

4th April 1945

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
Official Report.

Volume IV, 1945

(2nd April to 12th April, 1945)

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION
OF THE
FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1945



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

President :

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

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.

Volume IV—2nd to 12th April, 1945

THURSDAY, 5TH APRIL, 1945—contd.	PAGES
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill —Insertion of new section 93-A—Circulated	2520—26
The Kazis Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee—Negatived	2535—52
FRIDAY, 6TH APRIL, 1945—	
Member Sworn	2553
Starred Questions and Answers	2553—68
Motion for Adjournment re Supply of wrong Information by the Honourable the Food Member in reply to a Question and Refusal to verify Incorrectness—Disallowed	2560—70
Amendment of the Indian Aircraft Rules	2570—71
The Banking Companies Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	2571—2604
MONDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1945—	
Member Sworn	2605
Starred Questions and Answers	2605—35
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2635—37
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2638—42
Motions for Adjournment re—Misrepresentation of India's Constitutional Position by the Honourable Sir Feroze Khan Noon at the Empire Conference—Disallowed	2642
Failure to tackle acute Cloth Shortage—Disallowed	2642
Failure to grant Special War Pay to Indian Commissioned Officers of Indian Army Medical Corps—Ruled Out of order	2642—43
Harsh Conditions of Service of Indian Troops in Middle East and Italy—Adopted	2643—44, 2660—81
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	2644
The Banking Companies Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	2644—66
TUESDAY, 10TH APRIL, 1945—	
Member Sworn	2663
Starred Questions and Answers	2663—2706
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2706—07
Short Notice Question and Answer	2707—08
Motions for Adjournment re—Refusal to indicate Government views re Recruitment to Indian Civil Service and Indian Police—Disallowed	2708—09
Restrictions on Issue of Railway Ardh Kumbh Meha at Hardwar for Pilgrims—Withdrawn	2709—11, 2732—42
The Banking Companies Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	2711—32
WEDNESDAY, 11TH APRIL, 1945—	
Members Sworn	2743
Starred Questions and Answers	2743—55
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2755—57
Motions for Adjournment re—Tearing of Notice of Resolution re Chhimur and Ashti convicts by Mr. Le Bailly at Delhi Municipal Committee Meeting—Ruled out of order	2757—59
Bezwada Grain Purchase Officer's warning to Gu davalieri Rice Millers re Paddy Purchase—Disallowed	2760—60
The Indian Central Oleochemicals Committee Bill—Appointment of Sir Feroze Kharegat to the Select Committee	2760
The Banking Companies Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee—Adopted	2760—66
The Mines Lascarity Bill (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	2760—66

THURSDAY, 12TH APRIL, 1945—

Shared Questions and Answers	2797—2804
Unshared Question and Answer	2804
Statements laid on the Table	2805—11
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2811—12
Message from the Council of State	2812 2844
Demand for Supplementary Grant — Railways	2812—37
The Allgarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of sections 16, 20, etc.—Passed as amended	2837—42
The Indian Divorce Bill—Introduced	2842
The Delhi Muslim Wakfs (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of sections 2, 7, etc.—Introduced	2842—43
The Allgarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 5 (3)—Introduced	2843
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 54, etc.—Introduced	2843

THURSDAY, 12TH APRIL, 1945—contd.

The Delhi Sikh Gurdwaras and Religious Endowments Bill—Introduced	2843
The Technical Personnel Protection Bill—Introduced	2843
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of Section 302—Introduced	2843
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 3 and insertion of new section 56—Introduced	2844
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 14—Introduced	2844
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 103—Introduced	2844
The Delhi Restriction of uses of Land (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2844

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 4th April 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

INDIAN TRADE IN LIBERATED BURMA

1566. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations please state, in view of the progressive capture of Burma, whether any arrangements are being made to ensure the trade of Indians in those areas, which were in Indian hands before the war?

(b) What steps are being taken by the Government of India to safeguard the interests of Indian traders who were trading in Burma and who have now been ousted at great loss because of the war?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Recently on representations from various bodies interested in the postwar trade in Burma the question of Indians being allowed to go to the liberated parts of Burma to re-establish their trade again was referred to SEAC Headquarters and we were informed that at present no private individuals or firms, including the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation, are being permitted to enter Burma for the purpose of establishing business in the liberated parts of Burma and that supplies are being obtained through normal Army channels. It was further stated that those civilians were being allowed to enter Burma whose presence was considered necessary for the furtherance of the war effort. It was also added that those persons who wished to enter Burma were being advised to register their particulars with the Government of Burma. The S.E.A.C. will let us know any change in their policy in the matter of entry of Indians into the liberated parts of Burma.

This is the present policy and if there is any change in this policy we shall be informed and I assure Honourable Members that we shall take every care that no foreign interests try to steal a march over Indian interests.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: There was something about civilians being allowed in the war interest. I did not follow that portion of the answer.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Only those civilians are being allowed to enter Burma whose presence is considered necessary for the furtherance of the war effort, and not for trading purposes.

HAJ PASSAGE FOR MAULVI HAQDAD KHAN OF LUCKNOW

1567. *Mr. Abdul Qayyum: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations be pleased to state if it is a fact that Maulvi Haqdad Khan, Government Pensioner of Lucknow, sent a money order for Rs. 328 on the 14th September, 1944, from Aminabad, Lucknow and an application for passage to Jeddah under registered cover, No. 46, dated the 14th September, 1944?

(b) Is it a fact that the money and application were not acknowledged?

(c) What are the dates of receipt of the money and the application at the Haj Office?

(d) Is it a fact that Maulvi Haqdad Khan sent a reminder under Registered cover No. 30, Aminabad, Lucknow, dated the 25th September, 1944, and this too was not acknowledged?

(e) Is it a fact that Maulvi Haqdad Khan reached Karachi and presented a petition to the Haj Officer and requested him for the issue of a reservation card?

(f) Is it a fact that the Haj Officer did not take any action on the petition?

(g) Is it a fact that the said Maulvi Haqdad Khan was granted a reservation card for the 2nd sailing and had to stay at Karachi for one month?

(h) How do Government propose to compensate Maulvi Haqdad Khan for the loss of money and time during his stay at Karachi?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) 22nd September and 16th September 1944, respectively.

(d) Yes.

(e) and (f). No such petition is on record. If he had reported himself to the Hajj Booking Officer in time, he would have got his reservation card and steamer ticket.

(g) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. I have no information regarding his stay in Karachi.

(h) The question does not arise.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know whether the arrival of a Haji at the Hajis' camp is noted by some official?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I have no information on this point.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Is the Honourable Member in a position to state if any record is kept in the Hajis' camp giving the time and date of arrival of a person?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I have no definite information on the point, but I gather that records must be kept.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: If that is so, may I know why the matter is left to an ignorant person who may not be aware of the technicalities and rules and why is it that the officials themselves do not move in the matter?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: The officers render all possible help which they are capable of; but if the party does not present himself at the given time, the officials cannot help him.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: This is a very technical thing i.e. the rules in the Hajis' camp. I want the Honourable Member to see to it that in future such technical mistakes do not involve people in trouble and long detention in Karachi. Will the Honourable Member see to it?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I will see to it; but I am sure that any inconvenience caused is due to the action of the Hajis themselves.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Does the Honourable Member know whether any complaint book is kept in the Port Haj Committee's office, and whether this complaint was entered therein?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: May have been so.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Did the Honourable Member send for a copy and ascertain if this is there?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I have got the information all right. I am satisfied with it.

Haj Passage for Mr. Musharraf Ali of Sylhet

1568. **Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations please state if it is a fact that reservation card No. 2613 was issued to Mr. Musharraf Ali, son of the late Mr. Hatim Mian of Hathikhola Kanaibazar, Sylhet, directing his presence at Karachi on the 2nd October 1944?

(b) Is it a fact that the said card holder arrived at Karachi on the 30th September, 1944, with pilgrim pass No. 32 in his favour?

(c) Is it a fact that the above reservation card was endorsed by the Haj Booking Officer to the Mogul Line for the grant of a steamer ticket?

(d) Is it a fact that the Mogul Line declined to issue the ticket against the said reservation card for the first batch of steamers?

(e) What action do Government propose to take against the Shipping Company for failure to grant passage against reservation card?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) and (b). Reservation card No. 2613 was issued to him in Karachi on the 2nd October 1944. It is not known on what date he arrived at Karachi.

(c) Yes.

(d) No. He failed to present his card at the office of the shipping company for securing a steamer ticket as directed.

(e) The question does not arise.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I make a suggestion to the Honourable Member that in view of these complaints, he should appoint an inquiry committee to look into these matters?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: We have already held inquiries on the specific complaints which were submitted.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know who was the officer who held the inquiry?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I am not aware of his name.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if the Honourable Member is prepared to lay that report on the table of this House?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I do not think it will serve any useful purpose.

CARRYING OF CARGO ON PILGRIM DECKS OF "S. S. RIZWANI"

1569. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations please state if it is a fact that S. S. Rizwani was to sail with pilgrims on the 3rd October, 1944, along with two other steamers?

(b) Is it a fact that the Haj Officer permitted the steamer agents to load cargo on the pilgrim decks on the 1st October, 1944?

(c) Did the Haj Officer consult the Government of India before permitting the shipping agents to carry cargo on pilgrim decks?

(d) Is it a fact that on account of cargo pilgrims were debarred from obtaining passage on the said steamer?

(e) What action have the Government taken to safeguard the interests of pilgrims? If none, why?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). Government permitted the "Mogul Line" to carry cargo in pilgrim ships as they reduced the return deck (net) fare to Rs. 200 which otherwise would have been higher on account of the abnormal rise in the cost of running ships. This arrangement however did not affect the interests of the pilgrims as there was still room for 450 pilgrims in the "Rizwani" whereas only 84 sailed.

(d) No.

(e) The interests of pilgrims were duly safeguarded.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know the answer to part (c) of the question? Did the Haj officer consult the Government of India?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Of course; the answer is there that Government permitted the carrying of cargo.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Were the Government consulted before hand, or was their permission obtained after the thing was done?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I think they must have been consulted.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: The Honourable Member is not sure of it?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I cannot be sure of everything; I cannot carry everything in the attic of my brain.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know how many people were not able to get their passage because cargo was taken?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Not one. There was room for 450 more and only 84 travelled.

HAJ PASSAGE FOR ONE MAULVI REHMAT ALI

1570. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations be pleased to state if it is a fact that Maulvi Rehmat Ali was issued with reservation card No. 2644, with reference to his application, dated the 27th August, 1944?

(b) Is it a fact that the said Maulvi Rehmat Ali reached Karachi well before time but was not issued a ticket in exchange for the reservation card? If so, why?

(c) What action do Government propose to take against the Haj Officer and the Shipping Company for failure to honour the Government of India reservation card?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) and (b). Reservation card No. 2644 was issued to Maulvi Doctor Raushan Ali, on his arrival in Karachi on the 2nd October 1944 and not to Maulvi Rehmat Ali. Doctor Raushan Ali was directed to go to the office of the shipping company for registering his name for a steamer ticket, but he did not do so.

(c) The question does not arise.

A PUCCA BUILDING BUILT IN KARACHI HAJ CAMP

1571. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations be pleased to state if it is a fact that a *pucca* building in the Haji's Camp, Karachi, was built for the convenience of pilgrims?

(b) What was its cost and from what head was it paid?

(c) How many pilgrims can it accommodate?

(d) What is the number of *kucha* barracks and the number of pilgrims that can be accommodated?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) Yes.

(b) Rs. 35,725, No. 50—Civil Works—Central.

(c) 200.

(d) Thirteen barracks. 1,800 pilgrims.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I inquire how many Haj pilgrims were actually accommodated in that *pucca* building?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: The accommodation is for 200. The total is for 2,000.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Does the Honourable Member know that this staff was accommodated in that building and not the Hajis?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I have no information.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Honourable Member inquire, in view of the allegation, that the Hajis for whom it was primarily intended were not allowed access?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: I will make inquiry.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: With reference to part (b), may I ask from what head it was paid?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: Central P. W. D.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Will the Honourable Member let us know the result of his inquiry?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: If you will put down a question, I will.

PLIGHT OF HAJ PILGRIMS AT KARACHI

†1572. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations please state whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a statement in the *Dawn*, dated the 17th February, 1945, under the heading "Haj Pilgrims' Plight at Karachi"?

(b) Is it a fact that ten pilgrims died of pneumonia due to exposure to cold winds in the Haji's camp?

(c) Is it a fact that the Haj Officer, when questioned about the number of deaths in the camp, admitted his ignorance?

(d) Is it a fact that the records of the Port Haj Committee were incomplete?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) Yes.

(b), (c) and (d). No.

COMMITTEE FOR COTTON TEXTILE FUNDS

1573. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

(a) whether a committee has been appointed to administer the Cotton Textile Funds;

(b) the members of the committee; and

(c) the object of the Fund, and how it is derived?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) No. The Committee will be constituted as soon as nominations are received from the respective bodies as per constitution published in the Government of India, Department of Industries and Civil Supplies Resolution No. 244/1-TB/44, dated the 5th March 1945.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The objects of the Fund are as stated by section 6 of the Cotton Textiles Fund Ordinance, 1944, published in the *Gazette of India Extraordinary*, dated

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

the 8th July 1944. The Fund is derived from the proceeds of the duty of 3 per cent. on the export of cotton cloth and yarn levied in accordance with section 4(1) of the Cotton Textiles Fund Ordinance, 1944, less the expenses of collection of the duty.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know how much money has been collected?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: I should like to have notice of that. There is nothing in the question about it and I do not remember.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know what is the purpose of the fund?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: The purposes of the fund are: To meet

- (1) the cost of discharging its functions under this Ordinance,
- (2) the cost of such measures as may be necessary for supervising the export of cloth and yarn,
- (3) the cost of such measures, including measures involving capital costs as the committee may consider necessary or desirable to take for promoting and increasing the sale of Indian cloth and yarn abroad and generally for the development of technical education and research relating to cotton textiles industry.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it the policy of Government to encourage the export of cloth even when there are not enough supplies in this country?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: If there is to be export of any commodity, in the long run it will be desirable to help research and to ensure quality with a view to see that the goods which do go abroad do so under certain state guarantee.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When do they expect to constitute the committee?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: Within the next few days or fortnight or so. We have already taken steps. We have written to the constituent bodies of this committee and as soon as replies are received, the committee will be constituted.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know why the Government has issued an ordinance in this matter, whereas with regard to other matters they have produced Bills?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: That was because the House was not in Session at the time and we considered that the matter should be taken up urgently.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Government consider the advisability of bringing this matter to the House at some stage?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: At some stage it will have to be considered whether this should be a permanent body or not.

