefore, it could not be true. I think the statement of the Honourable the Leader of the House was correct. Sir, I am quoting an extract from an article to show the type of propaganda which has been carried on against us: Here is an extract from a publication entitled 'Four Freedoms' issued by the British Information Service in America:

"What is the force that holds the Government of India and the mass of the Indian people together?"

[Mr. Abdul Qaiyum]

It is news to us that the Government of India and the mass of the Indian people are at all together. The article proceeds:

"The Atlantic Charter guarantees four freedoms to the world of the post-war future—Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Religion, Freedom from Fear and Freedom from Want. It may be necessary to promise the first three of these freedoms to other countries, but India has already been enjoying them for over a hundred years."

Sir, it is really a lie of the worst type to say that there is freedom of speech in this country when men like Jawahar Lal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and other patriots are under indefinite detention just because they had the courage to say "Quit India, because we want to set up a Government of our own".

There is an other short extract: It says:

"Under Bajpai's direct supervision, thousands of pages of poisonous propaganda against India and her leaders have been published at the cost of the Indian taxpayer. The strong and natural anti-Japanese feeling in America is exploited to describe Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders as defeatists and agents of Japan. The least bit of criticism appearing in any obscure paper in India is eagerly picked up and purveyed to American readers by means of hundreds of thousands of leaflets for the sole purpose of discrediting Gandhiji and the Congress. This is the special responsibility of the department over which Bajpai presides. The air mail brings an unending stream of the right stuff from India where a huge 'Information' department is maintained for the purpose. The air mail reaches in a matter of a week."

It would be very interesting to know why this propaganda is all centred on the United States of America and not on Russia. For the simple reason that the Russian people know all about the doings of the present Government in this country and about their masters in Great Britain—the atrocities, the horrors, the detentions, the shootings and the murders committed by this Government. Therefore there is no room for the spread of malicious lies in that great Republic of the Russian people. But in the United States of America they think that they have got a soil where the seed which they are scattering all over the country might take root, but I am sure, Sir, that there also they are going to be disillusioned.

I now come to the performance of the present Government in the domain of agriculture. They have absolutely failed to rise to the occasion and to come to the rescue of our peasants. What do we find in this country? If you go to the villages in the countryside you find illiteracy, you find hunger, you find nakedness, you find complete absence of medical relief: and these are the people who contribute to the upkeep of this white elephant which is called the Government of India.

And now, Sir, coming to the financial and industrial side, although the Governments in the Dominions of Canada and Australia did not have any heavy industries before the war started, they became alive to the realities of the situation, and while this great war was going on and in spite of the difficulties of shipping space they managed to obtain capital goods and they started heavy industries like automobile, aircraft production, ship-building, locomotive manufacture and chemical industries. But what do we find in this country? We find that the Government of India did not take any advantage of the war situation to set up these industries because we have got no freedom in the matter of setting up industries. We cannot set up any industries which are likely to compete at the end of the war with the industries which now flourish or are likely to flourish in Great Britain after the war. We have no freedom and therefore that is the real reason why this Government has betrayed the people of India by not setting up these heavy industries which are so vital for the welfare and for the strengthening of our nation.

Now, Sir, in the closing year of the war, we have got absolutely no freedom to pursue an exchange or currency policy of our own choice.

Then there is the coal muddle. The machinery for the production and distribution of coal has absolutely broken down at a time when the industries set up during the war were badly in need of coal. There is a shortage of coal with

the result that several factories and mills had to close down and this might bring down the production in this country and might result in killing once and for all some of the industries which the Indian people managed to set up during this war in spite of the restrictions and handicaps which an unsympathetic Government had imposed upon them.

And then what is their attitude in the matter of sterling balances which now amount to the tune of 1,200 crores and the Empire Dollar Pool? It is a wonderful mystery. It is like the Dead Sea. Liquid gold flows into it but nothing comes out of it. The Government of India will not take this country into its confidence by telling us what are the financial resources of this wonderful dollar pool. Everything is being kept as a sort of mystery. Everything is secret and now after so much public agitation something like 40 million dollars for two years have been released because there was an uproar in the country. All this is shrouded in mystery and all our currency, our finances, our sterling balances, our dollar reserves are being manipulated by a subservient Government in the interests of Great Britain and not for the people whom they pretend to serve. This must be exposed once and for all.

Then there is the sending of the Hydari Mission to England. All these attempts to bring consumer goods into the country when the war is about to end is a direct blow aimed at industries set up in this country as a result of the war. We do need consumer goods but we must see that those goods should not be brought into this country which would compete with the goods already being manufactured in this country. We do not want our industries—which have come into existence as a result of the war, to be killed just because it suits Great Britain to send our consumer goods to this country. When we demand that capital goods should be brought into this country we are told there is no money and no shipping space. These difficulties will go on as long as an irresponsible Government is at the helm of affairs in this country.

Now I come to another subject which deals mainly with my people whom I have the honour to represent, that is the Pathans. In the year 1935 this House passed an adjournment motion against the Government of India in which in clear and unequivocal terms the policy of the Government of India in bombing the Pathan tribesmen in the tribal belt was condemned. And what do we find in 1944? I will read a short extract to show that this kind of bombing has been going on in the tribal areas by a Government which pretends to be a civilized government, a democratic government, a government which is fighting for freedom of conscience and of thought all over the world. Here is an extract from an interview given by the British Political Agent in North Waziristan. It was published in the *Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, on the 5th January, 1945, and it was for the first time that we came to know that our kinsmen in the tribal belt were being bombed for months on end. It reads thus:

"The story of intermittent bombing, lasting for five months, of the villages of some of the turbulent Pathan tribes in North Waziristan under the Faqir of Ipi, was described to me by Mr. R. H. D. Lewis, Political Agent, North Waziristan, in an interview at Miranshah, on Thursday.

Mr. Lewis emphasised that air action was taken against carefully selected villages," (*This is how a butcher sets about his business efficiently*) "and houses and invariably followed verbal and written warnings to the tribes about the time of bombing. . . .

"In retaliation the Political Agent ordered the bombing of the villages where hostiles were encamped. The first bombing was made in February, and then it intermittently continued up to June last."

For five months these unfortunate people were being bombed by a Government which pretends to be civilized. It is said that the hostiles were encamped in these villages. They are never encamped in these villages. The hostiles who come out to fight are always at the front. The people who really occupy the villages are the women, the aged, the infirm and the children: it is this unfortunate non-combatant population which was the target of these bombs falling from British aeroplanes and on a people who are as good British subjects as we are.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only one minute more.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: I will take two minutes and then I will conclude.

Let me say something about the notice which is given. The first notice which they receive is the first bomb which falls on their heads: no other notice is given. All this story of notice is a lie and I would ask the Government of India to do one thing. If they do not abstain from this horrible practice of bombing civilian non-combatants, I would ask them to confine this dirty work to non-Indians. It is really very cruel on the part of Government to send out our young airmen, who really are as good patriots as any on these Benches, to do this dirty work in the cause of British Imperialism. I would like the Government of India to see that only non-Indians are sent out to perform this dirty work of bombing the civilian population.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Why not try them in England?

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Sir, the promise of reforms for Baluchistan has not been fulfilled. There is nobody to speak here on behalf of Baluchistan. Even though a promise was made that a representative would be nominated the powers that be thought it fit to send a representative to the other House. They would not introduce elections.

The people in Baluchistan are very largely Pathans. They are of the same race, the same blood and speak the same language as my people in the N.-W. F. P. In fact they form part of the same people whom I have the honour to represent in this House and I condemn the Government of India for having ignored the question of reforms for Baluchistan and for having done their worst to stop those people from having elected bodies of their own.

There is also the failure of the Government to revise and increase the subvention to the N.-W. F. P. Our Provincial Government is starved for money and 6,000 of our teachers are on strike because of inadequacy of pay. Sir, I conclude my speech as my time is up. I think that the record of this Government of India is so very black indeed that they deserve to be censured and defeated. Sir, I move.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced to Re. 1."

Sir Olaf Caroe (Secretary, External Affairs Department): Sir, I listened with great interest to what my Honourable friend Mr. Abdul Qaiyum has said. I should like to correct one or two statements which were definitely incorrect.

In the first place, I should like to correct the impression that the tribesmen in the Tribal Belt are British subjects: they are not British subjects, they are British-protected persons. This area is not part of British India. It has not been disarmed. It consists of a large number of armed men who sometimes are a considerable nuisance. From the other side of this House, much more in peace time than in war time, and from the middle of the House there has been very strong pressure that something should be done to protect the lives of the most unfortunate and innocent, mainly Hindus, not always Hindus by any means, who live in the adjacent districts, from kidnapping and most violent outrages. We have to strike a balance. We have to do what we can to protect those lives and to see that the armed tribesmen do not exceed, what I might call, their brief.

During the war there have been in the neighbouring State of Afghanistan Legations of our enemies. I wonder whether it is fully realised either by this House or the country at large that a great deal of effort has been put into the Tribal Belt by our enemies in an endeavour to embarrass the Government of India and to tie up troops on the North-West Frontier. We regard (I am not at all penitent) when necessary the use of the air arm as justified against armed tribesmen who might be instigated by our enemies or by the enemies of India and the enemies of the Commonwealth generally to embarrass us, also to take lives, to carry off innocent persons and so on and I am not in the least penitent in this matter. I regard it as entirely justified to use the air arm.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Is the Honourable Member sure that those who kidnapped are really the only ones who received the bombs?

Sir Olaf Caroe: Almost always. Very often action has been taken against belligerents, against harbourers and kidnappers. I repeat, and I am not in the least penitent, that the air arm should be used when necessary to keep them under control. At the same time a warning is always given. The Honourable Member made a definitely incorrect statement. He said that it was quite untrue that warning was given. That is utterly and completely false.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: This is absolutely true and we have no faith in what the Government have said. This Government consists of liars, especially the Political Officers.

Sir Olaf Caroe: On every occasion when the air arm has been used against tribesmen a warning has been issued and the tribesmen given the time to enable them to remove non-combatants from the area.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What is the nature of the warning?

Sir Olaf Caroe: It is sent out by the officials of the neighbouring Tahsil. This is also dropped from the air. It is a well known practice and the tribesmen themselves recognise it as absolutely fair. It is done on every occasion. It has always been done and always will be done in the tribal area.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: It will never be done. We will, God willing, kick this Government out: we will bomb them out of this country.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Why should the Honourable Member get so excited?

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Sir, this is our country, who is he to talk like that?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): So long as the Honourable Member is in this House he should respect the rights of the other Members of the House.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Sir, he should not talk like Hitler. Sir, you may tolerate this behaviour but I cannot.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I think the Honourable Member is really too excited.

Sir Olaf Caroe: Sir, the Honourable Member is a friend of mine and I do not wish to see him excited at all. He is a Member of this House for whom I have the greatest respect, but, at the same time, I would like to point out that he has made an incorrect statement about air bombing on the Frontier.

The Honourable Member at the end of a very hurried speech, hurried through no fault of his own, made certain comments about Baluchistan. I could not quite understand exactly what the purport of those comments was but he implied that because a large part of Baluchistan was Pathan (it is perfectly true and, in fact, it might as well be called 'Pathanistan'), there should be a member to represent Baluchistan

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: I said that a member should have been nominated to the lower house, whereas I see a member nominated to the Upper House.

Sir Olaf Caroe: There are many reasons for that. There are not always vacancies available.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammanadan Rural): Is he a member of British Baluchistan?

Sir Olaf Caroe: Even Quetta is not in British Baluchistan. It would be rather a pity if we were to limit representatives to what is technically known as British Baluchistan and as I explained in this House on three or four previous occasions, it is a constitutional anomaly by which even the capital of the Province is not in British Baluchistan. In the circumstances, I think Honourable Members would prefer that we cast our net wider and look for the most suitable representative without being tied down to this purely paper distinction between British Baluchistan and other parts of Baluchistan. That, Sir, is the reason why a member of that kind was nominated.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Is he the real representative of the people?

Sir Olaf Caroe: I would like also to say that the other point which was very largely stressed by my Honourable friends of the Muslim League when we were discussing Baluchistan in the last Session was that there ought to be an elective system in the Quetta Municipality. The proposals in this connection have been

[Sir Olaf Caroe.]

worked out and are now under examination and I hope they will shortly be put into effect.

I was not expecting these matters to be raised so soon but it seemed to be well that I should rise and nail certain matters to the counter straightaway. That, Sir, is all that I have to say.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Was the bombing on the Frontier started in 1935 before Mussolini had started it in Abyssinia?

Sir Syed Raza Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I support the cut-motion for two reasons, and I will put them before the House briefly without possibly availing myself of the full fifteen minutes which under the rules are at my disposal.