SETTING UP PERMANENT TARIFF BOARD

1574. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- (a) whether Government have finished consideration in the matter of setting up a permanent Tariff Board;
- (b) what the considerations are which have made them consider the establishment of such a permanent Tariff Board; and
- (c) when they expect to constitute it?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that many industries entitled to protection are already suffering on account of the high costs of coal and labour, etc., will Government announce the decision as early as possible, according to the promise made in the Council of State?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: We are actively considering this question but I shall certainly be glad to know as to which industry is suffering on account of high prices.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What are the answers to (b) and (c)?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: These are too big questions to deal with in answer to a question like this.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Policy Committee has recommended the establishment of a Permanent Tariff Board?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: That is one of the questions that will have to be considered at some stage but at the present moment we find there are so many matters which have to be discussed along with it that we are trying to come not to a disconnected decision but to a connected decision on all aspects of this question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government come to some decision before the end of the war, so that the country may be provided with a permanent Tariff Board before the post-war problems face us?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: They will be simultaneously considered.

RECOGNITION TO SCHOOLS IN DELHI STARTING CLASSES UNDER XI YEAR COURSE SCHEME

1575. *Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) if he is aware that the XI year Course of the Higher Secondary Education was introduced in Delhi on the 1st April, 1943;

(b) the names of schools which were given recognition to start classes IX or IX and XI both according to the new scheme on or before March 31, 1943, giving the dates of recognition in each case;

(c) the reason for not giving recognition on or before March 31, 1943; and

(d) if it is a fact that a circular was issued in April 1943 to those schools which did not receive their recognition orders to teach such subjects as may be useful for both the new and the old schemes?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) No. The XI Class for the Higher Secondary Examination, started in July, 1943.

(b) A statement is laid on the table of the House.

(c) The meaning of the question is not clear. The Special Recognition Committee of the Board in March, 1943 recognised as Higher Secondary Schools a limited number only of the then existing High Schools. Some more schools were, however, raised to the Higher Secondary standard early in April, 1943, after the Recognition Committee had satisfied themselves of the degree of efficiency of those schools and the arrangements made by them for the introduction of the new scheme.

(d) Yes.

Statement giving the names of schools in Delhi which were given recognition to start class IX or classes IX and XI both according to the new scheme on or before 31st March, 1943

No.	Name of School	Date of recognition
1.	Anglo-Sanskrit V. J. Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
2.	D. A. V. Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
3.	Modern Higher Secondary School, New Delhi	23-3-1943
4.	Raisina Bengali Higher Secondary School, New Delhi	23-3-1943
5.	L. N. Girdhari Lal K. U. Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
6.	Indraprastha Hindu Girls' Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
7.	Anglo Arabic Girls' Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
8.	Punjabi Islamia Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
9.	Queen Mary's Higher Secondary School, Delhi	23-3-1943
10.	St. Thomas's Higher Secondary School, New Delhi	23-3-1943
11.	Harcourt Butler Higher Secondary School, New Delhi	23-3-1943

LACK OF PROVISION FOR TEACHING OF CERTAIN SUBJECTS IN HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DELHI

1576. *Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) if it is a fact that in some of the Higher Secondary Schools in Delhi, provision for teaching of certain subjects did not exist after the orders recognizing them as Higher Secondary Schools were received by them; and if it was due to the fact that the School administration themselves chose to do so or because the Board of Higher Secondary Education did not give such permission; and

(b) if it is true that due to the facts mentioned in (a) above several students had to change their schools; if so, what the number of such students from each such school was?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Yes. Recognition in their cases, for teaching particular subjects, had, however, been granted subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions. The recognition was subsequently cancelled in the case of schools which were unable to fulfil those conditions.

(b) It is likely that some students have had to change their schools because the school authorities were not able to make timely provision for teaching certain subjects. The number of such students is not known. The information is being collected.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the new system of three years' degree course has begun in the colleges in Delhi?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: This is a question with regard to Higher Secondary Schools.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the Secondary Schools are now teaching the proposed 11th class, in order to befit the students for the Inter class?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Some schools are teaching the 11th class.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Which are those schools?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: I have laid a statement on the table in reply to Q. No. 1575, which was not orally put today.

OBLIGATION ON STUDENTS PASSING DELHI HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION IN 1943 TO JOIN CLASS XI IN SAME SCHOOL

1577. ***Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state if it is a fact that under rules of the Board of Higher Secondary Education, Delhi, it was obligatory for a student who passed the High School Examination of the Board in 1943 to join the XI class of the same school from which he appeared at that examination; if so, what are the reasons for imposing such an obligation?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Yes. The students were required to continue in the same institution from which they passed their High School Examination, if the school provided facilities for subjects which they wanted to offer. This was done with a view to ensure a reasonable distribution of scholars in the XIth classes of the Higher Secondary Schools and also to minimise undesirable competition amongst the Higher Secondary Schools.

CIRCULAR OF BOARD OF HIGHER SECONDARY EDUCATION, DELHI, TO SCHOOLS WANTING TO START CLASS X UNDER OLD SCHEME

1578. ***Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) if it is a fact that in October, 1944, a circular was issued by the Board of Higher Secondary Education, Delhi, asking the Principals of Higher Secondary Schools if they wanted to start the X class according to the old scheme for students who failed in the High School Examination, 1944;

(b) if the fact mentioned in (a) above is correct, will Government please state why such an enquiry was not made on or before the date of the publication of the result of that examination;

(c) if it is a fact that in October there were many students who had failed to secure admission in any of the existing schools in Delhi imparting teaching according to the old scheme; and

(d) the response to the circular mentioned in (a) above from the Principals?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Yes.

(b) It was not considered necessary to make the enquiry before the declaration of the results.

(c) No.

(d) None of the Higher Secondary Schools was prepared to run additional Class X under the old scheme.

DEVELOPING FRUIT CULTURE AND CANNING INDUSTRY IN BALUCHISTAN

†1579. ***Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) the progress made in developing fruit culture and setting up canning (fruits) industry in Baluchistan;

(b) whether applications have been made by private individuals for starting a canning factory in Baluchistan; and

(c) if so, the action taken or proposed to be taken by Government?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) There has been a Government Fruit Experimental Farm in Quetta for some years past on which work has been done in connection with the introduction of varieties of fruit trees, varietal trials and selection, propagation of successful varieties and standardization of methods of production. Largely as a result of demonstration on this farm and the advice and assistance offered by the Department of Agriculture the area under fruit trees and vines in Baluchistan has now increased from a few hundred acres to some 6,500 acres. A Fruit Experimental Laboratory has also been operating at the Fruit Experimental Station for some 7 years past and methods of canning fruit and fruit juices and producing jams have been standardised. During the war a certain amount of canning has been undertaken on behalf of the Defence Services and active investigation of the possibilities of increasing production for the army is in progress. Plans for post-war development have been prepared which should increase the fruit growing area three or four times and also create a fruit preservation industry in the province.

(b) Yes.

(c) In view of the existing shortages of plant, it has not been possible so far to take any action on these applications. As mentioned already, possibilities of increasing the production of canned fruit are being investigated and the setting up of such an industry financed partly by Government and partly by the public is envisaged as a post-war measure.

RESERVATION OF PORTIONS OF JUMNA AT OKHLA FOR FISHING BY EUROPEANS

1580. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) if he has read the news in the *National Call*, dated the 10th March, 1945, namely "Okhla Weir Reserved for Europeans";

(b) whether certain portions of the river Jumna at Okhla have been exclusively reserved for Europeans for fishing; and

(c) whether he proposes to take steps to remove the above discrimination?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Yes:

(b) No;

(c) Does not arise.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know whether that statement has been contradicted?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: We have not put out any public contradiction. I understand it is not correct.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: What is the total number of membership of the Delhi Anglers' Association?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: I mentioned it the other day in the House. My recollection is between 40 and 50.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: May I know what is the proportion of Indians to non-Indians?

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

Mr. J. D. Tyson: I think it is: 10 or 12 Europeans and the rest are Indians.

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Is the reply based on memory or on accurate figures?

No-reply

CONDITION FOR GRANT OF WHOLESALE DEALER'S LICENCE FOR SUGAR IN BIHAR

1581. *Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable Member for Food be pleased to refer to his reply to part (d) of starred question No. 953 of the 13th March, 1945 and state: (a) whether establishment in trade is a condition for the grant of wholesale dealer's licence for sugar in Bihar;

(b) whether the said three Marwaris had ever worked as wholesale sugar dealers in Muzaffarpur district; if so, for what amount, from what sugar factory and for what length of time;

(c) the amount the said three Marwaris paid over the purchase of National Savings Certificates and the date when such certificates were purchased; and

(d) the date of the grant and issue of the sugar wholesale dealer's licence?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) Yes.

(b), (c) and (d). Yes. All the three Marwari firms have worked as wholesale sugar dealers in Muzaffarpur District. A statement about other particulars is laid on the table of the House.

Statement

Name of the Firm	Extent of sugar business	Names of sugar factories from where supplies obtained	Period in trade	Date & amount invested in National Savings Certificates	Date of grant & issue of the sugar wholesale dealer's licence	Remarks
M/S. Meghraj Ram-chandra.	Had a turnover varying from 14,000 to 18,000 bags a year between 1940-41 to 1942-43; annual investment exceeds Rs. 5 lakhs.	Majhauria, Bagaha, Ram-nagar, Sagauli and Motipur.	Nearly 50 years.	Rs. 20,000 in January, 44, Rs. 5,000 in March, 44; and Rs. 2,500 in January, 45.	12th March, 1943.	
M/S. Ram-nivas Ram-ballav.	Annual investment between Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 3 lakhs.	Bagaha, Motihari, Japaha, Sitalpur, Motipur, Pachrukhi, Marhowrah and Riga.	About 50 years.	Rs. 5,000 between January and February, 1945.	February, 1943.	
M/S. Ramji-wan Dalal.	Turnover of 15,000 to 20,000 bags a year.	Riga and Narkatiaganj	10 years.	Rs. 250 in 1944 and Rs. 350 during 1945.	March, 1943.	

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: May I know whether these merchants were dealers in sugar or in cloth?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: In sugar. They have been dealing in sugar for fifty years.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Has the Honourable Member verified this fact?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: This is the information supplied to me by the Bihar Government?

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: As this is not correct information, will the Honourable Member make further inquiries and find out whether they were dealers in sugar for so many years?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I do not consider it necessary at all, in view of the definite information given to me by the Bihar Government.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: In reply to part (c) of the question, may I know how much money these merchants have invested in the National Savings Certificate?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: The question is redundant in a way, because investment in national savings certificates is not considered for the grant of sugar licenses, although the person investing in them will be regarded as a prudent man.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the fact that there are Regional Food Commissioners in the place, will the Honourable Member be good enough to inquire from him whether the facts stated in the question are correct or the facts sent to him by the Bihar Government are correct?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that the Honourable Member has his own Regional Food Commissioner, will it not be possible for him to ascertain the true state of things from his own agent?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let the Honourable Member first answer the supplementary question.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: If my Honourable friend wants it, I will make further enquiries, but I do not think there is really any need for it in view of the definite information supplied to me.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Since there is a doubt as to the accuracy of the information sent by the Bihar Government, since the Honourable Member has got his own agency

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

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is only reasonable that the Honourable Member should use his own agency and ascertain the true facts.

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: That is a matter for argument.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: I rise to a point of order, Sir. An Honourable Member of this House has challenged the facts given by the Honourable Member for Food and requested him to ascertain the true facts again, but the Honourable Member refused to do so. The Honourable Member Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani really gives facts from his own personal knowledge, whereas the Honourable the Member for Food is giving out what has been supplied to him by the Bihar Government?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no point of order.

Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall: The Honourable Member said on a previous occasion also that he has got definite information, but when I asserted similarly that the information was otherwise, then the Honourable Member said that he had satisfied himself. May I know what are the sources through which the Government of India satisfy themselves as against the Bihar Government when they make a deliberate misstatement?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: The Government have their own sources of information which the Honourable Member ought to know.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What are these sources? Are not the Regional Commissioners one of these sources?

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

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: The point of order raised by Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad has not yet been decided, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the point of order?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: The point of order is this. One Honourable Member challenged the facts given out by the Honourable the Food Member and requested the Food Member to make further enquiries into the matter which he refused.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is no point of order. The whole position has been clarified so far as the Government Member apparently could do it.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: No reply has been given to part (c).

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He has given his reply. Next question.

HYGIENE INSPECTION OF COFFEE FACTORIES

1582. *Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state: (a) whether the factories, at which coffee is prepared, have been examined from the point of view of hygiene; and if so, when they were last examined; and

(b) the precautions taken to prevent adulteration of coffee at the factories and at the time of sale to consumers?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Presumably the Honourable Member refers to the supply of Ground Coffee.

(a) The six factories of contractors for the supply of coffee for the Army, to which the Honourable Member presumably refers, have all been inspected from the point of view of Hygiene within the last three months except one which was last inspected in June 1944.

(b) Precautions against adulteration are periodical inspections of the factories during production, monthly statements accounting for the Coffee berries received and the powder produced; and analysis of samples at the Military Food Laboratories. No question of precaution at time of sale arises, as Food Department purchases Coffee only as a ration for the troops.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know the agency through which this inspection is carried on?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have already answered that.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: The particular character of the Agency?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: It is being carried on by the Food Inspection Directorate.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know the name of the factory which has been mentioned whose inspection was not carried out from the point of view of hygiene?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: That was a factory belonging to Messrs Husain Bhoj and Sons Ltd.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is the precaution against adulteration taken by the Central Government or by the Provincial Government? If so, what is the specific machinery in order to check that the public do not get adulterated stuff?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have already explained that at length.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is it by the Central Government or by the Provincial Government?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: By the Central Government.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Are yearly reports received by the Food Department?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Yes.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Do Government take action?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: The Food Department is very much alive.

HYGIENE INSPECTION OF CONDIMENT POWDERS FACTORIES

1583. *Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state: (a) whether the factories, at which condiment powders are prepared, have been examined from the point of view of hygiene; if so, what the reports about these factories were; and

(b) the precautions taken to prevent adulteration of condiment powders?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) Yes. The reports were generally satisfactory.

(b) The Precautions to prevent adulteration include analysis of samples at the Military Food Laboratories and occasional inspections by officers of the Food Department and of the Inspectorate of Hygiene.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: The Honourable Member said that the reports were generally satisfactory. What is the meaning of that?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Wherever there was any defect found it was brought to the notice of the proprietors and set right.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if such complaints were made and whether inspectors have gone into them, to the knowledge of the Honourable Member?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Oh! yes, they are being made as occasion arises.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Do the Government inspect factories which are producing only for armed forces or do they inspect factories which produce for the general public also?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: It is only for the army condiment powder.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know if there is any provision for inspection of factories which supply for the civilian needs?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: There is no purchase made by Government for the general public. We are on condiments now.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: What are the contents of the report?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have not got copies of reports. Inspections are made from time to time. If there are any defects they are brought to the notice of the Department by the Inspectors and those defects are set right.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: In view of the fact that reports are submitted to the Central Government, is the Honourable Member in a position to say what the reports are and from which factories?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have not got a detailed list of factories.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: The names of such of the factories whose reports he has?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: None.

GHEE PURCHASING FIRMS OF GOVERNMENT

1584. *Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Will the Honourable the Food Member please state:

(a) the number and names of firms with the names of partners, if any, appointed by Government to purchase ghee last year;

(b) whether any of these have been given notice that their services will not be required; and

(c) the precautions taken to prevent adulteration of ghee?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) Only one Agent was newly appointed last year, viz., British India Trading Co., Bombay in which Mr. D. Khandka, Mr. Devji Rattansi and Mr. Gordhan Dass Javdavji are partners.

(b) No.

(c) Food Department only buys ghee for the Army which before acceptance is tested to a specification designed to ensure the supply of pure ghee.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: What are the special qualifications of this firm?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I am afraid, I do not know what my Honourable friend means by 'special qualifications'. They are a good firm.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Were any tenders invited? Was any comparison made between the tenders? How were they found to be efficient?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I shall require notice as to whether tenders were invited or not. That does not arise out of the question on the order paper.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: I know tenders are not invited but applications are submitted to this Department which purchases food for the army. What are the grounds on which applications are granted or rejected?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: We must get hold of a reliable firm which will do the job.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: What is meant by "a reliable firm"?
(No reply was given.)

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Is it a fact that a large amount of National Savings Certificates was purchased by this firm and therefore they got the license?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: No, Sir, 'therefore' does not arise.

Ghee HEATING CENTRES

1585. *Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state the number of Ghee Heating Centres in India, and the places where they are situated, and whether Government propose to continue all of them; if not, which of the Centres are to be discontinued and why?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: There are six Ghee Heating Centres in India located at Agra, Muzaffarpore, Kamptee, Ambala, Karachi and Bangalore.

At present Government proposes to discontinue only the Ghee Centre at Kamptee, from 1st June 1945, or soon thereafter, in view of the changed circumstances of demand and availability.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: What is the meaning of "changed circumstances"?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Change in demand and availability.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Did not the demand originally exist and supplies made? On what grounds has this centre been discontinued?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: The military demand is now less and there is less ghee to be obtained in that area.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Then will the Honourable Member take steps to decrease the ration that is given to the army in the matter of vegetable ghee? Is the Honourable Member aware that the army is given vegetable ghee simply because animal ghee is not available?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: That question ought to be addressed to the War Department. I do not fix the ration for the army. I only carry out the demands of the Quarter-Master General.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: But is the Honourable Member really certain that the demand for ghee from the army is less?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Yes, it is less.

APPLICATIONS FOR OPENING PRIMARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS IN BALUCHISTAN

†1586. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) the total number of applications received in Baluchistan in 1944-45 for opening new primary and middle schools;

(b) the number of such applications which were granted; and

(c) whether any new schools are being opened in Baluchistan in 1945-46?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) 10 and 5 respectively.

(b) None of these applications could be granted owing to financial stringency. It may, however, be added that nineteen primary schools and one middle school were opened in April 1944.

(c) No, the question of opening new schools will be taken up as soon as the financial situation permits.

EXPENDITURE ON GROW MORE FOOD CAMPAIGN IN BALUCHISTAN

†1587. *Mr. Abdul Qaiyum: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) the amount spent on "Grow More Food" Campaign in Baluchistan in 1944-45?

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

- (b) the amount ear-marked for the above purpose in 1945-46;
- (c) the results achieved; and
- (d) whether any comprehensive scheme has been prepared; and, if so, the salient provisions?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) The amount given in 1944-45 to the Baluchistan Administration for Grow More Food schemes is Rs. 1,82,000 as grants and Rs. 1,66,000 as loans.

(b) For the year 1945-46 schemes involving recoverable and non-recoverable expenditure of Rs. 10,54,700 and Rs. 4,28,000 respectively have been sanctioned so far.

(c) It has been estimated that some 14,000 tons of additional food will be produced by schemes sanctioned in 1944-45. As a result of the scheme for vegetable seed production about 42,000 lbs. of seeds of European types of vegetables were produced at Quetta valued at Rs. 3,58,000 approximately.

(d) The salient features of the scheme of work for 1945-46 are:

- (1) the multiplication and distribution of improved wheat seed.
- (2) the distribution of improved ploughs and fodder cutters.
- (3) the training of fieldmen.
- (4) the composting of town and village refuse, and
- (5) the construction of minor irrigation works.

Sachhuts CONFERENCE AT CAWNPORE

1588. *Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House please state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to page 4 (12) of the weekly news called *Kaukab-i-Hind* of Lucknow, dated the 2nd February, 1945, regarding holding a sachhuts conference on the 29th to 31st December, 1944, at Cawnpore; and

(b) whether Government of India in Reforms Department received copies of resolutions passed at the said conference along with notes of the Organiser of All-India Hindu Backward Classes League asking for separate representation for Hindu Backward classes; if so, with what results?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: (a) and (b). I have now seen the news item referred to, and the resolutions which are said to have been passed. If action is desired on them, the appropriate authorities should be approached.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: What are the appropriate authorities?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: The Central Government, the Provincial Government and the local bodies.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Has the Central Government been approached by these people by sending their Resolutions?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: No, Sir.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS OF INDIA

1589. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please give a list of the various industrial products of India about which Government collects information and also a statement regarding exports under each of these heads on private and Government accounts during the last three calendar years?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: It is not possible to furnish the list asked for as information of one kind or another is collected for a large number of products, and preparation of a list of all products, for which information of any kind is collected would involve an expenditure of time and labour which would not be justified in war time. Moreover, it is not clear what products are included under the expression 'industrial products' and what excluded from its connotation.

GRIEVANCES OF STUDENTS OF LADY HARDINGE COLLEGE, NEW DELHI

1590. *Mr. Lalchand Navairai: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state what restrictions have been imposed upon the students of the Lady Hardinge College, New Delhi for going out and returning late to the College?

(b) What are the rules for visits of relations and friends to girl students? Will he please place the same on the table of the House?

(c) Why was the Founders' Day celebrations at the Medical College postponed *sine die* as announced in the *Hindustan Times* of 18th March, 1945?

(d) What are the grievances of the students which have caused embitterment and for which the Governing Body of the College has to meet on the 24th March, 1945?

(e) Is it a fact that Miss Lila Pandit, President of the College Students' Union, has written a letter to the President of this Governing Body that the students' daily life has been embittered owing to their grievances not having received consideration?

(f) Will he please state how many times the Governing Body met during 1944 and up to March, 1945, and which members of the body elected by the Indian Legislature attended each meeting of the body?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) and (b). A copy of the rules is placed on the table of the House.

(c) As already explained in reply to Mr. Neogy's question No. 1346 on the 26th March 1945. Founder's Day was not celebrated this year because the students intimated to the Principal that they were not willing to attend it.

(d) The meeting of the Governing Body on the 24th March was not called specially to consider the grievances of the students as assumed by the Honourable Member. A copy of the letter sent by Miss Lila Pandit, President of the Students' Union, to the principal explaining the grievances of the students was laid on the table of the House in answer to part (b) of Mr. Neogy's question.

(e) Yes.

(f) The Governing Body met twice during 1944 and once in March this year. The following members of the Governing Body, who are Members of the Indian Legislature, attended the meetings of the Governing Body held on the dates specified against each:

Sir Syed Raza Ali and the Honourable Mr. Sapru attended the meeting of the 25th March 1944;

Sir Syed Raza Ali attended that of the 25th November 1944; and

Sardar Sant Singh attended that of the 24th March 1945:

LADY HARDINGE MEDICAL COLLEGE, RULES REGARDING LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND VISITORS *Leave of Absence and Visitors*

Students may go out daily after classes end, but must return in time for roll call at 7.45 P.M. unless a pass has been obtained. Students must sign the book at the front entrance on going out and coming back stating their destination, or object in going out the time of departure and return.

In order to be absent from roll call and out after 7.45 P.M. a student must obtain a pass from the Warden. Application for passes are made in a book outside the Warden's office. Passes are to be applied for before 2 P.M. daily and before 2 P.M. on Saturday for a Sunday pass. The Warden's signature must be obtained before the pass is valid. All passes must be handed to the Durwan at the front entrance on going out. Passes allow absence up to 10 P.M. only, except in very special cases. Students must leave and enter the College by the front entrance only.

All hotels, restaurants and tea shops are out of bounds even when students are spending the week-end with friends, except that students may go to Davico's or Wenger's between 3.30 and 7.30 P.M.

All parents or guardians supply a list of: (1) friends who may visit their daughters or wards or (2) friends with whom they may spend week-ends or odd holidays. Students may only visit the friends whose names are on the list. When visiting friends students should enter the name of the person in the book. It is not sufficient to write "visiting friends". Students may only write "Home" if their parents or guardians actually live in Delhi.

Students wishing to stay with friends and thus be absent from College for one or more nights, must apply on a leave form through the Warden to the Principal and receive her permission before absenting themselves.

Students wishing to take leave at times other than recognised holidays and week-ends must apply on a leave form through the Warden to the Principal and state the reason for their application for leave.

Visitors on the list supplied by the parents or guardians may come to see students between the hours of 3.30 P.M. and 7.30 P.M. on week-days and between 10.30 A.M. and 7.30 P.M. on Sundays. Gentlemen visitors will see students in the Hall and Visitors' room,

but lady visitors are permitted to go to students' rooms. Permission to see students at other time in cases of emergency can be granted by the Warden.

Students may have visitors to stay in their rooms after obtaining the Warden's permission. The period of stay should not exceed three days.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: With reference to part (a) may I know what new restrictions have been imposed upon these students?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: No new rules have actually been added, but the Principal has been tightening up the administration of the rules, and in particular, she has put the quarters of the House Surgeons in the college compound out of bounds to students. The students can only entertain House Surgeons in the students' common room. The reasons for this are congestion in the House Surgeons' quarters and the fact that students were meeting soldiers and other men in those quarters. The second thing is that she has curtailed the number of passes that are issued to these lady students on the ground that Delhi is a dangerous place for young women after dark, especially in the winter months.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Have any arrangements been made for guests, friends and relatives of these students to meet them? And at what place do they meet?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Yes, Sir. The Honourable Member will find that, in the rules that I have laid on the table, very adequate arrangements have been made.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Is it a fact that the Founder's Day has been postponed because of the hot atmosphere created by the students?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Yes. The students intimated that they would not attend; they presented a manifesto saying that they would not attend it. The Principal convened a meeting of the staff and decided not to hold the celebration.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Was it found out from them why they were not attending?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Yes; they said that unless their grievances, specially those to which I have referred, were met they would not attend.

Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: May I know, Sir, if there is a tutorial system in the College, each professor being in charge of a certain number of students?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: I shall require notice of that; it really does not arise.

Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: In view of the fact, Sir, that from questions put in this House and reports in the press it is quite clear that the state of affairs in this college is not satisfactory, will Government give their immediate attention to the urgency of appointing a committee to make a thorough investigation?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: No, Sir; we are not at all convinced that conditions are not satisfactory. The college has got its own Governing Body and they are handling the matter.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know if the Governing Body have considered the manifesto issued by the students and their complaints and grievances?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: The Governing Body had two letters from the students before them in their meeting on the 24th March and did consider them,—I do not know with what result.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Did the Governing Body find Delhi a dangerous zone?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: I should point out that this tightening up of the rules was introduced during the cold weather when the nights are long and dark.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that moonlit nights are more dangerous than dark nights?

PUBLIC UTILITY CONCERNS HELD BY NON-INDIAN INTERESTS

1591. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state:

(a) the number of public utility concerns held by British and other non-Indian interests in India; and

(b) whether any attempts were made to acquire these public utility concerns?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) and (b). The information asked for is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House.

EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION IN BALUCHISTAN

†1592. ***Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

- (a) the sum spent on education in Baluchistan in 1944-45;
- (b) the percentage this constitutes of the total expenditure;
- (c) whether the sum allotted for education is being increased in 1945-46; and, if so, by how much;
- (d) how this compares with the amount spent on education in Ajmer-Merwara and Delhi; and
- (e) what percentage of the total expenditure was spent on education in 1944-45 in Ajmer-Merwara, Delhi and Baluchistan?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) The revised estimates for 1944-45 for "Education" under "Baluchistan" are Rs. 5,54,400.

(b) 6.52 per cent.

(c) Yes, by Rs. 2,25,200.

(d) The budget estimates for 1945-46 for "Education" under "Ajmer-Merwara" and "Delhi" are Rs. 7,19,400 and Rs. 20,03,600 respectively, as against Rs. 7,79,600 under "Baluchistan".

(e) The respective percentages in Ajmer-Merwara, Delhi and Baluchistan were 21.17, 20.2 and 6.52.

ENFORCEMENT OF ROMAN SCRIPT IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF CERTAIN DISTRICTS IN UNITED PROVINCES

1593. ***Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

(a) if the Government of India are aware that the Government of the United Provinces have enforced the use of Roman script in Primary schools of the Districts of Garhwal, Bulandshahr and Partabgarh for which text books have been compiled and are being printed in the Government Press, Allahabad; and

(b) if the reply to part (a) above is in the affirmative whether the Government of India have enunciated any policy with regard to that?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Government have no information.

(b) No; the Government of India have not enunciated any policy in the matter.

Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall: In view of the importance of the question, will the Government of India inquire into the matter?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: No, Sir, it is a provincial matter.

Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall: In view of its importance I suggest that this introduction of the Roman script is an all-India matter, and so the Government of India should inquire into it.

Mr. J. D. Tyson: If any province likes to raise it in the Central Advisory Board of Education, I have no doubt that the Board will consider it.

Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall: In view of the fact that the U. P. is a province ruled by section 93 of the Government of India Act and there is no popular Government, will the Central Government inquire into the matter and see that in the interim this rule may not be introduced as it will be very prejudicial to students?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: No, Sir.

PAYMENTS TO CONTRACTORS FOR SILT CLEARANCE AT CHANDRAWAL AND WAZIRABAD, DELHI

1594. ***Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

(a) if it is a fact that, total payments to contractors for silt clearance, at Chandrawal and Wazirabad, Delhi, under the Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board, New Delhi, etc., during 1941-42, 1942-43 and 1943-44 were only approximately Rs. 3,000, 12,000 and 9,000 respectively;

(b) if it is a fact that during the current financial year the figure of payments has gone above Rs. 50,000;

(c) if it is a fact that the contract of the present contractor is being renewed on the present high rates without inviting fresh tenders; if so, why?

(d) if it is a fact that payment at higher rates is being made for wet silt, while in actual practice, silt is removed only when it has dried up;

(e) if it is a fact that the Board is, at present, paying an exorbitant rate of Rs. 7-8-0 per hundred cubic feet for extra load for every additional chain, while the rate during the previous years has been less than Re. 1; if so, why; and

(f) if Government are prepared to institute enquiries into the working of the Board and its staff?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) to (f). Information has been called for and will be furnished to the house when received.

EXCESSIVE REQUISITION OF FOODGRAINS FROM CULTIVATORS IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS

1595. *Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether he is aware that in the following districts, excessive requisition of foodgrains from cultivators was made and that their objections are not heard and that there is agitation in the press against the method employed and the policy followed:

(i) Madras:—South Kanara District, and

(ii) Bombay:—Dharwar, Belgaum, Bijapur and North Kanara; and

(b) in view of the assurance given by the Honourable Member in his reply to Starred Question No. 618, dated the 20th November, 1944 that the cultivators' requirements would be safeguarded, whether Central Government have issued any circulars in this regard so far; if not, whether they propose to do so now?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) I have made enquiries and am assured that excessive requisitioning of foodgrains from cultivators was not resorted to in the districts mentioned. Objections are carefully considered and where necessary rebates are allowed. In Bombay articles in the Press regarding the levy system generally are regularly discussed in District Press Conferences and misunderstandings removed as far as possible. A report has been called for from Madras on this point.