The first reason is this. What has the Executive Council so far done to find a solution for the present constitutional muddle? What have they done to pave the way for a political scheme which can be introduced ultimately in the form of a revised and new constitution? Though I fully realise that the Government of India today do not take this House seriously, a fact which is shown by what has been happening in this House since November last, yet I think that even according to the poor standard set up by the Government of India for themselves, the Executive Council has invariably failed to do its duty. Let me tell the Honourable Members of the Executive Council what I mean. In 1916 when the Great War entered on a very acute stage, action was taken by 19 members of the then Indian Legislative Council to frame certain proposals which were submitted to the Government of India. One of the signatories to that memorandum, which was signed, as I pointed out by 19 members, was the present leader of the Muslim League, Mr. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who fortunately is a member of this House today. Sir, a great change has taken place since then. It is no longer open to the non-official or elected Members of this House to submit any proposals to the Government of India for the simple reason that no attention will be paid to these proposals which will only fall flat on the Government of India. The change clearly indicates that what was done in 1916 by the non-official members of the Legislative Council should be done today by the Members of the Executive Council. That is the great change which has taken place. Their number is large. What are they doing? What have they been doing? What thought have they given to this question? Have they had consultations among themselves? Or are we to believe that even if these 14 or 15 Members of the Executive Council are united—and this is a question on which they should more or less be united, so far as I can see—no cognisance of their united proposals will be taken at all by the Governor General or by the Secretary of State? Sir, my main grievance is that the Members of the Executive Council take things very mildly, they do not care, they do not consider it their duty to help this country in the present crisis. We know that action has been taken in almost every direction to find a solution for such problems with which the country and the Government of India will be faced after war. There is such a thing as post-war planning on which hundreds of crores of rupees are going to be spent. There is the Hydari Delegation which was mentioned by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. Numerous, almost too many, Delegations have been sent out during the past eighteen months to England and America to deal with economic, social, labour and other questions which will arise after the war. The Government of India are doing their level best to deal with every problem except the political problem, which it should be the first duty of the Executive Council to consider. So far as the present members are concerned, I am sure they are keenly interested in the question. One of them, namely, the Leader of the House, is interested in the question to such an extent that he has brought out a book which, to say the least of it, is a thought-provoking one. One may or may not agree with what the Honourable Member has said in that book, but surely the questions that have

been discussed by him in his book are questions which deserve the serious attention and consideration of the country, and more so of his own colleagues, namely, the Members of the Executive Council. If the Honourable Members of the Executive Council feel any keen sense of duty, I will ask them to put their heads together, and to appoint a Committee from among themselves to go into this question, a small committee of three of which personally, I would prefer one to be a Hindu, another a Muslim, and the third an Englishman. If I had the power, I would almost nominate the Committee at this very minute. There are in front of me faces of people who can discharge this duty in a very proper and satisfactory manner. The only thing which the Members of the Executive Council lack is seriousness. That is the whole trouble. There is nothing so dangerous as lack of seriousness. If I may say so without any offence, I would say that the Members of the Executive Council are acting like the Prince of Denmark in the play of Hamlet. They know all the facts, they want to do something, they consider, they think, yet their minds are not free from suspicion and doubts, and they do not know what to do. They want to do something, but they do not know how to do. In order that their fate may not be the fate which befell the Prince of Denmark, namely, to act but to act too late, I would ask them seriously to take such action as they can, as they are the most competent people to take the initiative at the present stage.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Member for Railways and War Transport): Thank you.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: I do not know whether that is ironical or sincerely meant: my own fear is that it was rather the former than the latter, and this is the disease from which they are all suffering. I am very glad that my friend made that interjection.

A few words on the second ground and I have done. The question of the bombing of the Pathans in the tribal area was raised in the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. The Honourable Secretary for External Affairs justified that bombing on two grounds. I happen to be acquainted with the North-West Frontier Province up to a point: I was a member of the committee that toured the whole of the province in 1922, and brought forward a report: it was presided over by Sir Denys Bray, Sir Olaf Caroe's predecessor at that time. Sir Olaf Caroe said pressure had been brought to bear on the Government by this part of the House—he referred to the Central part—to take action against those who were engaged in kidnapping the Hindus. Secondly, he pointed out that the enemies of England, those who are at war with us, were carrying on propaganda to sow the seeds of mischief in the tribal area. These two grounds have nothing to do with each other. They are absolutely unconnected, absolutely separate. What was it that induced the Government of India to embark on a policy of bombing these innocent people? Was it the tender regard for the Hindus that prompted the Government of India to take this action? Or, was it really the intrigues that were carried on by England's enemies in the trans-border frontier area? This is a painful subject in fact. I am sure that the Government on this question have been acting recklessly, because there is no public opinion in that part of the country, and there is nobody in this House from that area to represent these unfortunate people who are bombed. After all, you are bombing people who even though they do not owe allegiance to the King are our neighbours. No doubt they act in a very unruly manner at times; but resort to bombing is a very extreme step; and the Government of India, constituted as they are, can act in any manner in which they want to act; but surely it is a very wrong thing to have recourse to bombing these mostly unarmed people—some of them are armed no doubt but it is a very wrong thing to do. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has one minute more.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: One detects one thing more. In the explanation given by the Secretary for External Affairs, I seem to detect a desire to cause a split

[Sir Syed Raza Ali.]

between the Hindus and the Muslims, namely, that the action that was taken was to safeguard the Hindus' interests. What have the Government of India been doing to safeguard the interests of the Hindus since the year 1922? In fact the worst year so far as the Hindu community was concerned was the year 1921. What did the Government of India do then? They did not bomb these unfortunate people then. Why are they doing it now? So all this pretext of protecting the unfortunate Hindus against these unruly Pathans is a farce. In any case that pretext ought not to have been brought forward in this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: Sir, I support the motion of my Honourable friend.

Sir Olaf Caroe: I said that most of the victims were Hindus, but there were also Muslims; and the last thing I had in mind was to draw any communal distinction. The question is to protect the people of the plains who are British subjects from outrages and worse from people who are not under adequate control.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: By bombing innocent people?

Sir Syed Raza Ali: The question is does the Honourable Member want to protect the interests of the Hindus or the interests of England? I want to protect the interests of England; but say in what direction you are moving? What is most dear to your heart?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I find the cut motion is to refuse supplies—in other words, if the supplies are not given for the Members of the Executive Council, they will have to go starving!

An Honourable Member: The Food Member is there!

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am coming to the Food Member; he starves others and therefore it is right that we should starve him first. A motion of this nature would require to show the irresponsibility of the Members of the Executive Council collectively and also individually. I think in their own mind of minds they know they have committed and are committing many acts of omission and commission for which they deserve censure. I wish I had time to take up collectively and individually the Executive Council and show their irresponsibility and non-performance of duties to the public and to this House but I shall however take up a few of the points now. For want of time I cannot speak on any and every point sufficiently.

The first and foremost point is their irresponsibility in not giving their advice to the British Government as well as to their own Government, to remove the deadlock that is going on now in this country, which gives no freedom to the people; it is their duty, I say, as Members of the Executive Council to do their duty, at least to give their own honest, conscientious advice to the Viceroy and the British Government. I know that they are bound hand and foot and they feel they cannot do anything and that it is the British Government only that can do this in removing the deadlock; but I do think they must do at least their own part; and I say they have failed in it—they are not even giving advice: they are not giving their own views in public or the House as to what their view is. I know they sit collectively in a chamber which may be styled a star chamber where they talk between themselves secretly and that is all. They show no independence. But all the same they owe a duty to the public, at least to state their own inclinations in some way which may be considered creditable to them to show that they are also striving—at least those Indian Members of the Executive Council should give an inkling that in their heart of hearts they do support freedom. Why, for the matter of that, if they become independent and give their view in their council or in public, deadlock will be removed, but they do not care. I know if men—like Sir Sultan Ahmed or the Law Member go outside to express themselves they will be applauded by the people. But they feel subservient and therefore I am submitting that they have failed in their duty collectively. With regard to giving views outside, we have seen even members of Parliament and of the British Government and many responsible persons have given

their views on India's plight. Why are they giving it and not these Honourable Members? Then, Sir, I have seen that not only politicians but even Professor Politicians have given their views in England and they have given it very plainly and without fear. I have been reading the views of Prof. Bertrand Russell. He says that dominion status won't do for India. Of course, even dominion status is not being offered. He says advocating the grant of independence to India should not be construed as opposing the grant of dominion status. While discussing the question of the future of India at a crowded meeting at Cambridge yesterday, Professor Russell argued that there was no cultural affinity or sympathy between Britain and India as existed between Britain and the British Dominions. Even if dominion status is offered to India, India would exercise the right of secession. Then what is the use of offering dominion status. The tie between Britain and India is an artificial one.

So far as the Members of the Executive Council are concerned, they feel shy to express their views even privately. They do not even give their own opinion to people to come to India for the purpose of finding out whether and if so how freedom should be given to India. For instance, last time Sir Stafford Cripps came to India. May I ask if the Members of the Executive Council gave him their honest views. They left it to the Congress and other people to decide between themselves.

The second question is with regard to the release of political prisoners. In that also they have failed. The present Home Member is giving short shrift to questions. He will give a short reply. When you put another question, he will give the same reply in monosyllables. There are prisoners considered to be non-violent, who can give good advice like Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram of Sind who has been incarcerated for a long time. The reply always is—go to the Provincial Government and if we go to the Provincial Government, they say it is Central Government policy—go to the Central Government. This is how things are being done. Persons are being locked up and no help is being rendered either collectively or individually by the Members of the Executive Council.

The third question is about food. May I ask the Food Member what he has done? We know the condition of Bengal and other places. In places where there was much food, matters were brought to his notice that corruption and jobbery was going on. Rs. 70,000 was taken by one man, as a bribe. What did he do? He again left the management of this to the Provincial Government. They should appoint their own Inspectors on higher pay for food distribution and rationing. The Food Member says we have not the machinery for doing all that. If you have not the machinery, then it proves you are failing in your duty. So far as the question of food is concerned, they should give more attention. In this respect also they are to blame.

Then, Sir, I come to clothing.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava (Food Member): You have finished with Food?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: No. I will come back to you some other time, you don't give us food. You are getting good food yourself.

So far as cloth is concerned, the Honourable Member says that ten yards will be given at some places and 12 yards at some other. Is that sufficient? Have you consulted the people and come to that conclusion? They feel they are masters of the situation and the matter is for them to decide. This is the time when we should tell them plainly what is their responsibility. If they don't listen we must censure them.

With regard to industries, the Honourable Member is not in his seat. We have asked him a plain question and only evasive replies have been given. The question was—will the new industries that have been built up now and which are working for the war, survive after the war or will you scrap them and send for all things from England and the United States? We have got no satisfactory reply on that. Here also, they are playing hide and seek. They know full well that the interests of Britain will suffer. We know what

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

has happened to their country, how they have suffered and how their industries have been ruined by bombs like V1, V2 and V8. After the war, they will say that first they will put their own house in order. They will say 'You are a subject race. We will give you after we have helped ourselves, after we have rebuilt our homes and hearths'.

Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has one minute more.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In the end I will say one word about the Honourable the Finance Member. He is not here in his seat. He was getting on fairly well but you saw his conduct today, how he flared up and said that he was not going to reply to supplementary questions, because the war work is on him. Is that the reply to be given? They want as if to sit upon us. Are we their servants or masters as legislators? There are certain other handicaps also but as my time is up I will take another opportunity to discuss them.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Executive Council is constituted for the benefit of the administration of India and it is only from the point of view whether they are discharging those duties for the benefit of India that I rise to speak on the present motion. Now, Sir, there are various ways in which a country can be governed. It may not only be a democratic government as it is being demanded by us today; it may also be a benevolent bureaucracy, and if there is not even that benevolent bureaucracy in this country, then it is incumbent on us to support this cut motion to refuse supplies. It is often said by the Government that Cripps Mission was sent to India offering to give Indians a larger share in the Government of the country but the Indians refused to accept it. The Government, therefore, was obliged to be run on the old model. But the question is that now that they have sent prominent leaders in the country to the prison, persons who had any voice in the country, could they not come to any terms with the other Parties—the Muslim League and other Parties, whether they be capitalists or labour? The Government, however, selected quite a large number of Indians—prominent Indians—to serve on the Executive Council. Now that might have been considered a step forward. But the question is whether these Members who are Indians, do they really represent the Indian point of view? I say and I maintain that even with the present Government, constituted as it is, we can establish and carry on to a certain extent a government which can be for the benefit of India. But are the present Government Members conducting themselves in such a way as to inspire confidence of the Opposition and act according to their wishes? It is only if they do so, that it can be said that they are acting for the good of Indians. Is it necessary that formal change of Parties should take place before real National Government can be formed? Can there not be an intermediate stage? By intermediate stage, I mean that persons selected should be from among the Indian people who would constitute the Government. Let them be selected by the Government, but they must absolutely act according to the wishes of the elected representatives in this House. Are the present Members of Government prepared to do that? If they are prepared to do that, and if they can do it, then, I, for one, will have no complaint, and I would say that we should not refuse the Grant for the Executive Council. But what do we find? Unfortunately, we find that every one of them works with joint responsibility.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): But have they got joint responsibility?