(b) I am satisfied that the need for safeguarding the requirements of cultivators which my Department has already impressed on Provincial Governments and which was discussed at the last Food Conference, is fully understood, and no special directive on the point is required.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: With reference to the Honourable Member's reply to part (a) of the question, may I know what he means by "excessive requisitioning of foodgrains from cultivators"? May I know how much grain was left with the cultivators?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I mean exactly what I have said—no more and no less.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: There is no question of 'no more and no less'. I want to know how much grain was actually left with the cultivators for themselves and their families?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: That was not the question on the order paper.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: The question was 'whether he is aware that excessive requisition of foodgrains from cultivators was being made'. . . .

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I am satisfied that excessive grain was not requisitioned from the cultivators.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: What are the rules for the requisitioning of foodgrains?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: We have made no rules; these rules are made by the Provincial Governments. The whole system is explained in the Butler Report which is in the Library of the House.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the fact that large complaints have been received in this matter, will the Government issue a fresh circular saying that proper allowances which are promised in the orders made by the Government itself are kept up and that proper allowances are given? The order is all right but the execution is defective. We do not know what machinery he has, but may I know if he will issue a strict circular that the orders which are being issued are strictly adhered to?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Yes, certainly.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member enquire from his Regional Food Commissioner whether his orders are being strictly enforced and whether the cultivators' requirements are left with the cultivators?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: As I have already stated in my reply, so far as Bombay goes I am satisfied with the reports which I have received that all legitimate complaints are looked into and put right.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What about Madras?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I am awaiting a reply from Madras. I have written to Madras and as soon as I get information from there, I will lay it before the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Does it cover both the Government of Madras and the Regional Food Commissioner?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: Yes, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Honourable Member's attention has been drawn to actual reports of excessive procurements of foodgrains from various other districts also, apart from South Canara—for instance, South Arcot?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: No, Sir. I have not seen any such reports.

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

AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES

1596. ***Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether the accounts of the Government of India Presses are annually audited by the Accountant General, Central Revenues, New Delhi;

(b) whether copies of the audit reports are sent to his Department for perusal and action; and whether such copies were received in the last two years; if so, the action taken thereon;

(c) whether it is a fact that serious discrepancies in the accounts of paper were found in the last two reports and no action was taken on them; if so, what the reasons are; and

(d) whether Government propose to place a copy of each of the audit reports for the last two years of the New Delhi Press on the table of the House?

The Honourable Dr. B. B. Ambedkar: (a) The accounts of the Presses are audited by the Accountant General, Central Revenues and other Accountants General who act on his behalf.

(b) Reports are submitted by audit to Heads of Departments. Reference is made to Government of India only on points of importance or matters on which settlement cannot be reached.

(c) The 1942-48 report revealed certain discrepancies which were mostly due to wrong entries in registers. The matter is still under examination. The 1943-44 report has recently been received and is under examination by the Controller of Printing & Stationary, India.

(d) No. Important points are included in the Appropriation Accounts of the year by the Accountant General, Central Revenues. These accounts are

examined by the Public Accounts Committee and their report is laid before the Legislative Assembly.

Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde: May I know with reference to part (d) of the question whether the Honourable Member will please lay the audit reports on the table of the House?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: No, Sir. It is not necessary. These are included in the Public Accounts Committee reports.

Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde: May I know whether these audit reports are incorporated in full in the Public Accounts Committee reports?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Such parts of it as are necessary for the purposes of the Public Accounts Committee are incorporated.

NEW LIST OF VOTERS FOR CENTRAL ASSEMBLY IN BOMBAY

†1597. ***Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Will the Honourable the Law Member please state:

(a) whether only two copies of the registered list of voters for the Central Assembly are at present available to the Bombay Public;

(b) the date on which the new list of voters for the Central Assembly was published in Bombay;

(c) the last date for preferring claims and objections;

(d) whether a large number of names have been left out from the new list;

(e) whether owing to inadequate number of new lists, people are experiencing difficulty to find out if their names are on the list;

(f) whether he has read the complaint in this connection in the *Hindustan Times* of 17th March, 1945 (page 4) under the heading 'Central Assembly voters list, several thousands of names omitted' and

(g) whether he proposes to take steps to redress the grievances voiced in the news item?

The Honourable Sir Asoka Roy: (a) and (e). In accordance with regulation 2 in Part II of the Legislative Assembly (Bombay) Electoral Regulations, publication was effected at the headquarters office of the Returning Officer where seven copies were available and at the headquarters office of the Municipality where one copy was available. The public referred freely to the available copies and there is nothing to suggest that any difficulty arose.

(b) and (c). Publication under regulation 2 was effected on the 12th March, and under sub-regulation (3) of regulation 3 claims and objections were required to reach the office of the Judge on or before the tenth day from the date of publication, excluding the day of publication. I would add that publication under regulation 2 was preceded by a preliminary publication under regulation 7 on the 8th January when 15 days were allowed for the submission of applications for enrolment.

(d) No. I lay on the table a copy of the report received from the Returning Officer on this point.

(f) Yes, but the report laid on the table in reply to part (d) shows that the complaint had no foundation.

(g) Does not arise.

Returning Officer's Report

It is not correct to say that a large number of names have been left out from the Electoral Rolls. Every care was taken to include all legitimate names at the time of the preparation of the Rolls. There was first the Government of Bombay's Notification No. 6805, dated 2nd October 1944 in the Bombay Government Gazette. Then I issued a press notice, dated 26th October 1944, through the Director of Information, Bombay, asking all persons intending to have their names enrolled to register them in the Collector's office. Again, after the preliminary publication, the public was again informed through a press communique that qualified persons whose names were not enrolled should apply to the Collector. Only 205 claims have been received by the Revising Authority by the 22nd instant, which shows that only few names were left out. No complaint has been received from the persons who actually came to consult the lists.

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner having exhausted his quota.

PRODUCTION AND EXPORT OF CHILLIES

1598. *Mr. Ananga Mohan Das: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state:

(a) the production of Chillies in the country in 1941-42, 1942-48 and 1943-44; and the quantities exported out of India and to which countries;

(b) what system was adopted to grant export licences and on what basis, the firms were selected for such licences;

(c) the number and names of firms which are authorised to export chillies out of India; and

(d) if in selecting firms Government prefer firms quoting lower prices to those charging higher prices; if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) A statement giving such information as is available is laid on the table.

(b) and (d). Price quoted is not the determining factor in the issue of licenses. Licenses are, as a rule, granted by the Export Trade Controllers to established exporters on the basis of their shipments in the basic year 1941-42. The object of confining licences to such exporters is so that, when trade is restricted, it should be reserved as far as possible to those whose normal business has been affected.

(c) There are 194 established exporters. It is not in the public interest to disclose their names.

Statement

(a) Production of Chillies during the period 1941-42 to 1943-44.

Province	Production (Tons)		
	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44
Bengal . . .	Figures not available	3,130	Figures not available
Bombay . . .	7,010	7,381	8,020
Madras . . .	156,595	170,470	Figures not available

Data for other parts of the country are not available.

(b) Export of Chillies from British India during the period 1941-42 to 1943-44.
(In cwts.)

To countries of destination	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44
Ceylon (excluding Maldives)	128,279	189,201	107,225
United Kingdom (including Channel Islands).	1,987
Aden and Dependencies . . .	2,192
Burma . . .	531
Straits Settlements . . .	10,194
Federated Malay States . . .	1,846
Union of South Africa . . .	120	12,091 (to countries other than Ceylon)	6,700 (to countries other than Ceylon)
Mauritius and Dependencies . . .	1,858
Commonwealth of Australia . . .	687
Iraq . . .	347
United States of America . . .	617
Other countries . . .	753
Total	149,181	201,292	113,925

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the answer to part (d) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I answered parts (b) and (d) together.

Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: May I know if it is a fact that a great quantity of Chillies got deteriorated for want of transport facilities?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have had no definite complaint to that effect, but the shipping facilities are limited as the Honourable Member must understand.

Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: Is it not a fact that if the number of exporters is increased, it would be to the advantage of growers of chillies?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I don't accept that, but I can give the Honourable Member certain figures. In the year 1941-42, we exported 150,000 cwts. of chillies. During the year 1942-43, we exported 201,000 cwts. of chillies, so that the quantity increased in that year.

Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: May I know if the Honourable Member is aware that there was an insistent demand from the Government of Ceylon for chillies?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: We have met that demand.

Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: What is the difficulty in increasing the number of exporters?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: I have explained that in my answer.

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

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: May I know the number of European exporters?

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

EUROPEAN AND INDIAN I. M. S. OFFICERS HOLDING ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS

1599. ***Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

(a) the number of European Officers of the Indian Medical Service holding administrative posts as Surgeon-General or Inspector-General of Hospitals;

(b) the number of Indian officers holding similar appointments; and

(c) the number of European officers appointed to these posts since the beginning of the war; and whether such appointments have resulted in supersession of Indian officers; if so, why?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Eight.

(b) None at present. One Indian officer refused an appointment of Inspector General of Civil Hospitals, when selected for it. Another Indian officer has recently been selected for appointment as Inspector General but has not yet joined.

(c) British officers were appointed to fourteen out of fifteen of these posts filled since the beginning of the war. Appointments to the posts are made by selection by Provincial Governments. As these are purely selection posts no question of supersession arises.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I know the reasons why the Indian Officer refused the post of Inspector General of Civil Hospitals?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Domestic reasons; it involved service for the whole year in what is virtually a hill station and he said that his wife's health would not permit his accepting the appointment.

Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh: Who makes the selection?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: The Provincial Governments.

FEMALE SUBORDINATE IN FOOD DEPARTMENT

1600. ***Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani:** Will the Honourable the Food Member please state:

(a) the total number of female subordinates Division, I and II in the Department of Food and how many of them are Bengalis; and

(b) whether it is a fact that no seniority list of these female subordinates is maintained; if so, on what basis their promotions to higher posts are made;

and if any seniority list is maintained, whether it is combined or separate from that of male subordinates?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) Thirteen in all: two Assistants, ten Clerks and one confidential Secretary.

Out of the total of thirteen, three are Bengalis.

(b) A combined gradation list is maintained for both men and women.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman: What is the duty of the Confidential Secretary?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: She is a Confidential Secretary.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman: Is she attached to the Honourable Member?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: No, not to the Honourable Member.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: May I know whether it is a fact that female subordinates are divided into two categories: (i) those under teens; and (ii) those above teens; and, if so, those under teens are retained in the Administration Branch under the direct control of Administration officers and those above teens are spread over different branches in the Department?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: No, Sir. We do not do anything so monstrous as that.

ADMISSIONS IN DHANBAD SCHOOL OF MINES

1801. Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state the number of admissions in 1940, 1941 and 1942 to the Dhanbad School of Mines and the number of Muslims in respective years?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: 26, 24 and 24 out of which the number of Muslim was One, Nil, and Nil respectively.

Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: In view of the low percentage of Mussalmans who have been admitted in the Dhanbad School of Mines, has the Honourable Member considered the advisability of fixing the percentage of Mussalmans with minimum qualifications as he has done in the case of the Scheduled Castes or Depressed Classes?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I shall carefully examine the matter.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman: May I know if the Honourable Member has done it for the Scheduled Castes and whether the minimum percentage has not been fixed for them?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Yes.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: In reply to a supplementary question which I put on the subject on the 16th March, the Honourable Member replied that the Governing Body has got full powers to make the reservation for the admission of students in this manner. Does the Honourable Member confirm that statement today?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Yes, Sir. The Governing Body has the right to ask the Government to enlarge its functions and if the Governing Body took the matter up and applied to the Government to have this matter left to them, Government will be glad to consider the matter.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: They have got no such power at present and they have to come to the Government to get this power?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Yes, Sir.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: The impression was created by the last reply of the Honourable Member that they have already got this power.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: They have the power to ask for the enlargement of their functions.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I am not asking for the enlargement of their functions. I want to know whether they have got the power at present to reserve the seats in the school.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Not in the specific terms in which my Honourable friend has referred to it.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that my name was mentioned in the reply of the Honourable Member to a supplementary question

on Question No. 1047 on the 16th March, I made enquiries from the Principal of the School of Mines and I found that the Governing Body has no such power.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Not at present. If they move in the matter, the Government will be pleased to consider it.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Did the Governing Body move in the case of the Scheduled Castes?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Yes, Sir. There was correspondence with the Principal. I might inform the Honourable Member that the position with regard to the Muslims, as I find it, is that they do not seem to be keen to take advantage of the school. (Interruption.) My Honourable friend will listen to me. I will give some figures. In 1926-27 three Muslims were admitted, one left. In 1930-31 two were admitted of whom one left. In 1932-33, four were admitted of whom two left. In 1934-35, three were admitted, one left. In 1935-36 two were admitted of whom one left. In 1943-44, two were admitted and one left. In 1944-45 one was admitted but did not join.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: We had been hearing similar arguments in connection with engineering and other colleges, and on investigation they were found to be incorrect. If the Honourable Member reserves the seats I am sure I can supply him with three times the number that he has reserved.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: That is a matter which I will consider.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: As it is disclosed by the reply of the Honourable Member that so many Mussalmans left continuously year after year, will the Honourable Member enquire why every year Mussalmans did join but left?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I seem to think that there is some explanation. I find on examining the position of the Dhanbad School that from 1926-27 there has been a general decline of students. In 1926-27 the total was 51. In 1929 it fell down to 10 and it is only in 1941-42 the number came up to 24. The reason seems to be the general decline in the coal industry and also because there are very few possibilities of the student being employed afterwards, since most of the mining areas employ uncertificated people.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Does it mean that the coal mines do not take advantage. . . .

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

PERMISSION TO CERTAIN BOMBAY COMPANY FOR REGISTERING A COMPANY FOR MANUFACTURE OF RADIO SETS

1602. *Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state if it is a fact that Messrs. Eastern Electric and Engineering Company of Bombay have secured permission to register a company with fifty lacs of rupees as capital and an influential Board for the manufacture of radio sets in India?

(b) Is it a fact that the Managing Director of this Company applied for priority air passage to America and the grant of such passage was approved by the Civil Supplies Department, New Delhi?

(c) Is it a fact that on the 14th March, 1945, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Political and Services Department, wrote to this firm that their application for a priority air passage could not be entertained?

(d) Is it a fact that the Managing Director of this firm has not yet been granted a passport to proceed to America by the External Affairs Department, New Delhi, in spite of the fact that his application for a passport was favourably recommended by the Government of Bombay?

(e) In view of the declared policy of Government to encourage the manufacture of radio sets in India, do Government propose to call for these papers and consider whether the facilities requested for passport and travel to arrange for equipment and machinery, could not be granted?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) The permission has been given to the Motwane Radio Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Bombay.

(b) No. The Managing Director did not apply. Mr. V. G. Motwane, Vice-Chairman of the same Co. did however apply and the Industries and Civil Supplies Department recommended the grant of air passage to U. S. A. for him.

(c) Yes, because Mr. N. G. Motwane, the Managing Director of the firm is already in U. S. A. to look after the business.

(d) The Managing Director, Mr. N. G. Motwane, as stated in reply to part (c) of the question, is already in U. S. A. and hence the question of granting a passport to him does not arise.

(e) In view of the answer to part (c) of the question, does not arise.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that Government's attitude with regard to the encouragement of certain types of industries, such as chemicals, photographic films, radios, etc., is being misunderstood, will the Honourable Member consider some extra effort in order to give facilities of the kind asked for?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: Here is a Managing Director who has already gone to America and there is no question of giving a passport to him. He is already in that connection there. I would like to know whether the Honourable Member wants all the Directors to be sent to America.

Mr. Manu Subedar: The Vice-President of the Company is now anxious to go and while the Government of Bombay are agreeable the Government of India are not agreeable and if the Government of India are agreeable, the Government of Bombay are not agreeable. Will the Honourable Member make in the Industries section of his Department some special effort to see that such things do not occur?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: The Industries Department has to find air passage even in these difficult times for not merely this company but a number of others as well and I myself have been approached by quite a number of people within the last few weeks and we have to make arrangements for them. I am sure that both the Managing Director and the Vice-President of a company cannot always be sent to America.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: If the Honourable Member wants to know from this company why two men are going there, may I ask whether it is a fact or not that the former man, the President, went there not for this purpose? He went there for other purposes. Now he wants this Vice President for this particular purpose. Why should not a passport be given to him?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: This is a company for which the capital issue was permitted recently. This gentleman who is in America is called the Managing Director. I cannot understand how a man can go there and say "I have come here for another reason. Send me another man, even though I am the Managing Director"?

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Will the Honourable Member enquire of this company (I have made full enquiries) why two passports should be issued? Has the Honourable Member enquired that?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: I do not think it is necessary, because it will be difficult for us to find out air passage for two people of one concern. I would be very glad to do so, when the passage position becomes easy.

REPRESENTATION FROM EMPIRE INDIAN LABOUR FORMERLY EMPLOYED IN BURMA

1603. *Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations be pleased to state:

(a) if Government have received any representation from the Empire Indian labour, formerly employed in Burma as to their future interests regarding (i) their freedom to emigrate to Burma; (ii) their need to be freed from the former evil of contract system of recruiting and paying labour; (iii) minimum

wages; (iv) unemployment Insurance; (v) improvement of housing conditions; and (vi) provision and other social securities;

(b) whether Government propose to meet these needs of Indian labour in Burma; and

(c) whether Government propose to call a conference of the representatives of former Indian labour in Burma, to ascertain their needs and wishes?

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) and (b). We have not had any representation from any organisation known as "Empire Indian Labour"; but certain representations on the subject have been received. Government are fully alive to the importance of securing satisfactory conditions for Indian labour in respect of the matters specified. They will continue to make every effort to meet these needs of Indian labour.

(c) The suggestion will receive consideration.

CONSULTATION OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON HYDARI MISSION

RECOMMENDATIONS

1604. *Prof. N. G. Ranga: With reference to his answer to part (d) of starred Question No. 1204, dated the 21st March 1945, will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state whether Government propose to consult this House before coming to final decisions on the recommendations of the Hydari Mission?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: I would refer the Honourable Member to the supplementary questions and answers to starred question No. 474 on the 22nd February 1945, answered by Mr. Trivedi.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Hydari Mission has already concluded certain agreements or has taken final decisions?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: Hydari Mission has come back.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It has come back it is true, has it submitted its report to the Government of India, and, if so, will the Government of India give this House an opportunity of discussing it?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: It was answered quite definitely by Mr. Trivedi that it is not a policy committee and had only gone to explore possibilities of certain supplies. It has come back, and it was also answered by Mr. Trivedi as to what will be done after they come back.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: This is a queer position. I put this question myself. When it came up for discussion the Honourable Member wanted notice. I gave him the notice. I asked him whether this House would be consulted at all in regard to the activities of this Mission. The Honourable Member refers me to some other question which was answered, and does not give a specific answer.

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: This Mission did not go at the instance of the Department of Industries and Civil Supplies, but at the instance of the War Department. Mr. Trivedi answered that the question of acquainting the Legislature with the results of the Mission will be considered after its return.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: Now that the Mission has come back will Government give us an assurance that the matter will be considered by the House?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: That should be addressed to the War Department.

(b) WRITTEN ANSWERS

BLUE-PRINT FOR CONDITIONS FOR INDIAN LABOURERS TO BE ALLOWED TO GO TO BURMA, ETC.

1605. *Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member for Commonwealth Relations be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to prepare any blue-print for the conditions subject to which Indian labourers are to be allowed to go and be employed in Burma, Dutch East Indies, Malaya, Singapore and other Pacific areas;

(b) whether he is aware that previous to the Japanese entry into war, Indian labour in those countries had serious complaints about the conditions economic, political and social, subject to which they were employed; and

(c) whether Government propose to convene a conference of representatives of the Indian labourers who had been in those countries and who had come back after the Japanese aggression and ascertain their views, needs and demands, before they make their final blue-prints.

The Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare: (a) and (b). Under section 10 of the Indian Emigration Act, 1922, emigration of Indian labourers is not lawful except to such countries and on such terms and conditions as the Government may specify. Of the countries mentioned by the Honourable Member Burma and Malaya are the only two to which emigration has so far been allowed. The Government are aware of the grievances of Indian labour employed in the various Empire countries in the East and will see that satisfactory conditions of employment are assured before emigration of Indian labour is allowed to those areas. The conditions under which emigration will be permitted have to be determined in respect of each country with special reference to local conditions and may have to be settled by negotiation. It is not, therefore, proposed to issue at present any blue-print detailing the conditions under which such emigration will be permitted.

(c) The Government will take into consideration the views of all representative bodies interested in the welfare of Indian labour before coming to any final decision. They have already had consultations with representatives of Indian labour in Burma.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT SERVANTS NOT PROVIDED WITH QUARTERS

1606. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state the percentage of Central Government servants serving in Delhi and New Delhi and having a monthly salary of below Rs. 600 who have not so far been provided with any Government accommodation?

(b) Is it a fact that a Government servant whose monthly salary is below Rs. 600 is not deprived of his quarter when he becomes out of class until accommodation of a higher type can be provided to him?

(c) Will Government please state the number of Government servants in Delhi and New Delhi who were in possession of Government quarters but have been deprived of them on technical ground of transfer from one Government office to another in New Delhi e.g. from Agricultural Institute, Pusa, Government of India Press, New Delhi, A. G. P. & T. etc., to the Government of India Main Secretariat Departments?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) About 65 per cent.

(b) Yes.

(c) The required information is not readily available and its collection at this stage would not justify the labour involved, but I would inform the Honourable Member that except in the case of the staff transferred from Government of India Press, Agricultural Research Institute and A. G. P. & T's Office, who have got their separate pool of quarters, no officer is required to vacate his quarter on transfer from one Government office to another in New Delhi.

FLIGHT OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT SERVANTS DEPRIVED OF QUARTERS ON TRANSFER TO ANOTHER OFFICE IN NEW DELHI

1607. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state if it is a fact that in a considerable number of cases where Government servants have been deprived of their quarters, the persons concerned have a total length of permanent service under the Central Government in Delhi and New Delhi for a period of fifteen years or more?

(b) Are Government aware that under the existing conditions, some of these Government servants who had to wait in the beginning for a number of years before they got Government accommodation, will have no chance during their service-life to get Government accommodation again?

(c) Is it a fact that distinction between orthodox and un-orthodox quarters has been abolished with a view to enlarge the scope of a Government servant to get accommodation in Delhi and New Delhi?

(d) Do Government propose to consider the cases of Government servants referred to in (a) and (b) above and grant them relief in the matter of accommodation by taking into account their length of service under the Central Government in Delhi and New Delhi. If not, why not?

The Honourable Dr. B. B. Ambedkar: (a) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to reply to part (c) of starred question No. 1606.

(b) Officers mentioned in my reply to the last question may have to wait for their turn in the general pool, but for how long they may have to wait, I cannot say.

(c) Yes.

(d) The length of service in the general pool is always the deciding factor. Government do not consider it equitable to alter this rule in favour of any particular groups of Government servants.

SCARCITY OF QUININE IN FARIDPUR DISTRICT

1608. *Mr. A. Satyanarayana Moorthy: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state whether the attention of the Government is drawn to a statement issued by Dr. Harendra Chandra Sen, President, Medical Association, Madaripur in the District of Faridpur, and published in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, dated March 16th, regarding the complete lack of quinine?

(b) Are Government aware that neither there is any stock of quinine in that local market nor is the civil surgeon readily making it available to Registered Practitioners.

(c) Are Government aware that no quinine is being allotted to the Registered Practitioners in spite of repeated requests to the Civil Surgeon, who is the rationing authority in the District of Faridpur?

(d) In view of the fact that the situation is growing serious due to lack of quinine and also of the presence of a number of acute chronic Malaria cases, do Government propose to make necessary arrangements for the issue of quinine in the immediate future to avert the situation and to save the lives of a large number of persons suffering from chronic Malaria?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) No.

(b) to (d). The distribution of quinine and other anti-malarial drugs within the Province of Bengal is the responsibility of the Provincial Government.

MEMBERS IN NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE

1609. *Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state how many members there are in the New Delhi Municipal Committee?

(b) How many of those Members are (i) official. (ii) non-official, (iii) nominated, and (iv) elected?

(c) If at present there are no elected members do Government propose to consider the desirability of introducing a system whereby the majority of members in that Municipality should be elected? If not, why not?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) and (b). The New Delhi Municipal Committee consists at present of 16 members of whom 6 are members *ex-officio* and 10 are nominated. Of the latter number six are non-officials and four officials.

(c) In view of the special circumstances of New Delhi and the large Government interests involved it is not proposed to alter the present constitution of the New Delhi Municipal Committee which is working satisfactorily.

NOTICES FOR VACATION OF HOUSES OF RESIDENTS OF WARD No. 14 DELHI

1610. *Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: (a) Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state whether notice under sections 36 and 38 of the United Provinces Town Improvement Act (VIII of 1919), as extended to the Province of Delhi, has been served on the residents of Ward No. 14 Delhi?

(b) If so, when will the residents of that Ward be actually required to vacate their houses?

(c) What compensation will be given to (i) the zamindars who own the land; (ii) the owner of the house to whom the buildings belong; and (iii) the tenants who live in the hired houses of that Ward, and in what form will it be given?

(d) Will the residents of Ward No. 14 be given houses constructed by Government under the Poormen Housing Scheme?

(e) What are the conditions under which poormen are given those Government houses?

(f) In what locality do Government propose to house the men of Ward No. 14 when they will vacate their houses?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) to (f). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given by me in fulfilment of the promise made on the 21st February 1945 in reply to Starred question No. 449.

REVISION OF PROCEDURE RE SPEECHES ON FINANCE BILL

1611. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable the Leader of the House be pleased to state:

(a) if Government propose to revise the rules and procedure regulating the speeches on the Finance Bill so that even the silent members who count upon the occasion of the Finance Bill to ventilate the grievances of their constituencies they represent, may get an opportunity to speak; and

(b) if Government propose to so amend the rules and adopt a procedure and help to bring about a convention, that either all the members desirous of speaking on the Finance Bill may get an opportunity to speak or those who seldom speak may get preference over those who are known to speak on all occasions?

The Honourable Sir Sultan Ahmed: (a) and (b). Government are prepared to consider whether any steps could suitably be taken with a view to secure not merely or mainly an increase in the number of Members participating in the discussion of the Finance Bill but also and primarily the curtailment of the aggregate amount of time spent on the discussion. In the meantime I must point out to the Honourable Member that the selection between members competing to catch the eye of the Chair is exclusively a matter for the Chair.

STEPS FOR SAFEGUARDING PRIVATE INVESTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS OF INDIAN COMPANIES AGAINST COLLUSION OF MANAGING AGENTS

1612. *Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

(a) if the attention of the Government has been drawn to the Bombay letter of the Roys' Weekly published on January 21, 1945, at page 12 of the said paper, under the caption 'Post War Plans and the Investor's Future':

(b) if the answer to the above is in the affirmative, what steps Government propose to take, as suggested in the said paper, to protect the private investors and shareholders of the Indian Companies against the Managing Agents and the Auditors who collude with and connive at the activities of the Managing Agents and Directors of the Companies; and

(c) if Government propose to consider the setting up of a Central Machinery for the Superintendence and control of the Indian companies for their uniform administration under the Indian Companies Act throughout the country?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The question of according any further protection to private investors and shareholders of companies under the Indian Companies Act will no doubt receive due consideration when the general revision of company law is taken up.

(c) Government have already noted for consideration the question of centralisation of the administration of company law in this country. It has, however, not been possible to proceed with the examination of this question in the present wartime conditions.

IMPROVING OF SERVICE CONDITIONS OF NURSES

1613. *Shrimati K. Radha Bai Subbarayan: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have seen the report of the statement by Lady Louis Mountbatten that unless strong measures are immediately taken to improve the service conditions of nurses, the situation will not improve;

(b) if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, whether Government propose (i) to take strong measures to remove the difficulties regarding recruitment and training of nurses, (ii) to make the service conditions more attractive and to raise the status, pay and emoluments, (iii) to increase the training facilities for them, and (iv) to have a centralised health service for the country;

(c) in view of the urgency of the matter, whether Government propose to deal with it immediately; and

(d) if Government propose to investigate whether recruitment to the W. A. C. (I) affects the medical and nursing professions as there is only a limited number of educated Indian girls and the reasons why some of them prefer service in the W. A. C. (I) though it involves more separation from home?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The improvement of the conditions of service of nurses and the provision of facilities for their training are matters for which Provincial Government are primarily responsible. In 1944 the Government of India pointed out to Provincial Governments the need for improving the conditions of service of nursing personnel and for strengthening the nursing staff. The Government of India have also started a school of nursing administration at Delhi for the training of sister tutors who are responsible for the teaching of probationer nurses. As the executive powers in matters relating to public health rest with Provincial Governments under the constitution it is not possible to centralise the health services.

(d) The Government understand that recruitment to the Women's Auxiliary Corps (India) has to some extent affected recruitment to the nursing profession, presumably owing to the better conditions of service in the Women's Auxiliary Corps.

CLOTH QUOTA FOR DELHI PROVINCE

1614. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

(a) if it is not a fact that the quota of cloth allotted to the Delhi Province is on the basis of 18 yards per head per annum calculated on the population figures of the 1941 census;

(b) if it is not a fact that the population of the Delhi Province has increased by 50 per cent. after 1941;

(c) if it is not a fact that the population of the Delhi Province is 95 per cent. urban and that the consumption of cloth by the people of the urban area is comparatively much more than the consumption by the rural people;

(d) if Government are aware that the meagre allotment of cloth per head in the Delhi Province has created a great dissatisfaction in the mind of the consuming public and that the great rush of purchasers at the cloth shops is likely to culminate in riots; and

(e) what steps Government propose to take to ameliorate the cloth situation in Delhi?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Yes, Sir, it is a fact.