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi: It is very doubtful, because joint responsibility means joint confidence and I am not quite sure whether they enjoy the confidence of each other and whether they know the secrets of each other. Joint responsibility cannot exist without confidence. Now, Sir, are they acting in the interests of India, are they discharging their duties in consultation or in concert with the Opposition parties? We find that we have been crying hoarse against the propoganda that is being carried on against India in America

at the expense of the Indian taxpayer. May I know how a Government can allow and permit one of their own agents who is paid by the Indian taxpayer to carry on a malicious propaganda against Indians in America? Have the Members of the Executive Council ever consulted, in spite of so many questions asked, so many Resolutions discussed and passed in this House, have they ever consulted the Members of the Opposition as to what they should do to meet this adverse propaganda that is being carried on by their own Agents in America? The Members of the Executive Council simply stand up and give cut and dry replies, sometimes having no information, sometimes contradicting them and saying that mere contradiction in the House is sufficient to give wide publicity in the world that what is being said in America is not with the consent of the British Government or of the Government of India. Do the Members of the Executive Council really try to meet the wishes of the Opposition in any Department which they administer? Take the Department of Supplies. We know the amount of extreme corruption that is going on in this department. We know the reign of terror under which we live, these controls and these Defence of India Rules are being actually enforced in a spirit of hostility to every Indian. Matters are so clear, so transparently clear that they must be known to every Member of the Executive Council if they have got any intention to know them or if they care to know them. But we all see that they are absolutely indifferent to what is going on in the country. Even in Delhi, under their very nose, in the name of controls, in the name of permits, a large number of persons are given monopolies, they are allowed to suck the blood of the poor people of this country and deprive them of their employment, deprive them of their food, deprive them of their clothing and they say they are carrying on efficient Government by these controls. Look at the condition of the market? Go to any market? You do not find even long cloth, you do not find muslin which used to be bought easily in the market. Go to any place, you do not find anything available in the markets. The moment any article comes under control order, that very moment it disappears from the market. Sugar has gone out of the market. Anything which the Government touches and brings under control, it disappears from the market. We find that agriculturists in U. P. have been producing large quantities of *gur*. The Government in their wisdom thought it necessary to put a ban on export of *gur* from U. P. to Punjab. In the Punjab, the people are not able to get a *chattack* of *gur*, while in U. P. large quantities of *gur* are rotting and going to waste.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: That is not correct.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi: If my Honourable friend would only get the latest information about this, he will find that there is ban.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: There is no ban on *gur* now.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi: The people in U. P. are forced to give their cane to mills, they are forced not to sell their produce at proper rates but only at control rates and when the *gur* season comes in the export of *gur* is prohibited. I can understand a ban being put on export of *gur* in times of scarcity, but you will find that under the present regime in U. P. even though there is a glut of *gur* in the market, the Government has prohibited its export.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: There is no ban on export of *gur* at all just now.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi: Very good, it cannot be just now, because the manufacturing season is only in November and December when the crop will be ready and when persons will have a lot of it in their hand. This ban comes at that time and it is withdrawn at a time when there is nothing to export. I will give an illustration. We appreciate the action of the Railway Member in submitting to the vote of the House in the matter of not increasing the railway fares last year. That is an example which may be followed by other Members of the Executive Council also; it

[Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi]

they respect the wishes of the opposition they can be a Government which will be for the benefit of India.

Now what about the release of political prisoners? There are all kinds of theoretical reasons which cannot survive the test of a trial, yet they are continuously detaining persons inside the jails. Now when we are winning the war and the war is coming to a close, what is the reason for detaining these persons without trial? Is it that the charges against them are so serious that a trial would mean a great scandal? No; it is the want of evidence which is forcing Government to keep them in detention without trial. It is said they may do a lot of wrong if they are allowed to be outside. But many of them have come outside. Mahatma Gandhi has come out and he was considered to be the originator of all these plans and schemes and it was also thought that his orders would be followed by the whole country. He is outside the jail and he has given indications of his views. It is well known that if any revolutionary or subversive activities are undertaken it will not be done against the wishes of Mahatma Gandhi. Still Mahatma Gandhi has been let out and those who are his followers only are detained. I personally know that persons who had nothing to do with this agitation, once they have been arrested and taken into prison, no one cares whether they are outside the prison or inside. Maulvi Habibur Rahman was the *ex-President* of the Majlis-i-Ahrar. He had some communication with Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai long ago. He was taken into jail; in the hot weather he used to be kept at Montgomery and in the cold weather at Dharamsala in Kangra.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has one minute more.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: In short, Sir, the actions of this Government are absolutely guided by a foreign Government which is not acting in the interests of India in any manner whatever; and therefore it is not entitled to get a single pice from the Indian taxpayer to carry on the Government in the way they are doing. Sir, I support the cut motion.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie (Home Member): Sir, I think that when one attacks the whole Government and wishes to abolish the whole of the Executive Council one should base one's case on facts and should at least know what the policy of that Council is. Mr. Abdul Qaiyum condemned the policy of the Government of India of detaining certain persons without trial; but he based his case entirely on slogans. He talked about concentration camps. The slogan of "one vast concentration camp" or "one vast prison-house" is very good, I have no doubt, as propaganda, specially abroad where the facts about this country are not known and cannot be verified. But I think Honourable Members of this House will prefer to base their view on the actual facts and not to be deceived by the slogans. What are the facts? The total number of persons under detention today in this country is 7,500.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): A very small number!

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: My Honourable friend Sardar Sant Singh comments that it is a small number.

Sardar Sant Singh: It is not consistent with the rule of law.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: What sort of people are these 7500? Firstly there are two thousand Bengalis—mostly Calcutta-goondas, whom I do not think it will be in the interest either of Bengal or the country at large to release. Then there are over two thousand Hurs from my Honourable friend Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's province, who cannot be allowed to be at liberty either. That reduces the number of detenus, who are not either actual or potential ordinary criminals, to about three thousand. Let us examine them. A certain number are detained because they have had dealings with the enemy,—they were either enemy agents or helped enemy agents. A large number are Bengali terrorists. I do not believe that the Honourable Members of this House wish to censure Government for not releasing enemy agents, and I am quite sure

the Government of Bengal would take strong objection to our asking them to release these terrorists.

Then there are a number of other miscellaneous people. The total of these three classes—enemy agents, terrorists and miscellaneous—comes to roughly about 1,500, which leaves us with 1,500 people detained in this country for what one might call political reasons in the ordinary sense of the word. Now, how large a number is that? Let us compare it with the population of this country.

Can you call a country where the number detained is four per million of the population one vast concentration camp? Compare it with the jail population; it represents one per cent. of the jail population. If the jails of this country are full, they are not full of political detenus. Compared with Mrs. Pundit's figure of 18,000, Mrs. Pundit's error of exaggeration is just over 1,000 per cent. That is the danger of slogans.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non (Muhammadian Rural): What about political prisoners convicted?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: Now, Sir, why are these people detained and who has detained them? This House is concerned solely with the responsibility of the Governor General in Council, particularly in a motion to censure the Council. Of that number of 1,500—of whom 1,350 were detained owing to the August disturbances—the number detained by the Government of India including Chief Commissioners' provinces is round about 50, the balance being detained by Provincial Governments.

Now, Sir, I am not giving these figures in order to plead that our fault, if it is a fault, is a very small one; nor am I sheltering behind the Provincial Governments. But what I do claim is that if we err we err in good company. Every argument which has been used against our policy can be used also against the policy of Provincial Governments, including the policy of Ministerial Governments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Allah Bux!

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadian Rural): They are all shaky.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I do not suggest of course for a moment that the Government of India and these Provincial Governments all by accident hit upon the same policy. We consult one another from time to time. Doubtless the Provincial Governments pay considerable attention to the views of the Home Department which receives information from all over the country, but we, on our side, also give great weight to the views of the Provincial Governments.

What sort of a policy is that which we have adopted? What is this one policy? To begin with, it cannot possibly be an anti-Indian policy; it cannot be called part of some sinister anti-Indian conspiracy. If it were, we would not have been supported by Indians responsible for the administration of their provinces, and responsible to their Legislatures and supported by those Legislatures. Nor, Sir, can these people be detained, as I think one Member suggested, because they believe in and would advocate self-Government for India. As far as the League Ministries are concerned, Mr. Jinnah has made it quite clear that one of his main objects is to obtain self-Government as soon as possible, and whatever the difference between the Punjab Government and the League may be, Malik Khizar Hayat Khan has made it quite clear that they are at one on this point. By self-Government I mean self-Government of the Dominion kind—full self-government with the right to secede. Nor, Sir, are these people detained for any opinions they may hold. If, as has been suggested, there is no right of free speech in this country, would Mr. Gandhi be out now, would Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit be allowed to go to the United States? These people are detained simply and solely for what they might do if they were released.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari What will they do?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: A great majority of them either believe in violence openly as a political method or have had associations with those who do

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Who?

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: Others who do not follow violence as a method cannot at once be released *en bloc* as that would very likely create a situation which would facilitate the operation of those who believe in violence.

An Honourable Member: Are you non-violent?

Ms. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I must ask the Honourable Member not to go on interrupting. Let the Government put forward their case. If the Honourable Members do not want to bear the Government, it is another matter.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: We want the Government to put their case properly.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: No Government could afford to take that risk at the present moment. No Government could afford to risk a repetition of what happened in 1942.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: How many people suffered?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): There is the right of free speech in this House.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: I quite agree that these people cannot be kept in detention for ever. It does not follow from that that they should all be released immediately—that would be disastrous. For that reason, the Government of India and all the other Provincial Governments have adopted the policy of gradual release which means that we and they release these detenus as rapidly as that can be done consistently with the public safety. Some provinces may be over-rash, some over-cautious. The decision rests entirely with them. They do not even ask us or report to us when they release any one.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari: Question.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: They decide as to when someone should be released. The pace of release depends, if I may say so, almost entirely on the behaviour of those who have been released. If those who are released behave well and cause no trouble then Provincial Governments are encouraged to release more and more rapidly. If, on the other hand, they cause trouble then Provincial Governments naturally hold their hand. The pace of release is governed almost entirely by the detenus themselves after their release.

I have not the least doubt myself that the policy we are pursuing of gradual release is the correct policy. It is equally clear that it is not an excuse for keeping the maximum number of people in jail. If you take those who were detained in connection with the disturbances in August 1942, the largest number of detenus in jail at any one time in June 1943, was 10,000. Six months later, —in January 1944—the number had approximately halved; it was 5,500. Ten months later it had decreased by more than half again; in October 1944, it was 2,000. And on the 1st of February this year, as I have said, it was 1,850. That means that nearly 90 per cent. of those who were in detention only 18 months ago have been released. That has been done without any great disturbance to the law and order of the country. That is the policy which we are following and that is the process which I would ask the House to endorse when they come to vote on this motion.

Sir, I would like to say one word more before I sit down. I should like to pay a tribute to those who have as Ministers been in charge of administration in the Provinces and had to deal with this very difficult and distasteful matter. They have been subject to criticism, wild criticism, ignorant criticism, in the press. They have also been attacked in their own Legislatures, but they have never faltered in what they have considered their duty. I think that it would be disastrous from the point of view of India as a whole if any vote given in this House today could be interpreted, as even by implication, showing lack of appreciation of what these people have done. Sir, I oppose the motion.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I can not congratulate my Honourable friend the Home Member on his frivolous attitude in regard to the manner in which our people have been kept as detenus. He was telling the House how at six months interval their numbers have been reduced. I was offering him the other day in our private conversation advice that it would be a good thing indeed if these people were kept in jails for at least six months so that they would be able to know the pains and the rigours of it. The Honourable Member does not seem to realize that there is what is known as humanity. Of course he cannot realize it, because he forms a part of the Government of which that Member, who spoke on behalf of Government for Tribal Areas, also forms a part. We were told that this Government will continue to bomb from air with or without notice those tribal areas just on some sort of a pretext that they have eloped with a woman or kidnapped a girl. There was a time in 1935 when there was no such charge made at all against these tribal people and yet they were being bombed from the air and that was the first time anywhere in the civilised world where aerial bombardment was resorted to in the case of civilian population. It was Mussolini who followed in the footsteps of the Government of India; it was not the Government of India who followed in the footsteps of Mussolini. And yet this Government has the cheek to say that it is fighting Fascism, Nazism, Hitler and Tojo. It is true to say that those people have only been following the soiled footsteps of this Government as well as its master, the British Government. Sir, I find that on every score there is enough reason and more to condemn this Government. My Honourable friend there began to take to task Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit for having given the number as 60,000 to 70,000.