(b) No reliable figures of increase in the population of Delhi since the 1941 Census are available.

(c) No separate quota is fixed for urban or rural areas in any Province. An over-all quota for the entire Punjab Deficit Zone (which includes the Delhi Province) has been fixed on the basis of the estimated pre-war consumption, and the population of the entire Zone.

(d) The quota allotted to Delhi can not be termed "meagre" in anyway. The per capita allotment of Delhi is in fact higher than that of several other provinces.

I am informed that there are no grounds to apprehend any such event on account of the rush of purchasers and I do hope, the Honourable Member will not publicise this impression of his which may have some encouraging effect.

(e) Government are making every effort to increase the amount of cloth available in the country by increasing production and importing limited quantities of fine cloth and yarn for the requirements of the Country as a whole.

ISSUING OF PERMITS TO DIFFERENT GROUPS OF DEALERS TO IMPORT CLOTH INTO DELHI

1615. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

(a) if Government are aware of the fact that the expenses incurred on importing cloth into the Province of Delhi through a purchasing agent ranged from 3 per cent. to 4 per cent. while the expenses on importing cloth into Delhi by dealers holding direct quota from the mills outside the Province of Delhi are only $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.;

(b) if the answer to the above be in the affirmative, whether Government propose to issue permits to the different groups of dealers for importing cloth from Bombay and Ahmedabad;

(c) if it is a fact that a large number of A class cloth merchants of Delhi have sent a representation to the Director of Civil Supplies requesting him to issue permits to their various groups to import cloth from Bombay and Ahmedabad; and

(d) if the answer to the above be in the affirmative, whether Government propose to make necessary arrangements to issue permits to different groups for importing cloth into Delhi?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Yes. The expenses increased in importing cloth through a purchasing agent are usually higher than the expenses incurred by a quota holder receiving cloth directly from a mill outside Delhi province.

(b) Honourable Member's attention is invited to answer to part (d).

(c) Yes, some representations have been received.

(d) Import permits are issued to licensed importers selected by the co-ordinating authority of the zone roughly on the basis of one importer for each lot of 200 bales.

CLOTH BALES IMPORTED INTO DELHI PROVINCE

1616. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cloth bales imported into the Province of Delhi per month by dealers holding direct quota from the mills outside the Delhi Province; and

(b) the mode of distribution of such cloth among the A, B, and C, class dealers?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) According to information available, 8,186 bales were imported during the quarter ending 31st January 1945 and 2,088 bales in February which gives an average of 2,568 bales per month.

(b) Generally the quota holders sell the goods to wholesalers (A & B), who sell to retailers (Class C); but in some cases the quota holders themselves hold 'B' and 'C' licences and sell the goods to the public through their retail shops.

REDUCED REMUNERATION OF CLOTH COMMISSION AGENTS OF DELHI

1617. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

(a) if it is not a fact that the notification of the Government of India, Department of Industries and Civil Supplies, No. TB(1) 35/45, dated the 1st February, 1945, has reduced the remuneration of cloth commission agents of Delhi from $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., to $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. only;

(b) if Government are aware that the cloth commission agents of Delhi play an indispensable part in the scheme of distribution of cloth among the cloth merchants of the areas outside the Delhi Province and also within the Province;

(c) if it is not a fact that Delhi is a distributing centre of cloth which deals in retail sale as compared to Bombay and Ahmedabad which deal in mill-packed bales;

(d) if it is not a fact that wholesale businessmen who deal in mill packed bales incur very low expenses compared to businessmen who deal in split bales and in pieces; and

(e) if the answers to the above be in the affirmative, what steps they propose to take to increase the remuneration of cloth commission agents of Delhi to keep their business alive?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) It is a fact that the profit margin of the Commission Agent has been limited to a maximum of $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. by the Notification. Prior to the fixation of this limit there was no statutory limit.

(b) Yes. They play a useful part but not an indispensable part.

(c) Retail sales and sales in mill packed bales are transacted in varying proportions in all the three centres.

(d) Yes.

(e) Government do not consider that any increase in the remuneration fixed for Commission Agents is justified.

PRICES OF INDIAN MILL ARTIFICIAL SILKS AND GEORGETTES

1618. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state if it is a fact that an average good quality printed art silk of Indian mills in June, 1939, was being sold at about eight annas per yard, that it was being sold in June, 1943, at Rs. 3/8/- per yard, and that in March, 1945, it is being sold at Rs. 8/8/- per yard?

(b) Is it a fact that printed and plain Georgette Crepe of Indian Mills was being sold in India in June, 1939, at Rupee 1 and Re. 1/4/- per yard, that in June, 1943, it was being sold at Rs. 5/- and Rs. 6/8/- per yard, and that in March, 1945, it is being sold at Rs. 11/- plain and Rs. 13/- printed georgette of average good quality?

(c) What are the ceiling prices fixed under control system for Indian printed art silk and georgette printed, per yard for retail sale?

(d) Is it a fact that prices are not marked on artificial silk of Indian Mills or georgette of Indian Mills? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) and (b). Government have no definite information regarding prices at these different dates, but the prices mentioned by the Honourable Member appeared to be fairly correct.

(c) No ceiling prices have been fixed so far but under Section 6 of the Hoarding and Profiteering Prevention Ordinance producers and dealers of these articles are allowed to add to the cost of production or the price at which the producer sold the article to the dealer as the case may be, no more than the addition allowed them by pre-war normal trade practice unless this is specifically varied by the Controlling General of Civil Supplies.

(d) A notification directing mills to stamp *ex-mill* prices on artificial silk fabrics manufactured by them is under issue.

CONTROL PRICES OF INDIAN SILK SUITING

1619. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state the ceiling control prices of Silks of Indian produce fit for Suiting and Shirwani purposes?

(b) What are the control and ceiling prices per yard of printed Kashmir silk and printed Bengal silk? What are the prices of five to six yards Sariee fixed for Kashmir silk and Bengal silk printed quality?

(c) Are prices printed on those varieties of silks or not? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) and (b). No ceiling prices have so far been fixed by the Central Government for silk fabrics of Indian manufacture, but the question of fixing such prices is under their active consideration. Prices of such silk fabrics, however, in the meantime continue to be regulated under section 6 of the Hoarding and Profiteering Prevention Ordinance. Under this

section the producer or dealer is allowed to add on to the costs of production or to the price at which the producer sells the article, as the case may be, such additions as were allowed by pre-war normal trade practice, unless in any particular case these have been varied by the Controller General of Civil Supplies.

(c) Does not arise.

PRODUCTION AND EXPORT OF COTTON CLOTH

1620. *Mr. Muhammad Nauman: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

(a) the total production of cotton cloth in India in yards, in the year 1944;

(b) the total export of Indian cotton cloth and silk cloth in yards, from India to other countries in 1944 and in January and February, 1945;

(c) whether an export licence creates any liability or the expenditure to carry on trade in his own name;

(d) whether cases have been reported to the Department where export licences were handed over to different parties for carrying on export trade; and

(e) what methods are adopted to scrutinize the *bona fide* exporters?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) 6,400 million yards approximately, including estimated production of handloom cloth.

(b) 500 million yards approximately during 1944 and 70 million yards approximately during January and February 1945.

(c) An export licence is not transferable and lapses if it is not utilised by the shipper in whose name it is issued.

(d) Yes.

(e) Exporters are required to produce evidence of firm contracts entered into with consignees abroad and also, in certain cases, of having purchased or having contracted to purchase the required quantity of goods in India for export.

CO-OPERATIVE STORES IN DELHI DISTRIBUTING FOOD RATIONS

1621. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state:

(a) if it is a fact that co-operative stores in Delhi have been recognised for distribution of food ration; if so, the number of such stores, and if these stores are contemplated for distribution of kerosene oil and fuel also; if not, why not; and

(b) whether Government propose to recognise more co-operative stores for distribution of food ration instead of opening government shops?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) Yes Sir. The number of such co-operative stores is 26. The question of using them for distribution of fuel and kerosene is under consideration.

(b) It is not proposed to replace the existing Government shops by Co-operative Stores, but the latter will be used as far as possible if and when need arises.

LICENCE FOR DISTRIBUTION OF CLOTH, ETC., TO DELHI PROVINCE CO-OPERATIVE STORES UNION

1622. *Mr. Kailash Bihari Lal: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

(a) if it is a fact that the Delhi Province Co-operative Stores Union applied to the Government that the selected Co-operative stores be granted licence for distribution of cotton cloth, Indian woollen cloth, knitting wool and other woollen garments and also for sale of drugs;

(b) if the authorities have granted the licence asked for; if so, to how many; if not, why not; and

(c) if Government propose to grant them supplies direct from the mills as in the case of Government shop in Connaught Circus?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) An application was received in regard to Indian woollen goods only.

(b) No, because the applicant was not normally a distributor of woollen goods manufactured by Indian woollen Mills.

(c) No.

CONDITIONS FOR SANCTIONING A FAIR PRICE STORE

1623. *Mr. Kallash Bihari Lall: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies be pleased to state:

- (a) the conditions for sanctioning a Fair Price Store;
- (b) if any co-operative store in India has been recognised as a Fair Price Store;
- (c) if any co-operative store in Delhi applied for being recognised as a Fair Price Store and whether the application was supported by the Director, Civil Supplies, Delhi, the Co-operative Department and the Union of Co-operative Stores; and
- (d) if Government have sanctioned any Fair Price Store after the receipt of the request of the Co-operative Store in Delhi; if so, why the request of the co-operative stores was not considered?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Once the necessity for having a Fair Price Shop in the city or the locality concerned is established, selection is made from amongst such of the existing firms as are known for their integrity, business reputation, stability and who possess good situation as are recommended by the Deputy Controllers General and Provincial Governments concerned.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) First part: Yes.

Second part: Because before enquiries could be completed on the application of this Co-operative Society of New Delhi another shop, in respect of which enquiry was completed and decision taken, was approved as a Fair Price Shop. No other Fair Price Shop has been sanctioned in Delhi since then.

CANCELLATION OF LICENCES OF CERTAIN CLOTH DEALERS OF DELHI

1624. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

- (a) if it is a fact that the Director, Industries and Civil Supplies, Delhi, on the 17th March, 1945, has cancelled the licences of twelve cloth dealers of Delhi;
- (b) if it is a fact that on cancellation of a licence the licensee is not entitled to sell the cloth in his possession on the date the licence is cancelled;
- (c) the arrangement made for the disposal of that cloth in his possession; if no arrangement is made, the reasons therefor;
- (d) if it is a fact that in spite of the cancellation of their licences they are still selling the cloth at their shops; if so, the reasons therefor; and
- (e) the procedure prescribed for the renewal of their licences?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Yes.

(b) He can dispose of cloth already in his possession under a permit issued under the Delhi Cloth Dealers Licensing Order, 1944.

(c) Does not arise in view of answer to (b).

(d) Dealers whose licenses have been cancelled are disposing of cloth in their possession prior to cancellation of their licenses, under a permit issued under the Delhi Cloth Dealers Licensing Order, 1944.

(e) No procedure has been prescribed for renewal of cancelled licences.

DISPENSING WITH PERMITS FOR PURCHASE OF CLOTH, WATCHES ETC., IN DELHI

1625. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

(a) if it is a fact that the Director, Civil Supplies, Delhi, has announced that no permits will be required for the purchase of cloth, watches and cycles from the 1st April, 1945; and

(b) if the reply to (a) be in the affirmative, the retrenchment to be made in the staff of that office from that date and the amount of expenditure to be decreased consequently, if no retrenchment is to be made and no decrease in the expenditure is contemplated, the reasons therefor?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Yes. By cloth the Honourable Member apparently means imported woollen cloth.

(b) Five junior clerks on Rs. 40 p.m. and a senior clerk on Rs. 60 p.m. who were appointed for the purpose have been retrenched on the 31st March 1945. The reduction in expenditure on account of the retrenchment is Rs. 800 p.m. (roundly)—The 2nd part of the question does not arise.

ENFORCEMENT STAFF AT DELHI

1626. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: Will the Honourable Member for Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

- the strength in each category of the Enforcement Staff at Delhi;
- the total expenditure on that staff; and
- the technical qualification of the Gazetted and Inspecting Staff?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a), (b) and (c). A statement is laid on the table.

Statement

(a) The strength in each category of the Enforcement Staff under Delhi Administration is as follows:

	Number
Enforcement Officer (Gazetted)	1
Prosecuting Police Inspector (non-gazetted)	1
Chief Investigating Inspector (non-gazetted)	1
Inspectors (non-gazetted)	7
Sub-Inspectors (non-gazetted)	7
Addl. Sub-Inspectors (non-gazetted)	7
Stenographers (non-gazetted)	1
Senior Clerks (non-gazetted)	2
Junior Clerks (non-gazetted)	2
Peons (non-gazetted)	20

(b) The total expenditure incurred on the above staff upto 31st March, 1945 is Rs. 30,860.

(c) The technical qualifications of the gazetted and inspecting staff are shown against each

Enforcement Officer	Retired Additional Superintendent of Police.
Prosecuting Police Inspector	Retired Prosecuting Inspector of Police.
Chief Investigating Inspector	Retired Police Officer.
Inspectors	2—Retired Police Officers.
	4—Lawyers.
	1—No police qualifications.
Sub-Inspectors	2—Retired Police Officers.
	5—No Police qualifications.
Additional Sub-Inspectors	7—No Police qualifications.

MALPRACTICES BY CANDIDATES AT ELECTION TO SHAHDARA MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE

1627. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state the reasons for not disqualifying the candidates of Wards No. 1, No. 3 and No. 4 on their malpractice (forged signatures, thumb impression and false personification as established by the convictions of persons by Magistrate on the spot) during the election in January, 1945, of the Shahdara Municipal Committee?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: Information has been called for and will be furnished to the house when received.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

SPECIAL OFFICERS FOR AMENITIES OF SEAMEN

127. Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state:

- the number of special officers for the amenities of seamen at various ports to be appointed during 1944-45 and also 1945-46;
- the requisite qualifications for such officers and salary proposed;
- the proportion of Muslims in such appointments; and
- the number of posts reserved for Muslims in the additional establishment as well as additional officers' appointments during 1944-45 and 1945-46 under Ports and Pilotage Department?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) Four Officers were appointed during 1944-45 of whom one resigned. During 1945-46 it is proposed to recruit in all four Special Officers including one in place of the officer who has resigned.

(b) No qualifications have been prescribed nor has any scale of pay been fixed. Preference will be given to persons with war-time experience of seamen's welfare work.

(c) One of the existing three officers is a Muslim.

(d) By "Ports and Pilotage Department" the Honourable Member is presumably referring to the offices with which the Ports and Pilotage budget is concerned. The following additional appointments were made under those offices during 1944-45:

(i) *Bengal Pilot Service*: Six officers were appointed of whom two were Muslims.

(ii) *Office of the Controller of Indian Shipping*: Two officers were appointed of whom one was a Muslim.