The Honourable Sir Francis Mudie: Even Mrs. Pandit only went to the length of 18,000.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: My Honourable friend Mr. Krishnamachari was asking him for the number of all those political prisoners behind the bars and the Honourable Member would not give that information. And why? For very good reason, because their number is very much more. All these people have been kept there for all these years and some will be kept for more than 20 years on account of charges put up by the police who were let loose on the country in the troubled months of 1940. This country has been turned into an enlarged prison house.

My Honourable friend, Sir Sultan Ahmed, who deals in nine-tenths of false propaganda in America and other countries has nothing to say. If he were a responsible Minister he would have been driven out of his office within twenty-four hours for the villainous propaganda that he has allowed his agents to carry on in America against this country and Mahatma Gandhi. It was this Government who was responsible for saying that Mahatma Gandhi was a Japanese agent. It was after two years of adverse propaganda against our people by a few friends of the Government of this country in America that Amery was forced to admit that this Government had never charged Mahatma Gandhi as being a Japanese agent.

Now, what has this Food Member done for the country? One Member has called him not a Member for Food but for Starvation, and it is actually a fact. The other day so many of our Members were angry with this Government because the Finance Member was giving power to some people to enter into our houses. But what is happening in the seven lakhs of our village homes? Your officials are going into those homes and breaking open the locks to the doors with pistols and molesting our womenfolk and taking away their grain. When a question was put here to find out whether enough grain would be left for the peasants, we were informed that they would be permitted to have only three months grain. What was going to happen for the next nine months? Were they expected to go into the black-market?

Coming to the Emigration Department, even while the House was in Session to discuss the department's failure to give satisfaction to this House in relation to South Africa, the High Commissioner was being permitted to go to South Africa. When the Honourable Member in charge was asked questions about

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

him, he said he was not sure where the High Commissioner was, nor could he say whether he was really on his journey to South Africa. But that gentleman has actually gone to South Africa. What can he do? The Honourable Member has not sufficient power to give any sort of effective relief to our own people.

Then I come to the Law Member. What has he been doing while all the agents of this Government have been misinterpreting the Defence of India Rules and persecuting the masses. Here sits the Law Member without making any sort of move to remove the various anomalies brought to the notice of this Government by the Federal Court, not to speak of other Courts, instead of coming up here with the necessary legislative counter-proposals.

Then there is the Planning Member and he has been raising false hopes in the hearts of our people that this Government was going to do important things. This house has passed a Resolution. We asked this Member whether he was going to accept that Resolution. He had the temerity to say, No. And why? Because he was not allowed to speak. That is the frivolous nature of this Government. But there is the more important reason behind him: because the mail fist of the Finance Member has come out. The Finance Member has said that post-war planning must be post-war planning and there shall not be any anticipation of it during the course of this war. And yet he continues to be a Planning Member. I know the Planning Member does not care for the money he gets. There is some sort of glory about the position. But what sort it is I do not know. I would have thought that he would have been completely unconcerned about glory, but unfortunately he happens to be a former member of the Indian Civil Service. Poor fellow, in those days he could not rise to the position of an Executive Councillor. Now that he has the satisfaction of rising to that post, we hope he will go out once we pass this motion.

I now come to Industries and Civil Supplies. There is the gentleman who assures us inside and outside the House. I am impressed with his earnestness but I must condemn him for not being able to persuade the British Government to yield to our demands that it is not civil consumers goods that we want in return for our sterling securities but capital goods: and he has not been able to prevent the importation of these so-called special experts into this country. There have been streams of them.

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque (Member for Commerce and Industries and Civil Supplies): They do not require any license!

Prof. N. G. Ranga: But you are a part of this Government and an evil combination of it. We are told that he is in charge of civil supplies. What sort of supplies are there available? He wants us to be satisfied that the price of cotton cloth has been brought down to 75 from the peak figure of 1943. But how was it reached? Was it not reached by the Civil Supplies Department when it was still in existence? It was allowed to be reached because the Finance Member wanted to command the financial resources of the masses through the bottle-neck of the millowners. They were profiteering but they were condemned for very much more than they deserved because most of their profits went to pay their excess profits tax. You were absorbing 100 per cent of that. First of all make out a case against the millowners before you can condemn them for profiteering and black marketing.

Then to the Supplies Department. I have already told the House that the Supplies Department is another name for bribery department. It is growing like anything. It is under the aegis of the Supply Department that the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation has been allowed to commandeer our resources, take goods away at the cheapest price and sell them at the highest rates and also establish trading goodwill and other contacts.

Then I come to the Finance Member.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is 1.30 p.m. now. You had better continue your speech after Lunch.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till three of the Clock.

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

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Mr. Deputy President, coming to the Finance Member I have to say that he appears to be a very honest and sincere man but his honesty and sincerity have served a very good purpose so far as England is concerned but have proved very bad so far as this country is concerned. Sir, he has impoverished our masses, he has impoverished our villages. He has only enriched the Americans and the British. I am not here to say that he has enriched himself, because in that respect he seems to be an honest man. I am rather more afraid of such people. They disguise the continued drain that they have been carrying on of our economic resources in favour of their own country, that is, England. He is like Lord Irwin. He also posed as a Sadhu. He also let our country down at a most historic moment in her history.

The Honourable the Finance Member has introduced a new element into our taxation system, that is commodity taxes and through that he has been impoverishing our agricultural masses. Only the other day I was touched to see agricultural peasants and landless people shedding tears, because when they went to buy *bidies* and cheapest possible cigarettes they found that the cost had gone up, thanks to his tobacco tax. Similarly he has introduced the betel nut tax and other taxes and he envisages, he advises that our future finance ministers also should develop this commodity taxation. I am here, Sir, to protest very vehemently against that kind of attitude. The Finance Member considers that the system of commodity taxation must be developed and he is not at all ashamed of the growing regressive character of the taxation system. He has been draining our resources to America and England. The *Eastern Economist*, a very able weekly, has made it perfectly clear how the Finance Member and the other Members of the Government of India have conspired among themselves to insist that our commodities like jute should be sold to America and England at a much lower price than the purchasing power parity of the whole of the world. Similarly they have been trying to import consumers goods into this country from now on. I have got the information which was given in the other house only yesterday, from which it is clear that they are allowing retailers in this country to add as much as 100 to 150 per cent more to the cost price at which the foreign goods have been bought from England. What is the idea behind it. It is that they want to build up their trade again for British goods to be sold in this country. In all our markets, they know that before the war began the British business was losing its trade and they now want to regain that trade. And the Honourable Member comes here and says "Oh, I am importing all these commodities in order to lower the pressure of inflation". He creates the inflation. He then goes to England and makes what is known as the Financial Settlement with Great Britain and pretends that he is getting by it a *quid pro quo* for all the sales that we are making to England and America. But by this the Honourable Member has arranged for a very quick and rapid impoverishment of this country. All our goods are being sold to England and America. We have to sell these things and our people are obliged to pay higher and higher prices as a result of it and there is this mounting inflation. He is not prepared to stop this inflation but he says in answer to questions from my Honourable friend Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad that he is trying to stabilise prices. How does he propose to do it? By keeping down agricultural prices and thus keeping down the agricultural masses also and by not controlling the prices of industrial and commercial goods and by importing industrial goods and commercial services from England and America? This is how he has been impoverishing our country and draining away our country's resources.

Coming to the question of colour prejudice, my Honourable friend was saying this morning that there was no racial discrimination at all. I say that this

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

is a Colonial Government. It is a racial Government. It is for the benefit of Great Britain that this country is being governed.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Your time is up.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: England has not suffered half as much as India has suffered in sufferings and casualties, though England has been the scene of war; India has not been the scene of war, because India happens to be a colonial country. The British soldiers in the defence forces are paid thrice and four times what is paid to the Indian troops and this racial discrimination is being carried on under the very aegis of the Honourable the Finance Member. I am therefore here to dissent very strongly from the policy of the Honourable the Finance Member and to support this motion.

(Both Dr. P. N. Banerjea and the Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare stood up.)

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Under the convention only if Dr. Banerjea agrees can I call Dr. Khare to speak.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am a critic,—sometimes a stern and severe critic,—of Government's policy. But I have no personal quarrel with any Member of the Executive Council, whether Indian or British, although I want the Indian Members of the Executive Council to cast away their inferiority complex, to be more assertive as to the rights of Indians and to stand forth as the true representatives of the people of India. At the same time I want the British Members to curb their superiority complex and be more alive to their sense of duty to India, which has done so much for Britain during the last 200 years.

Sir, I have some grievances of a public nature against the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. My first grievance is that these Members of the Executive Council have placed a huge burden of taxation on this country. My second grievance is that they have placed a very large burden of debt on the shoulders of the poor people of India. My third grievance is that they have been a party to the adoption and continuance of a policy of inflation which has proved disastrous to the country and has resulted in a devastating famine in Bengal and scarcities in other Provinces and has caused an inordinate rise in prices throughout the country. Fourthly, my grievance is that they have not been able to modify the inequitable financial settlement regarding the allocation of the cost of war between Britain and India and to place it on a fair, just and reasonable basis. Fifthly, they have failed to safeguard the economic interests of the country. Sixthly, they have failed to prevent racial discrimination against Indians in the other parts of the Empire and the Commonwealth. Seventhly, they have kept in detention large numbers of men and women in the country without trial for a long time. Eighthly and lastly, they have failed to resolve the political deadlock in this country.

Now, Sir, if my Honourable friends, the Members of the Executive Council, are able to convince me that these grievances of mine are ill-founded, or if they are able to show that they are not responsible in these matters, then I am prepared to vote against this motion: otherwise, I shall consider it my duty to support the motion.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare (Member for Commonwealth Relations): Sir, I would not have stood up to oppose this cut motion had a full-fledged national Government responsible to the people been in sight. We have been asked by certain Honourable Members to state categorically our views in this matter.

An Honourable Member: Nobody asked.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: You have asked.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: We have asked, let us see the answer.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Therefore, in answer to that query I want to state here categorically that I am behind nobody in this country in my desire to have a full-fledged national Government responsible to the people here and now. I wish it was in my power to bring it about, but as it is not so, I cannot help it.

We are charged with bringing about a constitutional muddle. This is a wrong interpretation of history. Sir, we are not responsible for the constitutional muddle. We are here because the Opposition Members indulged in a constitutional muddle: That is the real fact. Sir, I have told on a former occasion to this House that in this drama of wilderness Bharata is willing to offer the crown at the feet of Rama when he comes back from Lanka, after slaying Ravana and rescuing Sita. Bharata is prepared to do it as his duty. But, Sir, if Rama comes back to Ayodhya for the throne from the wilderness without even going to Lanka, either from Madras or from Wardha or from Bombay, and if there is nothing to his credit excepting the doubtful and uncertain friendship with the Monkey-God Hanuman, then Bharata is entitled to revise his part in the drama. Therefore, Sir, I am bound to oppose this motion.

It has been said that we are irresponsible, that we are irremovable—it is a fact. We are here under the Act of 1919. We are not responsible for that Act at all. This is the best legal defence one can offer against this charge.

As regards the other charges that have been levelled against us, I believe in the dictum that the best form of defence is attack. I want to ask, Sir, whether this motion, which has been moved today, is a part of the programme for the fight for freedom. Are those who are responsible for this motion sincere about it. If this motion is carried, according to the best canons of political practice, it is clearly the duty of the Opposition to go to the country and start a no-tax campaign and a non-violent or a violent revolution. Are they prepared for it? I am sure they are not. Therefore, it is absurd for them to press this motion today. But they will not desist from that. Therefore, I doubt the motives behind this motion. What is their programme after this motion is carried? They say there is such a thing as the constructive programme; but it has been before the country for a generation; and yet it is supposed to be new lead for the country; I cannot understand this. It seems to me that the constructive programme is like marrying a barren woman.

The other part of the programme is demagogy in the open and intrigues in the secret. We are aware of these from press reports, rumours and otherwise. It was in the middle ages that palace intrigues were the springboard of political action. We are rather far advanced now, and democracy demands that all these political manoeuvres should be placed before the public and their verdict obtained. There is no place for secrecy at all. But they do not care either for democracy or for freedom.

Then, Sir, much has been said about the four freedoms. Here I myself have said once that before these four freedoms can be obtained there should be a freedom from humbug. They do not care either for freedom of thought or freedom of expression. When I began to give expression to my views, they victimised me. Here in my person you behold a live victim of Non-violent Nazism.

Sir, this country has gone through various storms. Recently we have been through one. The storm of war has also practically blown over. Where were my forgotten brothers then? They were not here. They have come back to the scene again after the storm has blown over just like a rainbow with its varied splendour called Vibgyor, and in their imitation whiteness all these colours from V to R—green implies jealousy, yellow jaundice, red revolution—are present, and I do not wonder how they can change their ground like quick change artists. There was a time when they called out "Quit India"—"Chale jao". Now, there is a time when they say instead of "Quit India", "Give jobs". In Hindi it means from "E chale jao" to "Hujur nokri deo". A cynic may call it, a fall from the sublime to the ridiculous; but because I am a gentleman, I will not say so; but a cynic may say that. I am constrained to say that all these manoeuvres are not for any programme of freedom at all. It is only a game of power politics—palace intrigues for power politics. Intrigues started under the shade of tamarind trees in the Hardinge Avenue; they entered into the Purana Kila, into its dark cellars; here they evolved

[Dr. N. B. Khare]

some sort of a scheme or Jantar Mantar and went on to King's Way, where I am afraid these intrigues will meet their *kerbala*. They have begun under the shade of tamarind trees and as the poet says, *Imli se dant khatte hoten hain*, are bound to come to sour end. We are quite willing to go out, but the Government expected to replace us as a result of this palace intrigue will be, I am sure, as much or as little national as we are; then how are we better; we may be worse. I would like to remind the House that there was a time last year when we were likened to *chaprassis*: the liveries were once very ugly; but after some time, at least to some people they have now become very attractive. It is no use beating about the bush. I will come straight to the point. I would like to ask this House whether they believe that this war should be won and won quickly and it is in the interests of India to win this war or not. If they believe that it is so, then they must vote against the motion. If they believe it is not so, then they can do what they like. I will say why. Because yesterday a member of the Opposition spoke and said that "this war is not of our seeking, and we are not going to support or finance it". He has said so definitely . . .

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari: Not yesterday: it must be the day before.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Yes; I will mention the name if you want it. The fact of the matter is that there is no use denying the fact that the Congress has been against the war efforts: it is on account of that that they left this House five years ago. They cannot deny that. I must say that the Congress is willing to hurt and bold enough to strike. But the Muslim League organizationally is willing to hurt and afraid to strike. That makes no difference, so far as the actual war efforts are concerned.

There was a reference in the debate to concentration camps. I do not want to say anything about it, because it has been replied to by the Member concerned; but the fact remains—and I want to tell this House definitely—that the very first arrest under the D.I.R. was made by a Congress Prime Minister in Madras in the person of Mr. B. Srinivasa Rao, a Congress socialist, a member of the All-India Congress Committee; and if that same procedure is adopted by this Government, who is to blame? Then, they cavil at nominated Members, and say we have got a packed house and this and that. I want also to say that my Honourable friend Dr. Rajan, who was here before, and who was not an elected member of the Madras Legislature, was taken into the ministry by the Madras Prime Minister after securing his nomination through the Governor; and when asked by the party why he was employing back door methods, he said, "No; it is not back door but he has come through the window". So, there is nothing to choose. What is the difference? You started the joke . . .

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): You have come through the black hole!

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: This phenomenon is common to all. To make a long story short: I have been attacked on the issue of South Africa. I will simply read to the House, with your permission, Sir, three or four lines of a press cutting I have got. This is from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, a Congress paper, . . .

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): No; question.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: . . . dated the 23rd February 1945. It says, it is from "Our Nagpur Office":

"I cannot forget the way in which Dr. Khare, the Member for Commonwealth Relations, has tried to solve the South African problem; he has tried to solve it with great bravery and great self respect. How can I forget that?" Said Mahatma Gandhi in the course of an interview to Mr. Harkare, the Secretary of the Capital Punishment Relief Society."

They call it bogus. I do not care; nor do I care for his certificates. My conscience is my only guide. That is all. But I want to tell them that Mahatma Gandhi, the great mighty atom of which they are all electrons, or

if I may say so, the great resplendent comet of which they are the tails, has said this. Sir, I oppose.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammad Rural): Mr. Deputy President, the motion which has been moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qaiyum, is intended to express lack of confidence in the Government of India as it is constituted today. This would not be the first time when it would be demonstrated that whatever anybody else may say, but so far as the peoples of India are concerned, they have no confidence, no respect, for the present Government of India. I have listened very carefully to the speech of the Honourable Dr. Khare. Sir, no royal court is complete without its jester, and the Executive Council of His Excellency the Viceroy of India would be incomplete without Dr. Khare. In the olden days, those who had the privilege of being appointed as court jesters were men of intelligence and wit. But the days are changed now. The Honourable Member's logic is indeed peculiar to himself. He says that if we pass this motion of no confidence or refusal of supplies to the Government we should go out and preach a campaign of non-payment of rents. I am afraid I do not see any logic in it.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: It wants intelligence to do so.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan: I am afraid it does because anything which is abstruse and is only intelligent to the Honourable Member himself would be ununderstandable by any intelligent person. He has taken shelter for his presence in this House under the Government of India Act of 1919; but he is not willing, he is not prepared to give this side of the House the privileges which are embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919. Are not the Members of this House entitled to express their lack of confidence in the Governor General's Council without going into the country and preaching a campaign of non-payment of rent? From where has he got this idea? Is he aware—can he point out a single instance where in any country if the Legislature has passed a vote of non-confidence in the Executive, its Members have gone out into the country preaching non-payment of taxes? From where has he got this idea? It does not exist in any constitution and it does not exist in any country in this world. Sir, the Honourable Member talked of sincerity. I think he should have been the last person to do so, because it is very fresh still in the memory of every Honourable Member of this House—the statement that he made to a press representative wherein he stated that he had accepted the Executive Councillorship because he wanted a job. So, I do not know how he can accuse the Members on this side of being not sincere, when on his own admission his motive for accepting the Executive Councillorship was anything but sincere or patriotic. Sir, the Honourable Member has pleaded for freedom from humbug. Well, he enjoys freedom for humbug. He has had a fling at the Muslim League which I think ill-became him, because one of his colleagues, the Honourable the Home Member had paid a tribute in his speech to the Muslim Leaguers who were in power in the various Provinces. He had paid a tribute to those ministries who had taken the responsibility and have not shirked their duty and yet his colleague comes forward and accuses the Muslim League of being willing to hurt but afraid to strike. The Muslim League is not afraid to strike and let me tell him that when the Muslim League decides to strike it will not be a blow of the type which the Government of India have received in the past. Mussalmans do not believe in going to jails. Mussalmans believe in either killing or being killed. He knows nothing about sacrifice. He thinks that because he has been to jail once to get some kudos therefore he is the only one who can strike. We know how to strike and we know when to strike. Sir, the Honourable Member has quoted some statement which is purported to have been made by Mr. Gandhi. In one breath, he accuses Mr. Gandhi and his movement for all sorts of things, and in another breath he wants to take credit from some utterances which might have been made by him.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I have already said I do not care for the chits.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan: He does not care for the chits but he is shrewd enough to mention them on the floor of this House so that the world at large may know that whatever Dr. Khare is doing is really receiving the blessing of the peoples of India. The peoples of India know what Dr. Khare has been doing. The people of India know to their shame and sorrow of the ill-treatment which Indians have been receiving in South Africa, without Dr. Khare turning a hair about it. The people of India know how he has been flouting the opinion of 400 millions of this country and yet he has the audacity to come forward and produce a chit in his defence.

Sir Syed Raza Ali: And talk of sincerity.

Nawabzada Muhammad Liaquat Ali Khan: I am sorry my Honourable friend Sir Olaf Caroe is not present in the House. While replying to a charge of air bombing of civilians in the Tribal areas that was made by my Honourable friend Mr. Abdul Qaiyum he stated—I have got his words written down—'I repeat that I am not in the least penitent that the air arm should be used'. This statement is at par with the evidence of General Dyer after the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. General Dyer had stated that if the troops had had more ammunition they would have continued firing on the defenceless people who had collected there. It shows, Mr. Deputy President, that Britishers in this country today—and I say it deliberately because your actions are proving that—are as bad where Indians are concerned, where Indian lives are concerned, as General Dyer was in 1919. He defends the act of bombing of unarmed civilians, women and children from the air for certain criminal offences they may have committed and yet the Honourable Member says that the people living in the Tribal areas are not British subjects but they are British protected persons. God help those poor people from such protection, which takes the form of throwing bombs from the air on innocent women and children and destroying their homes in their hundreds. Sir, any one with any decency and with any human feelings would feel ashamed that this mighty British Government should resort to such methods but not the Honourable Secretary for External Affairs.

Mr. Deputy President, my Honourable friend Sir Sultan Ahmed when speaking on a similar motion last year stated that the political parties had refused to join the Executive Council, and the Viceroy therefore did the best he could under the circumstances by proceeding with his original plans of expansion and appointing to the Executive Council public men standing aloof from the main parties. Sir, my Honourable friend's statement is not quite correct. I know at least one political party, I mean the Muslim League, did not refuse to share the responsibility and the burden for the successful prosecution of this war. It refused to accept—as any decent man would refuse to accept—the position of camp followers of the British Government. It wanted equal position as co-partners in a common enterprise and because Lord Linlithgow, the then Viceroy, was not able to offer those terms to the Muslim League, therefore as a self-respecting party it had no other course open to it but to refuse that offer. After that my Honourable friend says—I would not give the quotation but I think he can refresh his memory by reading his own speech—that it was through the efforts of this Government that an Indian had found a place on the War Cabinet. I have paraphrased him correctly, because I have got his speech in front of me. I would like to know who is the person in the War Cabinet today? Is it because the Indian who was sent there was found not a very docile person? Or is it because the British found that the Indian was useless. It may be either of the two things. Will the Honourable Member give explanation to this House as to why this great achievement of this Executive Council does not exist any longer? Why there is no Indian on this War Cabinet today and there has not been one for a very long time. Then, my Honourable friend justified his own existence and that of his other Indian colleagues on the grounds that they were doing a national job of work. I think it must have been on account of this that the present Government of India has been described by His Excellency the Governor

General as a National Government. He said they are a National Government because they are doing a national job of work. Now, Mr. Deputy President, this definition again is at par with the definition that is given by Japan to the Burma Government. Japan also says the same, that the Government of Burma is a National Government because it is doing a national job of work. To me, Mr. Deputy President, only that Government can be called legitimately and honestly a National Government that has the support, the good will and the co-operation of the peoples of that particular country. Unless the Government is that, it cannot by any stretch of language be described as a National Government. All that I would say is, give up these pretensions why do you want by such phrases to deceive the world at large, because do not think that the world at large consists of fools, and that you are the only wise people in this land. The world at large knows that the present Government of India has neither the backing, nor the good will, nor the co-operation of the peoples of this country. I do not cast any reflection, as I said on the last occasion on the honour of Honourable Members who are Executive Councillors. But they would certainly recognise that we on this side of the House are entitled to express on the floor of this Assembly the opinion which the people in this country hold about the present Government of India. Some of my Honourable friends who supported this motion referred to the misdeeds, the sins of commission and commission of the various Departments of the Government of India. They are indeed too many to be related in a few hours. Every Department of the Government of India is not only inefficiently managed, but in some cases its activities have proved a curse to the people of this country. What is the use of your sitting in your office and passing certain ordinances and orders without knowing and without appreciating the effect of those orders and those ordinances? Sir, the whole policy that has been followed during the last few years has been responsible for a great deal of misery to the people of this country. I do not want—it is not my intention at least in this debate to refer in detail to all that. You can ask any Indian you like—I am not talking of an Indian of the type of some of the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches, I am talking of an Indian who does not want jobs, I am talking of an Indian who does not want contracts, I am talking of an Indian who really wants to live in peace and pursue his normal life in the country—go and ask any Indian, and you will hear a long tale of woe. Even in the army, and I am making this statement with a full sense of responsibility in the hope that this Government, bad as it is, in their own interest, in the interest of this war, may be able to take some action which may prove useful in the future, even in the Army, your Indian officers are most dissatisfied with the treatment which they are receiving. It is not confined, mind you, to any particular community. People have approached me, those who have gone and fought for you on the battle-fronts of this war, they have told me—Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians—they have told me of the shabby treatment which is being meted out to Indian officers in the army. I would request the Government and tell them: do not at least treat those people who are shedding their blood, who are mingling their blood with yours to fight for the preservation of British Commonwealth of Nations, at least treat them with such decency, with such humanity, and with such justice that they may not have this rancour in their hearts. Sir, I again repeat what I have said does not apply to any one individual. What I have said applies to the Government of India collectively and I say that the present Government of India have failed completely in the purpose for which the present expansion had taken place. Sir, I support the motion which has been moved.