(iii) *Mercantile Marine Department*: Three officers were appointed all of whom were non-Indians. The posts are highly technical and are not reserved for any particular community.

(iv) *Shipping Offices*: Four officers were appointed of whom three were Muslims.

Additional appointments to be made in 1945-46 are not known.

MEETINGS OF COCONUT CESS COMMITTEE AND IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

128. Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Secretary for Education, Health and Lands please state:

(a) the number of meetings of Coconut Cess Committee held with dates since its creation; and

(b) the number of meetings of Imperial Council of Agricultural Research with dates in 1944-45?

Mr. J. D. Tyson: (a) No meeting of the Indian Central Coconut Committee has yet been held. The first meeting will take place in Trivandrum on the 20th April 1945.

(b) The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research held the following meetings during 1944-45:

	No. of meetings	Dates
Governing Body	1	4th and 5th September, 1944.
Advisory Board	2	(1) 7th and 8th July, 1944. (2) From 6th to 8th March, 1945.
Annual General Meeting	1	7th March, 1945.

MEETINGS OF STANDING COMMITTEES FOR LABOUR AND FOR GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

129. Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state:

(a) the number of meetings of Labour Standing Committee with dates held during the current year; and

(b) the number of meetings of the Standing Committee of Geological Survey of India held with dates since its constitution?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Presumably the Honourable Member desires information in respect of the Standing Labour Committee for the period from 1st April, 1944 to 31st March, 1945. Two meetings were held during the period—one on 27th June, 1944 and the other on 17th March, 1945.

(b) Presumably the Honourable Member desires information in respect of the Advisory Committee of the Utilisation Branch of the Geological Survey of India. Four meetings were held as shown below:

1st meeting, 26th November 1942.

2nd meeting, 22nd November 1943.

3rd meeting, 6th March 1944.

4th meeting, 14th December 1944.

**MEETINGS OF STANDING COMMITTEES FOR INDUSTRIES AND CIVIL
SUPPLIES AND FOR COMMERCE**

130. Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Industries and Civil Supplies please state:

(a) the number of meetings of Standing Advisory Committee on Industries and Civil Supplies held during the current year; and

(b) the number of meetings of the Standing Committee on Commerce held during the current year?

The Honourable Sir M. Azizul Huque: (a) and (b). No meetings of these Standing Advisory Committees were held during the current year.

**APPLICATIONS FOR KHAS KHAS TATTIES FROM OCCUPANTS OF GOVERNMENT
QUARTERS IN DELHI AND NEW DELHI**

131. Mr. K. C. Neogy: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether he is aware that formal applications in regard to the supply of *khass khass tatties* in the residences occupied by Government servants in Delhi and New Delhi during the ensuing Summer Season, 1945, were invited by the 20th March 1945, *vide* Additional Chief Engineer (Western Zone) Central Public Works Department, circular memorandum No. WII/8708, dated the 20th February, 1945, and No. WII/8708, dated the 18th March, 1945?

(b) Is he also aware that the Summer allotment (1945) is not yet out?

(c) If the reply to (b) above be in the affirmative, does he propose to extend the date for applying for *khass khass tatties* in the case of those Government servants who will be allotted quarters in April, 1945, but have none at present? If not, why not?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) As seasonal allotments have been dispensed with under the latest Rules, this question does not arise.

(c) Government servants who have no official quarters now and will be allotted official quarters in April, will be permitted to apply for *khass khass tatties* upto the end of April, although the supply of such *tatties*, will be necessarily somewhat delayed.

**PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS TRANSFERRED TO RATIONING AND CIVIL SUPPLIES
OFFICES IN DELHI PROVINCE**

132. Mr. K. C. Neogy: Will the Honourable the Food Member please state:

(a) the number of officials, Provincewise, who have been transferred from places outside Delhi to the Rationing and Civil Supplies offices in the Delhi Province;

(b) the duties assigned to each of them;

(c) whether any of them have been entrusted with outdoor duties; if so, how many; and

(d) whether Government propose to consider their claims for the posts of Circle Rationing Officers, Godown Officers, etc., in view of their past experience; if not, the reasons therefor?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) From C. P. 1. From the Punjab, 11.

(b) C. P. 1 Director of Civil Supplies, Delhi.

PUNJAB

One Administrative Officer (Civil Supplies and Rationing).

One Public Relations Officer.

One Assistant Director of Civil Supplies (General).

Two Circle Rationing Officers.

Four Inspectors.

One Sub-Inspector.

One Clerk.

(c) Yes, Sir. Eleven.

(d) The Delhi Administration will no doubt consider the claims of all these officers for promotion, when vacancies in higher posts arise.

**PROMOTION OF STAFF TO POSTS OF CIRCLE RATIONING OFFICERS, ETC., IN
DELHI RATIONING AND CIVIL SUPPLIES ORGANISATIONS**

133. Mr. K. C. Neogy: (a) Will the Honourable the Food Member please state the policy of Government governing the promotion of the staff to the posts of Circle Rationing Officers and Godown Officers in the Delhi Rationing and Civil Supplies organisations?

(b) Are Government aware that in November, 1944, a post of a Godown Officer was newly created and an outsider was appointed in preference to experienced staff? If so, do Government propose to see that the claims of the existing staff are not overlooked in future?

The Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava: (a) The policy is to fill up posts by promotion or direct recruitment, both methods being used, with the object of obtaining the best man for each appointment.

(b) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The official appointed as godowns officer had previous experience which made him especially suitable for the post.

The second part of the question does not arise.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE

Information promised in reply to part (a) of starred question No. 651. asked by Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall, on the 21st November, 1944

**LITERARY ATTAINMENTS OF OFFICERS ON THE HINDUSTANI PROGRAMME SIDE OF
ALL INDIA RADIO**

The required information cannot be prepared as it has been found difficult to interpret what the Honourable Member means by "writers or scholars of repute". All the officers mentioned in part (a) of the question have good knowledge of Hindi and/or Urdu and have other first class qualifications and experience necessary for their work in the All India Radio.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 449, asked by Mr. Kailash Bihari Lall, on the 21st February, 1945

NOTICES FOR EVACUATION ON RESIDENTS OF DELHI, WARD No. 14.

(a) Notices were served in accordance with the provisions of sections 36 and 38 of the United Provinces Town Improvement Act 1919, as extended to Delhi, in respect of the Serai Purani Idgah Scheme in January 1942, and in respect of the Ahata Kidara Scheme in July 1939. Both these Schemes fall within the limits of ward 14.

(b) In respect of the Serai Purani Idgah Scheme, residents will be required to vacate if their properties are to be acquired. Acquisition can take place only after the scheme is sanctioned under section 40 of the Act. The scheme has not yet been submitted for sanction under that section.

In respect of the second scheme acquisition after sanction is practically complete, and such properties have been already vacated. A few properties remain to be acquired and a few have been acquired but not yet vacated.

(c) Compensation is paid in all cases in cash in accordance with the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 as modified by the Schedule to the United Provinces Town Improvement Act, 1919, as extended to Delhi.

(d) Yes. All those who are eligible for re-housing.

(e) A note giving details of the schemes is laid on the table.

(f) No decision has yet been taken in respect of the Serai Purani Idgah Scheme. As regards Ahata Kidara Scheme 100 families have been rehoused in Block 10-A in Karol Bagh and 17 families have been rehoused within the scheme area. All remaining families will be rehoused in the scheme area or in other suitable localities

NOTES ON DELHI RE-HOUSING SCHEME

Scope :

The scheme embraces families displaced by the execution of slum clearance schemes by the Delhi Improvement Trust :

(a) Whose monthly income does not exceed Rs. 30 per mensem

(b) who wish to be rehoused, and

(c) Who are willing to accept the terms offered.

Types of dwelling :

There will be three types of dwelling. Allotments will be made on the basis of number in family as follows (two children under 10 years of age counting as one adult).

Number in family.

One-roomed—Not exceeding 3 adults.

Two-roomed—Over 3 but not over 5 adults.

Three-roomed—Over 5 adults.

The one- and two-roomed dwellings are capable of expansion into the three roomed type.

Allotment and terms :

Allotments will be made in accordance with the actual requirements of each individual family to be rehoused and will be approved by the Improvement Trust Board.

It is intended that there should be fixed monthly rents for each type of house, viz., Rs. 1/12/-, Rs. 2/4/- and Rs. 2/12/- for a one-roomed, two-roomed and three-roomed house.

Those able to pay not less than a stated monthly sum, viz., Rs. 3/4/-, Rs. 3/10/- and Rs. 4/- for a one-roomed, two-roomed, and three-roomed house, will be entitled to hire purchase terms under which they will become owners of the house after 20 years.

*Financial details :**Cost of the houses :*

One-roomed—Rs. 564.

Two roomed—Rs. 711.

Three-roomed—Rs. 875.

Taking a concrete scheme, viz., the Paharganj Circus Rehousing Scheme, 142 houses are now under construction to accommodate 515 persons whose existing houses are being acquired in the Paharganj Circus, Improvement Scheme.

The total cost of the new houses is—Rs. 94,600.

The 'pooled' (or average) cost per house is—Rs. 666.

The equated hire purchase instalment ordinarily payable for a house of 'pooled' cost Rs. 666 is composed of :

(a) Equated instalment of principal (Rs. 666 + interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ p.c.)—Rs. 50-2-0 p.a.

(b) Ground rent at Rs. 1 per 100 square yards per month. 10-11-0 p.a.

N.B.—The plot unit for this scheme is 88.8 sq. yards.

	Rs.	60 13 0 p.a.
(c) Maintenance at 1 P. C. of pooled cost	6 11 0 p.a.	
Total	67 8 0 p.a.	
or	5 10 0 p.a.	

Assuming the family to be re-housed is capable of paying not less than the fixed hire purchase instalments, the balance is met from the subsidy (proceeds of Entertainments Duty)

If the family to be re-housed is not capable of paying the fixed hire purchase instalments, it will occupy the house as ordinary tenant and the amount payable for ordinary tenancy (not carrying ultimate right of house ownership) is calculated as under :—

	Rs. a. p.
Interest on pooled cost at $4\frac{1}{2}$ p.c.	23 5 0 p.a.
Ground rent	10 11 0 p.a.
Maintenance	6 11 0 p.a.
Total	45 11 0 p.a.
or	3 13 0 p.a.

The family to be re-housed under ordinary tenancy terms will be subsidized from the proceeds of the Entertainments Duty to the extent of the difference between the fixed monthly rents and the actual monthly rent as calculated. above.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 588, asked by Mr.

K. C. Neogy, on the 1st March, 1945

RESTRICTION ON NEWS ABOUT STREET ACCIDENTS BY MILITARY LORRIES IN CALCUTTA

The Government of Bengal report that a working arrangement exists between them and the provincial press whereby all incidents in which civilians on the one hand and military personnel on the other are involved are voluntarily submitted for press advice. In the case of accidents involving military vehicles the press is advised not to publish the report without deleting the word "military". The expression "special type vehicles" is apparently the creation of the press.

Information promised in reply to part (b) of starred question No. 620, asked by Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C. Chatterjee, on the 2nd March, 1945

INDIAN CHRISTIANS ON OUDH AND TIRHUT RAILWAY

The following are the numbers of Indian Christian employees of the Oudh and Tirhut Railway in receipt of salaries—

(i) over Rs. 150 p.m.	4
(ii) over Rs. 100 but below Rs. 150 p.m.	9
(iii) over Rs. 50 but below Rs. 100 p.m.	38
(iv) below Rs. 50 p.m.	265

Information promised in the reply to part (b) of starred question No. 621, asked by Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, on the 2nd March, 1945

OVERCROWDING ON TRAMWAYS AND BUSES IN CALCUTTA

The number of tramcars damaged and put out of order through reckless driving by military lorries resulting in serious accidents and dislocation of tramlines is not readily available. The number of accidents that occurred during 1944 in which tramcars and military vehicles were involved and in which the Calcutta Tramways Company Limited, have preferred claims, is 265. It is not possible to say how many of these accidents resulted from the reckless driving of military lorries.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 656 part (g), asked by Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, on the 5th March, 1945

STANDARD CLOTH, ETC., FOR BENGAL

Name of firm or individual against whom prosecution launched.	Conviction.
1	2
1. Benoy Haldar, Diamond Harbour, 24 Parganas.	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
2. Prionath Haldar, Diamond Harbour, 24 Parganas.	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
3. Birendra Purkait, Diamond Harbour, 24 Parganas.	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
4. Akkas Ali Sk., Diamond Harbour, 24 Parganas.	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
5. Gangaram Agarwall, (Hawker), Silguri	Convicted u/s 81 (4) D. I. Rules and sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 50 in default to R. I. for 1 month.
6. Abdur Rohman of Akheriganj Bazar, Bhagwangola P. S., Murshidabad.	Convicted and sentenced to pay fine of Rs. 50 I/D to undergo R. I. for 2 months on 28th April 1944.
7. Hariash Chandra Sarker, son of Hiralal Sarker of Dashmari, P. S. Poba, Dt. Rajshahi.	Fined Rs. 50.
8. Madhusudan Ruj, Dt. Birbhum	Fined Rs. 100 in default to S. I. for one month.
9. Biswanath Ghosh, Dt. Birbhum	Fined Rs. 50 in default to S. I. for one month.
10. Lalchand Parak, Dt. Birbhum	Fined Rs. 150 I. D. one month S. I.
11. Surendra Lal Biswas, Terribazar, Chittagong Town.	Fined Rs. 200.
12. M/s. Prabartak Kutir Silpa of Bangla Bazar, Dacca.	Fined Rs. 10.
13. Krishnadas Biswas, Vil : Panchuria, P. S. Gopalganj.	Fined Rs. 300 in default to R. I. for 3 months.
14. Satyanaranjan Kundu of Narikelberia, P. S. Bagherpara, Jessore.	R. I. for 1 month & fined Rs. 100 in default R. I. for 2 weeks more.
15. Kiran Ch. Kundu of Narikelberia, P. S. Bagherpara, Jessore.	Fined Rs. 200 i/d R. I. for 1 month.
16. Nandalal Kundu of Narikelberia, P. S. Bagherpara, Jessore.	Fined Rs. 100 i/d R. I. for 1 month.
17. Kalipada Kundu of Narikelberia, P. S. Bagherpara, Jessore.	R. I. for one month & fined Rs. 50 I/D R. I. for 10 days more.
18. Radhakinder Mandal, Patrasayer, Bankura	Fined Rs. 25.
18.(a) Soleman Mustan	Fined Rs. 5.
19. Soleman Mustan	Fined Rs. 10.