The Honourable Dewan Bahadur Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Supply Member): Mr. Deputy President, this is the sixth occasion when I have had an opportunity of listening to a debate on a motion of this kind trying to abolish the Executive Council. There were previous occasions when I must confess that there were more tangible reasons put forward than have been put forward in the course of this debate. The discussion has gone away because in fundamental principles there is a difference between the point of view which my

[Sir A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar.]

Honourable friends opposite have and the point of view which any Government functioning at the present time and any set of Members sitting on the Treasury Benches here must have. Sir, I do not want to import any heat into this discussion at all. It was my Honourable friend opposite who suggested that whatever may be said by Honourable Members opposite, however wild accusations they may make, however much they may lose their temper, the Members on the Treasury Benches had always to sit calm, cool and collected and ought not to lose their tempers at all. For my part, and on the present occasion, I confine myself to the present occasion. I propose to follow that advice. What is the gravamen of the charges that have been brought against the Executive Council or the Government of India? It springs, does it not—we have heard a great deal about humbug, straightforwardness and frankness—it springs, does it not from the fact that Honourable Members do not like the existing Government?

"I do not like thee, Dr. Fell
The reason why I cannot tell
This I know and know full well,
I do not like thee, Dr. Fell."

I do not think that there has been any more serious reason than that. The fact is that they want to have a type of Government—I can understand that—a Government which is responsible, a Government which can be turned out, a Government, as they say, which has the backing of the elected element of the House. I do not quarrel with that. All of us want to have that sort of Government. But when they try to put the blame on this Government for not bringing into existence such a Government, I think they are very wide of the mark indeed. And I should like to refer to one point which has been made by more than one speaker—my Honourable friend Dr. Banerjee for instance—that this Government has done nothing, that the Members of Government have done nothing to resolve the political deadlock. Now, Sir, this phrase "political deadlock" has been so often used that it seems sometimes it is not properly understood. Taking it in any sense in which any speaker may use it, I think I can appeal to the knowledge that most Members of this House must possess that this Government as a united body, that individual Members of this Government, have time and again tried to do what they can to resolve the political deadlock. (Interruption by Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari.) I hope I shall have the courtesy of a patient and quiet hearing because while I am not afraid of interruptions I think they will take me away from my theme in the short time that I have at my disposal. Is it not a fact that since 1940 suggestion after suggestion has been made by individual members who are Members of this Government, by organised groups in this Government, by the Council as a whole, to resolve this political deadlock? I shall not refer to all the steps that have been taken; some have not been liked by one section, others have not been liked by another section; some did not come up to the expectations of some people at some time, others have not come up to the expectation of other people at other times. The proposals which were once anathema have become a little more reasonable as time has passed on. But to suggest that no effort has been made by either individual Members of the Government or by this Government as a whole to resolve what has been said to be a political deadlock and to bring into existence a Government more in keeping with the wishes of Honourable Members opposite—let me put it at that and no higher—to suggest that no steps have been taken is to wipe out all past memory which individual Members opposite must have on this subject.

Now, Sir, I will refer to only one other matter before I come to specific charges that have been made. A great deal has been said about propaganda in America. My Honourable friend the Leader of the House who is specially in charge of this subject may have to deal with that, and I hope he will; but

I should like to relate one personal experience. I was in America for over two months in the early months of 1943. I went about lecturing at various places; I put forward what I considered to be the point of view of the Government of India,—I do not put it any higher than that. Some of those speeches have been printed and circulated in America by American Foreign Relations Councils, not by the British Information Office, not by any agency functioning under the Agent General of the Government of India. I ask my Honourable friends, in fairness to myself, to take any of those printed speeches and to find one word there of abuse, of even severe criticism of any of the Honourable Members opposite or their leaders. I was in a foreign country, representing my Government and my country. Every Indian was sacred to me. Whatever differences we had were here in our own country, and I refused to be a party to saying one unsavoury word or phrase about any person, whatever my differences may be with that person. Just contrast that with the sort of propaganda that is going on by certain of the splendid representatives of the Party opposite at the present time. Look at the way in which Indians have been maligned simply because they do not agree with your views, ridiculed simply because they do not conform to your wishes, held up in the blackest of colours simply because you and I in this country cannot come to an agreement over such issues. That is the propaganda that has been going on. That propaganda is sufficient to bring India into disrepute; that propaganda is sufficient to make the Americans feel that Indians do not deserve self-Government; that is the propaganda against which one has to fight if one has a real love for the country. I should like to say this in all sincerity. Heresy-hunting is never profitable; religion has never advanced because of heresy-hunting, and political heresy-hunting will never bring about that unity which all of us are striving for. If people go about calling traitors those who do not agree with them, you are not going to have a national Government for the next one hundred years. There must be a common platform where most people must be considered to be as good patriots in advancing the cause of our own country, in advancing the cause of self-Government, in admitting our people to that stature which is necessary so that we may be in the same position as other people in other countries. A certain minimum of assumptions on this subject is required, and during the last 25 years it is because all those who are not in agreement with you were said to be not only against you but against the country, because you have treated them as traitors, the differences and divergences are widening in ever-widening circles. And I appeal to my Honourable friends opposite to take this lesson from that that while they may have the most severe criticism of men, of policies, of measures, common factors of all Indians of any self-respect, there must be the basic assumption that they are as good patriots as any that can be found inside the jails or outside them, in the Benches opposite or in the less comfortable Benches on this side.

Now, Sir, I will come, in the few minutes at my disposal, to one or two questions that have been raised in the course of the debate. I do not know whether I shall have time to deal with them, but I should like to deal with only one particular point. The Honourable the Finance Member both in the general discussion on the budget and now in the course of this discussion has been held up as the one tyrant here who has done all sorts of things to the detriment of the country. I hope I shall have a full opportunity of paying my meed of tribute to my Honourable colleague. It is not usual amongst us for one colleague to praise another in public. But this is an exceptional occasion when my Honourable colleague is shortly leaving us, and I do not think any tribute that I may pay to him will be misunderstood. In the first place I should like to state that the Honourable the Finance Member is not the one person who decides the policies, that every one of these questions comes before the Governor General in Council, that the whole Executive Council does take and must take the responsibility for these measures; and it is quite unfair, in fact and in theory, to put all the blame on the Finance Member. If he has introduced measures, if he has put forward proposals, if there has been inflation in

[Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar]

this country, and if certain measures have been taken which have tended to oppress the poorer sections of the people, the whole blame must be shared by every one of us, and there is no point in trying to blame the Finance Member only for them. I think that is a cardinal fact; I say it as a fact and not merely as a political theory that in these matters the Finance Member is not the only person that can be blamed. And, Sir, let me say this. I have been his colleague for six years; I have watched every one of his financial proposals. I do not suggest that there have not been differences of opinion amongst us; but I do suggest,—both as Commerce Member and as Supply Member, I perhaps have had more to do with the Finance Member than most other Members of Council—I do suggest this for serious consideration. I know there are whispers outside of gentlemen well in the public eye, who say that the Finance Member has after all done well by this country. And I do suggest that it does not require a historian of the future but any one who has taken an intelligent interest in the current affairs of the country will say that on the whole the Finance Member has dealt with this country as if it was his own country. I want to say this quite emphatically and categorically. (Interruption by Mr. Manu Subedar.) The Honourable Member from Bombay who has been flitting about the House, who has been for five years absenting himself and has not got even the credit of being an honoured guest of the Government of India cannot come here and say that the finances of the country have been mismanaged, when he has not done his duty either by his constituency or by himself. I shall not pursue the Honourable Member further. As I said, he has not got even the credential of having that highly valued certificate which other Members value in his Party, of having been guests of the Government of India.

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): I am not a collaborator.

The Honourable Dewan Bahadur Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: The whole issue about inflation, about the various measures that have been taken, about defence charges, etc., is warped by this one consideration, and one of my Honourable colleagues has referred to it. Honourable Members opposite, to this day, do not consider that this country is at war; Honourable Members do not consider to this day that it is at war along with the Allied nations; and if that is the fundamental hypothesis on which they are basing their criticism, it is no wonder that their point of view must be radically different from the point of view of those who occupy these Benches. We are aware that we are in this

4 P.M. war.—Never mind, it is another issue altogether whether the Assembly should have been consulted or should not have been consulted,—it is a fact that this country is at war. You cannot escape from that, and if it is at war, certain essential methods have to be adopted, certain essential measures have to be adopted which are inescapable and those are the measures that have been adopted by this Government. You may say that owing to inefficiency, bad administration, want of staff, whatever reason you may put forward, the measures that have been adopted have so worked that it has caused hardship here and there. Which country is there in this world today which has been and is at war where people of one section or another have not complained of the way in which bureaucratic rules and administration have caused hardship on them?

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: You are at war with the people.

The Honourable Dewan Bahadur Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: An excellent sentiment that I am at war with the people. That is a sort of argument, Mr. Deputy President, which will not advance the cause of the political freedom of the country by a hair's breadth. The Honourable Member talks of my being at war with the people when he is fully aware that for five years I stood at my post and tried to do what I can to defend the interests of my country, I stood at my post to defend the interests of my countrymen . . .

An Honourable Member: No.

The Honourable Dewan Bahadur Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: My Honourable friends who have been in the wilderness, who have allowed the Government to be run without bringing to their notice at the proper time any criticism that they have thought of, they are not the persons to talk of the liberties of the people, they are not the persons to talk of the economic interests of the people which they have woefully neglected.

Sir, I began by saying that it was not my intention to warm myself up and to deal with points which I feel are not relevant. I say in all sincerity that Honourable Members opposite should appreciate that some Government must exist in this country. So long as it is not possible for an agreement to be arrived at with the Parties opposite to replace this Government by another Government—it is no use indulging in mere nihilism—that is not good, this is not good, something else is not good and I am not able to take your place, that is an attitude of infructuousness which is prevailing in the minds of Honourable Members opposite—neither this Government nor individuals in this Government can be blamed. Mr. Deputy President, I would only close on one note. I intended to refer to other matters that have been referred to, but perhaps I may have an opportunity on the Finance Bill where I dare say these things will be thrashed out in greater deal, to refer to my own department and some criticism that has been made about that department. I could only say this that if Honourable Members are anxious to bring into existence a Government which they like better, none will stand in their way provided they are quite clear themselves, that they have come to some understanding among themselves, that they are able to run this Government on the basis of that understanding and it is not common hatred that joins Parties up and makes for cut motions being carried but something more substantial, something more positive, something that inheres them together more solidly than the mere hatred of any particular officials or Government or Council. If that is predicated—and I hope it will be predicated and I hope all the rumours that I am hearing and all the things that I read in newspapers—some of them inspired, some of them most uninspiring—that all these are correct and will evolve into something tangible, and in that case nobody will be happier than myself to give my place to those who want to occupy this seat.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support the cut motion which has been made before this House. It has been said that the aggressive declaration of patriotism is, I believe, the last argument of an unpatriotic person, for it is obvious that if it were so true it did not require the declaration of the last speaker before this House. It is a matter of sincere regret to me that people have been put forward here—my two honourable friends—to deflect the course of debate by pretending something which we never intend to say.

The motion before this House is extremely straightforward. There are two facts which are not in doubt—that those who sit on this side of the House represent the three-hundred odd millions of electors of this country, and it is equally a fact that those who sit there represent nobody except themselves and it is no use every time saying 'Oh, yes. I am as good a patriot as you, but nobody has confidence in me', and confidence, after all, is the real measure of patriotism in any democratic country in this world. Therefore, I think the less we speak about personal elements in this House the better so far as the other side are concerned, because they cannot claim more, for I am aware that in reference to most of them—and I am excluding perhaps the European Members because I am not quite aware of their secrets—that as regards most of them many of their own members of their own families do not agree with them, so that you might be quite certain that whether our struggle is based on means and resources which you may or may not approve, the fact that we struggle for the freedom of the country is a fact that cannot be denied. You may decide it, or,

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai]

as my Honourable friend the Home Member said this morning, he was under a duty to keep people under detention and his duty was to suppress those who were fighting for freedom. Therefore he cannot get away with the fact that without any cause and out of sheer misapprehension one night they carried out a raid on those patriots—and I venture to say that again—who dared and were prepared to lay down their lives for the cause of their country, and not those merely who sat and supplied other people who fought and laid down their lives. Supply is a very simple problem, because it is to be taken from me, passed through this hand on to the other and paid for by his sweat and labour—and that is the duty he did in our absence, extraordinary duty! I have known a sense of duty of this kind for the first time in my life. But, Sir, it is my duty to come down to every single charge that I propose to make before this House, to prove that you have done ill by this country, that you have acted during the last year, for which this particular vote is concerned, in a manner that is a standing disgrace to the Government, for indeed what have you done? Compliments are easily exchanged, and it is easily said, 'Oh. You don't believe in war; we believe in war'. Perhaps it is easily forgotten that in this very House last year, in this very House in the year 1940 I got up and said we are quite prepared to make this war ours if only you have the confidence and if you are prepared to leave it as our job, but we are not going to make it our job if we are going to do it for the purpose of defence of your own democracy and not mine. You may neglect it, you may forget it, you may disregard it, but you will do so at your peril at the bar of the world. It is no use saying what speeches were delivered elsewhere. The fact is that their conduct is much more important than the question of speeches delivered here or abroad. But take each thing done during the last year. My Honourable friend the Finance Member said in a most glorious tone, shall I tell you? We have collected 830 crores of loans in a year and it is your proud record.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Not in a year. Since the beginning of the war, and 833 crores.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: All right 833 crores. But what does that mean in terms so far as the people are concerned? Of course that is not a debt which the Indian people have to pay. The fact is that the stewardship of my Honourable friend, however much it may be praised by his own friends, has cost us this: our outstandings are sterilised. The thirteen hundred crores it will easily amount into. You are aware of the proverb: very often you go to a debtor. He says, you lent me Rs. 100 but after all cannot you accept Rs. 60? Then you say, cannot you give us Rs. 60? He says, what does it matter. Rs. 20 I will pay, Rs. 20 I will get paid, and surely you are not mean enough to ask me for the remainder Rs. 20! And I read that in the speech of the Honourable Member himself. He says that this is not time to discuss our liability. In other words it comes back to this. What we have taken we have pocketed and please do not discuss about it. It would be very wrong. I suppose some planning or unplaning is going on in the hope that he will try to rob me of some part of it. But let him beware that this country will not accept anything that is done by the irresponsible Executive of today. This country will demand that every pie that the sweat, labours, the starvation, the debt of the people of this country has paid shall be recovered to the last pie.

Another Honourable Member said that they are looking for jobs. I think it is the least he should have spared himself. The very disgraceful show he made is unworthy of a man in that position. You think Mr. Churchill is doing a job, or that he is looking for a job when he wants to govern his own country, because he has a right to do so! To call that a job is not understanding the English language and if you do not understand it why don't you talk in Marathi? I think it is right that if you use a language you should understand what you are talking: otherwise do not speak in it. So let us not have this kind of language in order to stigmatise people who deserve better. You may not want to do it or

desire to do it. You may want to feather your nest. You may not want to declare every moment that you do not want to resign, but you know that you do not want to resign. You all know that in all probability it will not happen. So you say, let us say, we will resign. The fact remains that you do not want to resign if you can help it. What is the good of tamarind trees in Hardinge Avenue! Why not have the courage to say that Parties in this House will come to an understanding and when the British Government have the honour to honour the pledge they have given, certainly you will have the honesty and obligation to resign. It is no use talking in terms of obscurity of this nature. Let us talk straight. The fact remains that whether we take office or not, are you here to say that because we do not take office therefore you have done everything right? It is a great pity that the way in which this issue has been raised has entirely obscured the issue.

I have told you about the two great issues which are the gift of our friend, the departing Member for Finance. Have you ever found a person who said your balances are not recovered and your debts have grown, and that is good stewardship! That is to his credit. Well, get on with the rest.

My Honourable friend who was very vociferous a little while ago when this House told him that he had no business to send any representative of this Government—not of India—to South Africa as an honourable protest, because that is the least we can do in order that we may show that we do not propose to deal with a country that does not deal with us, prevaricated in this House. He said I do not know whether the gentleman is in Bombay. I do not know whether he is going or has gone. Such a perverse ignorance coming from the Honourable Member is amazing. He ought to have stated, I insist on sending him. I intend to send him there. I do not intend to honour the vote of this House. And yet he says, why not give me your confidence? But by your own conduct you have forfeited it. Therefore if you resign you resign in an ignominious condition altogether. After all, one can say two things for one if he wants to.

The point is: what is it that you have done? Our position abroad had deteriorated daily including the position in every other country. My friend, the Leader of the House—of course he will have to apologise or speak at all events in an apologetic tone—knows that very dirty propaganda is being carried on under the aegis of this Government against India in general in America. He may say that it is one-half, or one-third, or one-ninth true. But why should it be anything at all? You spend my money and malign my country in another land and then say that this Government deserves some confidence? My friend says it is a joint responsibility. I hope it is. Then I hope we know with whom we are dealing.

This morning my friend, the Honourable Mr. Mudie, referred to an error of the number of prisoners and he thought he had secured a very great point. Does it really matter as to the number of prisoners? The question is under what circumstances, what class of people, and for what offences, have you kept these persons in prison, that is the issue. The issue is not the number. Even if you keep one man in prison it is a symbol that India is fighting for freedom against you. Then you do not deserve well of this country. One thing is certain that this war would have been fought in vain if India is to remain exactly where it is. Do not go and tell the world that my soldiers are fighting for freedom, that we are having victories, that we have great strength and great merit. So they have individually. I am glad India has. But for what purpose are you using it is the real issue? And that is the issue on which I hope and trust that every man, who votes against this motion, will have to lay his hand against his conscience and say that he is an honourable man or a dishonourable man. If you advance the freedom of India by an inch, it is a question of freedom. It is not a question of agreement to replace one or two Members from the other side. It is all very well to talk of slogans of democracy, etc. But for whose democracy? Your democracy, meaning the British race that you are serving? Undoubtedly the Indian soldier has the honour of his convictions. He has fought

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai]

in Africa, in Italy, in France. He now fights in Burma and I am quite certain he will go right into the frontiers of Japan. But who are you to talk about it?

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

I hope you have some sense that you are a subject race. It is amazing to me that these gentlemen should get up without the realization that they belong to the same slave race that we are, notwithstanding the salaries and the remuneration that they are claiming every time. We were willing to fight. We were not going to undertake the responsibility of fighting unless we fought for our own freedom along with the freedom of the other people and you do not like that. You went and are fighting for their banner, for their freedom against my freedom and that is the charge against you and that is a charge which will always remain so long as this present state of affairs lasts.

Two and a half million of our men, 830 crores of very easily raised loan and 1,200 crores of sterling balances. Indeed that is what we have paid, those whom I represent, not one of you. And what is the result? The result is that in the march of freedom I am exactly where I was. I am merely told in a glib manner by people who have no authority of any kind "Oh, come to some agreement and we will vacate our posts. We are fighting that India shall attain complete freedom like any other country". If there is the smallest honesty in all the declamations that Britain has made from time to time, if we desire to occupy a place similar to the Minister of the Crown elsewhere, it is not a proposition of finding a job and keeping people suppressed who want to fight for their freedom. So that the question is not what is happening in America. It is not your monopoly, though you may have a great deal of censorship. I know what is going on. What is going on is this that America by reason of the fact that they are allies in this war, by reason of the fact that their soldiers are in this country, by reason of the fact that they have come to acquire a great deal more of respect among the Indian people, not individual officials but among Indian people it has now become difficult for them to resist the demand of India for freedom! They cannot call us uncivilised. They cannot call us unfit for freedom. And my Honourable friend preached to me, of all people my Honourable friend in this House, we won't be fit to get the freedom of this country if I do not call him a patriot. That is all the qualification. I am afraid I will attain freedom long before you ever think you will get it. The fact remains that it does not depend on my calling each single individual here and there a patriot. Let us have some sense of proportion. Let us have some logic. Let us have some common sense. What is standing in the way of India's freedom? My not calling my friend a patriot? Have you ever heard of such a joke? I have not heard one. It is the best I have heard for a long time. If we do not call you a patriot, we do not get freedom. I assure you that I am prepared to lose that freedom if that is the only condition involved. The point is very simple. We have deteriorated every where. Our external affairs are not in our hands. We are ground down and our future is dark.

There is what is called planning going on. I do not know what is planning but this House passed a vote seriously and I trust that this House will stick to it. We said that it shall not be planned by any individual, however great or good he may be, that a committee of this House should be set up for this purpose and all plans should come before them. It does not matter whether you agree to it or not. We will be able to plan our future, we are quite capable of doing so when the time comes. It does not require merely the inside knowledge of a factory to plan a country's future. It is an extraordinary idea with some people that because they collect revenue, or keep order in a particular district and then go into the inside of a factory that they are super-planners of the world. Plans are made for the world by those who have greater hearts, larger

patriotism and greater interest in their country. So far you have mortgaged our future, you have degraded us in the eyes of the world. In every thing you have attempted to do you have disgracefully failed. I am very glad that any Indian, even a single Indian, who is able to go out can set an example to show what we are made of and what we represent. We do not want to take your place. It is not your place. It is a very different place, yours and ours.

Coming to the other Members of this House, it is not my desire to take up more time of the House. I have got only five minutes and I will sit down to the time. There is a Member for Trade, there is a Member for Supply and there are other Members also in this House. I have no desire, as I said, to deal with every Member individually. It is not the issue with me. It is their joint responsibility, on their own showing, of what has been done. And, as I said, if this country has been impoverished, if this country has come to the brink of starvation, if this country has come to the brink of epidemics, if this country has suffered it all in some useful cause, I would not regret it. I make a bold offer that I would even make a present of all the sterling balances if England has the decency to say "From tomorrow you are free to arrange your own affairs in the best way you like". But I do grudge that my money and my resources should be exhausted for other people's freedom and I continue to be a slave and this gentleman tells me that I must call him a patriot. Imagine coming and telling us that, the effrontery of it. The whole point is merely this. There is the fact that the country has fought the war. You may say you have fought the war. You have fought the war against us, against our will. I do not object to that, if you would like to use that phrase. But the fact remains that if all that had been expended even against me, notwithstanding all the difficulties I have put in your way, and you have secured the freedom of this country, I would have congratulated you but you do not care about that. The self-complacency of the Members sitting opposite is the most degrading thing that I have ever seen. They seem to think nothing better could exist in this world except themselves and I dare say if that is the attitude, then they compel us to say what we think of them. We do not want to say anything more. We want to talk about the administration. But the fact remains that unless this war is meant to be a war for our freedom, there is no doubt that every thing that has been expended, supplied, traded in or anything else, all that would be perfectly useless. That is the real issue before this House. The gentlemen opposite have administered this country in a most dismal manner during the previous years. As I said they have accumulated debts which bring me no *quid pro quo*. They have mortgaged the future of the country. They wish to plan something in secret and ask for the approval of this House. They say, "Our wisdom cannot be questioned by the representatives of the Indian people. We are a very different race. We are a very superior race". I am glad that you are a different race. We will treat you as a different race when the time comes. But the fact remains that if more resources are to be expended and if my freedom is gained, it is worth having done it but inasmuch as it is not done, I hope this House will unanimously condemn those sitting on those Benches and if they have a sense of honour, they will also give their vote in favour of this motion.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed (Member for Information and Broadcasting): Mr. President, it is not my desire or intention to vie with my Honourable friends opposite in the use of violent language or even intemperate language. I shall, however, deal with one item which has loomed large throughout the debate today as well as on several other occasions at question time. But I cannot allow my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to run away with one observation which he has made, without challenging it. He has put one question to us: Have you advanced the freedom of the country by one inch? What have you done for the freedom of my country? My answer to him respectfully is—and is entitled to respect—that we have certainly done much more by sticking to our jobs

Honourable Members: Hear, hear.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: and holding to our posts.

Honourable Members: *Ad infinitum.*

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: That is right. My Honourable friend thinks that only his freedom is involved, and freedom of people like him. Freedom of the country means the freedom of my country—this is my country as much as it is theirs. They have no monopoly of patriotism. I hope we will not hear the same thing again, because they repeat the same thing over again every year.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: You will if you remain there.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: We have been here, and we will be here as long as you behave as you have been behaving, and you may rest assured you are not serving the country by simply abusing those who are trying to do their jobs as best as they can.

Mr. President, I am glad that several matters, which I have to deal with, have been dealt with already by some of my friends who have spoken before me, and I am really going to speak only on the question of Propaganda outside India. I am glad I have got this opportunity to say a few words on this subject and I will do so within the limited time at my disposal. My Honourable friends are very anxious that they should carry this motion in time, and I assure them they will have plenty of time for that purpose.

The main point that has been discussed times out of number throughout the Session was our publicity in America. There have been a number of inquiries, in the House itself, various questions have been put, and statements have been made in the press in Delhi and outside and everywhere. I say that most of them are malicious and fantastic as I will show in a moment. I use the word malicious advisedly not only because most of them are false, but because they have been designedly used to decry every Indian as venal and unprincipled. Sir, before I deal with the statements I would like to say that I propose to describe the untrue statements in an unequivocal manner, and for this I am going to take advantage of the word which has been used by Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. He seems to think that unless you call something which is untrue as a 'lie,' it will not have the same effect. Therefore, for every untrue statement I propose to use the word lie.

An Honourable Member: Your Department is expert in lying.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: Let me just tell the House of a statement which has recently been made in America, according to press reports, by Mr. J. J. Singh. He is the President of the India League in America. As anybody can verify from the various papers that come to us, he has for years consistently been proclaiming that the Indian National Congress is the only political party in India representing Indian views as a whole, and that only the Congress representing Indians can place India in its rightful position on the international map. There is no objection to that. Everybody is entitled to have his own views, but this gentleman somehow or other came to hear a rumour that arrangements were being made for two other parties to send their representatives to America, and that is the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha. This was quite enough for him, and he made a statement at a public gathering to this effect: "The presentation of communal views in America will weaken India's cause, and strengthen British case". Now this amazing statement was made by him. But it does one good, it gives direct repudiation to Mrs. Pandit's statement that "there are no religious differences in India". Mr. J. J. Singh says that it is dangerous to allow these communal organisations to come and represent their views because it will weaken the case of India. Mrs. Pandit says there are no religious differences in India at all.

Sir, as regards Mrs. Pandit, she made three amazing statements: one, there are no religious differences—my Honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition also says that there are no differences, I wish it had been true. If there had been no religious differences, I am sure things would have been much better in this country than they are at present.

The second statement she made was that India is a concentration camp. That has been dealt with by my Honourable friend, the Home Member, effectively.

Honourable Members: No, no, it is nothing.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: That is because you will not accept anything which does not please you, and therefore you say it is nothing. In this connection there is one question which was put to the Home Member by either Prof. Ranga or Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, which has not been answered. That is the number of convicted prisoners still in jail. For disturbances 26,000 people were convicted. Let me tell them that out of this 26,000, 21,000—I think—are out of jail within two years or less than that, and there are only 5,000 who are there, and who will come out after serving their sentences. It cannot be said that the sentences were severe, and apart from that they were convicted and sentenced by courts of law. My Honourable friends cannot say that we are responsible for it.

The third statement which she made was still more objectionable. She says that Indian soldiers are rice soldiers thereby suggesting that they were mercenary soldiers, that they had no love for their country at all, that they were not dying for anything which was noble. The same thing has been repeated here in a different language by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Desai. Sir, I confess there is nothing so unpleasant as these derogatory expressions about our soldiers. If India is to get freedom, and get it soon, it will not be because you people have gone to jail, but because these soldiers have shed their last drop of blood. Mr. President, it is all very well to be talking here like this, but on the 5th May, 1944, I myself visited Imphal when that place was cut off from all sides. Let me tell the House the conversation I had with the Viceroy's Commissioned Officers in the evening quietly without any other officer with them. When I was leaving them, they told me "Please go and tell our countrymen in India that we will not return to India until we have driven the Japanese out of the Indian soil and until we have driven them out of Burma". Mr. President, it is all very well for our friends to be talking gaily as they have been doing. Do they realise that only one Indian division, supported by a tank division, actually annihilated about 3,00,000 enemy soldiers in North Africa?

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: I thought the Honourable Member was discussing and replying to criticisms about the propaganda in America: he is going on to discuss other matters.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: I was going to reply to Mrs. Pandit's remark about Indian soldiers being rice soldiers. Instead of paying a well deserved tribute to these people, these people who are the real ambassadors of the freedom of India, instead of paying a tribute to them, are called mere rice soldiers. I would be ashamed of thinking on those lines. As my Honourable friends are very anxious to hear about the allegations that have been made about our publicity in America, I thought that I should say something about the propaganda that Mrs. Pandit was doing; and when I say that those remarks made by her are absolutely unjustified then they say "We would like to hear about your propaganda". Very well; they will have it. I will deal with the criticisms in newspapers as well as the statements in the House as shortly as I can and I will take only about 10 or 12 of them. The first statement that has been made is that the Indian Information Series have issued hundred of books in America. What are the facts? The whole thing is a lie in the language of Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. Not one book has been published by us.

Sardar Sant Singh: Who published them?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: May be you!

Sardar Sant Singh: I can assure you that I never did anything of the sort.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: We are told that we have subsidised American writers and re-written their books for them and then purchased huge quantities for free distribution. Sir, this is a lie. There is not one single case where we have done it. I cannot use the word 'untruth'—it will not please Mr. Abdul Qaiyum. We are told that our Agent General devotes his time to spying on Indian students and visitors in America.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: That is a lie!

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: It is a black lie. I will try to use adjectives if they please you. He has neither the desire nor the time nor the staff necessary for such a futile and unsavoury job. We are told that the Agent General gets 52,000 dollars a year to carry on anti-Indian propaganda

Mr. Sri Prakasa: That again is a lie!

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: I will tell you, my Honourable friends are out by 30,000 dollars. You knew it, but you wanted to have it from me: you believe in inflation and therefore you use the bigger figure!

Now, it is a very serious thing that an allegation has been made that the British Information Services distributed Miss Mayo's book "Mother India". I have denied our and their connection with this book in explicit terms before; but let me repeat it again: that we neither distributed it nor encouraged its distribution anywhere either in this country, in America or in England

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Did you ever try to repudiate it?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: We are told that India spends 26 lakhs of rupees every year on doing propaganda. The fact is that we spend only 4½ lakhs

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: At least one-sixth is true!

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: So far as that is concerned, one-sixth is true. I wish my Honourable friend will force me to spend more, in which case I think our propaganda will be more effective than it is at present. The length to which our friends can go is really most amazing. We are told that the Indian Government confers titles and other favours upon American missionaries to induce them to poison the American mind against India. This is in one of the papers. Mr. Abdul Qaiyum

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: On a point of order: I never read these charges—they have been written for him—I do not know who wrote them—but he has got a written reply and he can unload it on the House: but I can assure him that I gave only two cases and I did not read this before—I never knew them.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: Questions were put to me and I remember very well that Mr. Chapman-Mortimer—I do not know whether he is here or not—asked me "Why do you not come and repudiate all these charges in the press?" I said I would do it at the proper time, and I am doing it now.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: Why are you uncomfortable?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: Why am I uncomfortable? I am ashamed of you. Now, we are told that 10,000 British propagandists of whom 3,000 are officials are devoting their time exclusively to India. I am afraid I gave credit to the statements in the press to the extent of one-tenth—I was wrong. When a statement is made, that there are 10,000 propagandists of whom 3,000 are officials, devoting their time exclusively to India the proportion of truth is negligible. If you want the honest facts, there are only three officials—so it is only one-thousandth true.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: The British have got their own independent agency.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: I am referring to that: there are only three and you multiply it by a thousand and ask us to believe in India that those are the facts. We know the author responsible for these statements; but it is thought that by doing this he is raising the status of India in America. I respectfully submit that the greatest wrong is being done to India by such lies and falsehoods.

There is another factor which has to be borne in mind. It is believed that anything will do for an American. The American is neither a fool, nor is he such a simpleton as my Honourable friends think. He knows how to assay these statements, and he knows what value should be put upon them. I respectfully submit that if Mr. J. J. Singh in America or the gracious lady, Mrs. Pandit, thinks that he or she can lead American opinion by the methods which they are adopting, I can assure them confidently that they will never succeed.

Mr. Badri Dutt Pande: Why take notice of them then?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: Our method is absolutely different, and I challenge anybody to repudiate that except those who will never understand these things at all, unless it suits their purpose, and it is this. We place only facts.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: And figures.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: When Mrs. Pandit says that there are no religious differences, we are bound to say that there are religious differences and that her statement is false.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Go ahead.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Why must you contradict it? Is it because you are a lover of truth?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: Yes. You can never solve a problem by saying that there is no such problem. There is the problem and the best way to solve it is to face it. There are religious differences and they must be resolved. We must sit down and try to solve them.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: The Honourable Member's time is up.

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: There is one more statement which I think must be contradicted.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Another lie?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: It is worse than a lie. Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar is reported to have made certain statements and based on those statements, there was a leading article in a Calcutta paper accusing us of doing anti-Indian propaganda in U. S. A. I have got the authority of Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar to say that he has written to the Editor of that paper that those statements are absolutely untrue and that they should not have been made. The Agent General is doing his level best to help India's cause and nothing is being done by us which will go to the discredit of the country.

An Honourable Member: It is a lie.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced to Rs. 1."

The Assembly divided:

Ayes—61

Abdul Basith Choudhury, Dewan.
Abdul Ghani, Maulvi Muhammad.
Abdul Qaiyum, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Ahsan, Mr. Muhammad.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Choudhury, Mr. Muhammad Hussain.
Chunder, Mr. N. C.
Daga, Seth Sheodass.
Das, Mr. B.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Deshmukh, Mr. Govind V.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.
Gauri Shankar Singh, Mr.
Habibar Rahman, Dr.
Hans Raj, Raizada.
Hegde, Sri K. B. Jinaraja.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Ismail Khan, Hajee Chowdhury Muhammad.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Kazmi, Qazi Muhammad Ahmad.
Krishnamachari, Mr. T. T.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lakhichand, Mr. Rajmal.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Liaquat Ali Khan, Nawabzada Muhammad.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Manu Subedar, Mr.
Misra, Pandit Shambhudayal.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nairang, Syed Ghulam Bhik.
Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pande, Mr. Badri Dutt.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narain Singh, Choudhri.
Ram Narayan Singh, Mr.
Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Raza Ali, Sir Syed.
Reddiar, Mr. K. Sitarama.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyanarayana Moorty, Mr. A.
Sham Lal, Lala.
Siddique Ali Khan, Nawab.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Srivastava, Mr. Hari Sharan Prasad.
Subbarayan, Shrimati K. Radha Bai.
Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
Yusuf Abdoola Haroon, Seth.
Zafar Ali Khan, Maulana.
Zia Uddin Ahmad, Dr. Sir.

Noces—53

- Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.
 Ambedkar, The Honourable Dr. B. R.
 Anthony, Mr. Frank R.
 Azizul Huque, The Honourable Sir M.
 Benthall, The Honourable Sir Edward.
 Bewoor, Sir Gurunath.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Sir Seth.
 Caroe, Sir Olaf.
 Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.
 Chatterjee, Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C.
 Daga, Seth Sunder Lall.
 Dalal, Dr. Sir Ratanji Dinshaw.
 Dalal, The Honourable Sir Ardeshir.
 Dalpat Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Dam, Mr. Ananga Mohan.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
 Gwilt, Mr. E. L. C.
 Habibur Rahman, Khan Bahadur Sheikh.
 Haidar, Khan Bahadur Shamsuddin.
 Imam, Mr. Saiyid Haidar.
 Inskip, Mr. A. C.
 Ismaiel Alikhan, Kunwer Hajee.
 James, Sir F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasjee.
 Kamaluddin Ahmad, Shams-ul-Ulema.
 Khare, The Honourable Dr. N. B.
 Krishnamoorthy, Mr. E. S. A.
 Kushal Pal Singh, Raja Bahadur.
 Lawson, Mr. C. P.
 Mehta, Mr. Jajnadas M.
 Muazzam Sahib Bahadur, Mr. Muhammad.
 Mudaliar, The Honourable Dewan Bahadur Sir
 A. Ramaswami.
 Mudie, The Honourable Sir Francis.
 Piare Lall Kureel, Mr.
 Raisman, The Honourable Sir Jeremy.
 Ram Nath, Mr.
 Richardson, Sir Henry.
 Roy, The Honourable Sir Asoka.
 Shahban, Khan Bahadur Mian Ghulam Kadir
 Muhammad.
 Sheehy, Sir John.
 Spence, Sir George.
 Srivastava, The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad.
 Stokes, Mr. H. G.
 Sultan Ahmed, The Honourable Sir.
 Sundaresan, Mr. N.
 Thakur Singh, Capt.
 Trivedi, Mr. C. M.
 Tyson, Mr. G. W.
 Tyson, Mr. J. D.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 10th March, 1945.