1	2
20. Samarendra Nath Kundu and Radha Ballav Kundu, Domkol Azimganj, P. O. Domkol.	Convicted & sentenced to pay fines of Rs. 200 and Rs. 100 respectively, in default to undergo R. I. for 1 month and 2 weeks respectively.
21. Nilkanto Halder	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
22. Ram Hari Nandi	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
23. Nilkanto Mandal	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
24. Basu Bh. Halder	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
25. Beidya Nath Mandal	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
26. Kader Box	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
27. Tarini Halder	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
28. Bankim Halder	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
29. Tulsi Ch. Halder	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
30. Krishna Dhan Iatna	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
31. Nagendra N. Mandal	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
32. Prio Nath Das	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
33. Gosto Behari Sadhukhan	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
34. Ashutosh Sadhukhan	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
35. Gosto Behari Mandal	Fined Rs. 40 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
36. Khirud Ch. Sadhukhan	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
37. Bijoy Kr. Halder	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
38. Bankim Mandal	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
39. Samsul Haque Molla, Mahammed Stores, License No. A/2450 (wholesale) area Calcutta.	Fined Rs. 5.
40. Chand Molla, License No. 1875 Retail, Area Howrah.	Fined Rs. 5.
41. Ladhuram Gangaram	Convicted, fined, Rs. 30 in default to R. I. for a month.
42. Kumeriah Chandra Dey, Santipur	Fined Rs. 30.
43. Monindra Nath Saha of Newapara, P. S. Abhoynagara, Jessore.	R. I. for 2 months & fined Rs. 200 i/d R. I. for six weeks more.
44. Cambay Bhutia, Kurseong	Convicted u/s. 81 (4) D. I. Rules read with 3 of the Bengal Cotton Cloth & Yarn Control Order 1943 and is sentenced to be detained till rising of the Court.
45. Bhagirath Nasker, Diamond Harbour	Fined Rs. 20 i/d. R. I. for 2 weeks.
46. Inanda Nasker, Diamond Harbour	Fined Rs. 20 i/d. R. I. for 2 weeks.
47. Sat Prasad Chaubey, Diamond Harbour	Fined Rs. 20 in default R. I. for 2 weeks.
48. Satya Charan Sadhukhan, Diamond Harbour.	Fined Rs. 20 in default R. I. for 2 weeks.
49. Saroj Kumar Ganguly, Kalna	Fined Rs. 50.
50. Gopaswar Chatterjee	Fined Rs. 100.
51. Satya Pada Das, Kalna	Fined Rs. 40.
52. Rajani Kanta Dey, Kalna	Fined Rs. 40.
53. Hari Das Nag, Kalna	Fined Rs. 50.
54. Kiriti Bhushan Das, Sadar, Birbhum	Fined Rs. 50 in default one month's S. I.
55. Kumudini Mohan Sirkar, Katwa	Fined Rs. 25.
56. Baikuntha Behari Basak, Sadar A	Fined Rs. 25.
57. Rangapada Saha, Bogra	Fined Rs. 15.
58. Bidhu Bhushan Poddar	Fined Rs. 25.
59. Kasim Molla son of late Anis Chand Molla of Randhunibari, P. S. Belkuchi, Dist. Pabna.	Fined Rs. 25.
60. Akhoy Kumar Das, Sadar Sub dvn, Bankura.	Fined Rs. 10 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
61. Jagadamba Singh, Tamluk Sub-Dvn. Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 200.
62. Ramranajan Guni Nirol, Dt. Burdwan	Fined Rs. 25 or R. I. for 2 weeks.
63. Radhika Prasad Nath, Dainhat, Burdwan	Fined Rs. 50 or R. I. for 6 weeks.
64. Sunil Kumar Saha, Lohagara	Fined Rs. 170 or R. I. for 3 months.
65. Pandarik Maity, Tamluk Sub Dvn., Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 200 or R. I. for 1 month.
66. Thakapa Bera, Tamluk Sub Dvn., Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 50 or R. I. for 3 months.
67. Lakshminarayan Daga, Gopalganj, P. S. Gopalganj, Dt. Faridpur.	Fined Rs. 350 or R. I. for 6 months.
68. Jagindra Nath Paul, Sadar Subdvn. Bankura.	Fined Rs. 10 or R. I. for 2 weeks.

69. Bibhuti Bhushan Goraih, Sadar Sub Dvn., Bankura.	Fined Rs. 20 or R. I. for 6 weeks.
70. Chiranjilal Gangadhar Agarwalla	Fined Rs. 100 or R. I. for 1 month.
71. Mobarak Mia of Laugani, P. S. Jhikergacha, Dt. Jessore Sadar.	Fined Rs. 150 or R. I. for 2 months.
72. Bhujanga Bhushan Mukherjee, Prop. Bangaluxmi Bastralaya, Khagra, P. O. Berhampore.	Fined Rs. 400 and Rs. 200 or R. I. for 4 months and 2 months respectively.
73. Wareah, Sadar Sub Division Rajshahi	Fined Rs. 25.
74. Kabir, Sadar Sub-Divsn. Rajshahi	Fined Rs. 25.
75. Ratait Karkun	Fined Rs. 25.
76. Jainuddih	Fined Rs. 25.
77. Dulal Chandra Mandal of Natanganj	Fined Rs. 40 or R. I. for 3 weeks.
78. Jitendra Nath Kundu of Galsi	Fined Rs. 40 or R. I. for 3 weeks.
79. Ram Kanaj Ganguli of Galsi	Do. Do. Do.
80. Bhupendra Nath Mukherjee of Galsi	Do. Do. Do.
81. Abdul Gaffur of Tentultala, Burdwan	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for a week.
82. Nalininath Banerjee of Raniganj, Birbhum	Fined Rs. 10 or R. I. for a week.
83. Sorajuddin Ahmed	Fined Rs. 30 or R. I. for a month.
84. Haripada Sadhu of Kapilmuni	Fined Rs. 100 or R. I. for 3 months.
85. Baksa Show of Khulna	Fined Rs. 10 or R. I. for 3 weeks.
86. Thakur Show of Khulna	Do. Do. Do.
87. Darbari Show of Khulna	Do. Do. Do.
88. Suk Chand Show of Khulna	Do. Do. Do.
89. Rashid of Maidhy, Halisahar P. S. Double Morry's Chittagong.	Fined Rs. 15 or R. I. for 10 days.
90. Mvi. Habudulla, Taltala, Noakhali Town, Noakhali.	Fined Rs. 250, R. I. for 3 months.
91. Kanajlal Singha of Katwa, Burdwan	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for 3 months.
92. Manikulla Akand	Fined Rs. 25, R. I. for one month.
93. Raniram Parameswararia Proead	Fined Rs. 200 or R. I. for 3 months.
94. Ramendra Nath Talukdar son of Rajendra Nath Talukdar of Sherpur, P. S. Sherpur.	Fined Rs. 25 or R. I. for 15 days.
95. Kashimuddin Munai of Datmia Beni Madhab, P. S. Raiganj (Pabna).	Fined Rs. 2 or R. I. for 2 days.
96. Hazarimall Thakur of Jaipurhat, P. S. Jaipurhat.	Fined Rs. 60, R. I. for one month.
97. Muslimuddin Miah of Dhanghora, P. S. Raiganj (Pabna).	Fined Rs. 25, R. I. for 15 days.
98. Salimuddin Miah of Jhapra, P. S. Raiganj (Pabna).	Do. Do.
99. Kumud Bandhu Bhowmik of Karilabari, P. S. Raiganj, (Pabna).	Do. Do.
100. Abdur Rahman Munda of Parba Lakshikola, P. S. Raiganj (Pabna).	Do. Do.
101. Abdur Rahman	Fined Rs. 7, R. I. for one week.
102. Mufizuddin Akand	Do. Do. Do.
103. Eman Ali	Do. Do. Do.
104. Amjed Hossain Sarker	Do. Do. Do.
105. Ismail Hossain Akand	Do. Do. Do.
106. Nurul Hossain Ahmed	Fined Rs. 20, R. I. for one month.
107. Rahim Boksho Sarker	Do. Do. Do.
108. Osman Ghani Khandaker	Do. Do. Do.
109. Sufiuddin Miah	Do. Do. Do.
110. Sabbar Ali Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
111. Habibar Rahman	Do. Do. Do.
112. Altaf Hossain Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
113. Ayenuddin Sarker	Do. Do. Do.
114. Bashiruddin Sardar	Do. Do. Do.
115. Harendra Nath Modak	Fined Rs. 25, R. I. for one month.
116. Alimuddin Akand	Fined Rs. 20, R. I. for one month.
117. Nashimuddin Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
118. Saundat Hossain	Do. Do. Do.
119. Amiruddin Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
120. Amiruddin Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
121. Reasuddin Shaikh	Do. Do. Do.
122. Kalipada Das of D.in rat	Fined Rs. 100.

1	2
123. Chunilal Halder	Fined Rs. 25, R. I. for 2 weeks.
124. Nanda Kumar Bairagi	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for one month.
125. Amrita Lal Das	Do. Do. Do.
126. Prem Chandra Kamar	Do. Do. Do.
127. Janendra Nath Biswas of Kayamkhola, P. S. Jhaikergacha, Jessore.	Do. Do. Do.
128. Bhuban Chandra Maity, Tamluk Sub Divn. Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for 2 months.
129. Upendra Nath Giri, Tamluk Sub Divn. Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for 2 months.
130. Dinabandhu Sarker, Maharajarhat, P. S. Raniganj.	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for one month.
131. Sk. Golam Bari of Burdwan Town	Fined Rs. 10, R. I. for a week.
132. Easin, Dacca, Sedar Sub Divn	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for 2 months.
133. Satish Chandra Nandi of Burdwan Town	Fined Rs. 10, R. I. for a week.
134. Ali Ahmed, C/o. Aklali Bhuyia	Do. Do. Do.
135. Mvi. Abdul Bari, son of Abdul Aziz	Do. Do. Do.
136. Suresh Chandra and Joy Chandra Sen	Fined Rs. 15, R. I. for 2 weeks.
137. Jugal Nandi, Vianupur, Sub-Divn.	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for one month.
138. Harikisan Kalwar	Fined Rs. 50, R. I. for a fortnight.
139. Md. Tobarek Hossain of Kayamkhola Bazar, P. S. Jhaikergachi.	Fined Rs. 200, R. I. for 6 weeks.
140. Osman Ghani	Fined Rs. 10, R. I. for 15 days.
141. Abdul Hossain Mia	Do. Do. Do.
142. Afzal Hossain	Do. Do. Do.
143. Abdul Karim Akanda	Fined Rs. 8, R. I. for 15 days.
144. Nur Mammad Sk.	Do. Do. Do.
145. Siddique Hossain Sk.	Do. Do. Do.
146. Ramjan Ali Bepari	Fined Rs. 10, R. I. for 15 days.
147. Tayeb Ali Bepari	Do. Do. Do.
148. Rajabulla Adhikari	Fined Rs. 15/-, R.I. for 1 month.
149. Nityananda Ghose, Nilmoniganj	Fined Rs. 75/-, R.I. for 75 days.
150. Mandar Ch. Das of Kishahpur Bazar, P.S. Keshabpur, Dt. Jessore.	Fined Rs. 150/-, R.I. for 6 weeks.
151. Sadek Ali Kurikar of Iswardi Bazar	Fined Rs. 40/- R.I. for 1 month.
152. Shaik Afjar	Fined Rs. 200/-, R.I. for 6 months.
153. Nagendra Nath Saha of Chanohuri.	Fined Rs. 150/-, R.I. for 3 months.
154. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Tamluk sub-divn, Dt. Midnapore.	Fined Rs. 125/-, R.I. for one month.
155. Paliram Marwari, Vianupur Sub Dvn.	Do.
156. Charu Ch. Dey & Ors.	Fined Rs. 250/-, and Rs. 50/-
157. Siva Pada Kundu	Fined Rs. 350/-, R.I. for 2 months.
158. Bhadu Kanta Debnath of Mahadebpur	Fined Rs. 30/-, R.I. for 3 weeks.
159. Kedar Nath Kabiraj of Mahadebpur	Do.
160. Karim Mahammad, P. S. of Mahadebpur	Do.
161. Sree Pulin Chandra Debnath of Mahadebpur	Do.
162. Mani Gopal Pandit of Mahadebpur	Do.
163. Brojeswar Nath Pandit of Mahadebpur	Do.
164. Pran Krishna Adhikary of Mahadebpur	Do.
165. Krishan Gopal Pandit of Mahadebpur	Do.
166. Chandi Charan Mallik, Burdwan	Fined Rs. 10/-
167. Atior Rahman of Galsee	Do.
168. Bijoy Krishna Hui, Burdwan	Do.
169. Biswa Nath Paul of Paraj	Fined Rs. 25/-
170. Biswa Nath Paul of Paraj	Fined Rs. 30/-
171. Mahaden Todsel	Fined Rs. 5/-
172. Gopeswar Maji of Bhatar	Fined Rs. 5/-
173. Gopal Chandra Sain of Bhatar	Fined Rs. 5/-
174. Harowowarimull Agarwalla	Fined Rs. 200/-, R.I. for 3 weeks.
175. Eakub Ali Mondal	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 15 days
176. Jameswar Ali Akanda	Do.
177. Gangaram Hanumanbox, Chuadanga	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 10 days.
178. Kedderbox Poddar, Mohanlal Banwarilal, Chuadanga.	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 10 days.
179. Jitendra Nath Bharati of Majdia	Fined Rs. 100/-, R.I. for 3 months
180. Kshitish Chandra Kundu of Sarsana	Fined Rs. 75/-, R.I. for 75 days.
181. Profulla Kumar Roy of Sarsana	Do.

182. Kamala Rani Biswas of Darsana . . .	Fined Rs. 75/-, R.I. for 75 days.
183. Hazarilal Kundu of Majdia . . .	Fined Rs. 25/-, R.I. for 25 days.
184. Pareeh N. Dutta and Amar N. Dutta of Darsana . . .	Fined Rs. 35/-, R.I. for 35 days.
185. Krishan Kanta Bakshy of Darsana . . .	Fined Rs. 75/-, R.I. for 75 days.
186. Jasoda Kumar Biswas of Darsana . . .	Fined Rs. 75/-, R.I. for 75 days.
187. Sudhir Kumar Dutta of Krishnanagar, Dt. Nadia . . .	Fined Rs. 25/-, R.I. for one month.
188. Sudhir Kumar Sen of Krishnanagar . . .	Fined Rs. 5/-, R.I. of 7 days.
189. Md. Jalil Mia . . .	Fined Rs. 15/-, R.I. for 3 months
190. Beni Singh son of Jagan Singh of 10B, Hari Sankar Lane, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-, R.I. for 6 weeks.
191. Baidya Nath Biswas . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-, R.I. for 6 weeks.
192. Nanda Lal Shaha and 2 others . . .	Fined Rs. 20/-, R.I. for 1 month each.
193. Chandi Charan Mallick of Burdwan . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 1 month.
194. Atior Rahman of Galsi . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for a week.
195. Bijoy Kumar Hui of Tentultala, Bazar, Burdwan . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 10 days.
196. Biswa Nath Pal, Vill. Paraj . . .	Fined Rs. 30/-, R.I. for 2 weeks.
197. Biswa Nath Pal of Paraj . . .	Fined Rs. 25/-, R.I. for 2 weeks.
198. Gopewar Maji of Bhatar . . .	Fined Rs. 5/-, R.I. for a week.
199. Mahadev Todoal of Bhatar . . .	Fined Rs. 5/-, R.I. for a week.
200. Gobinda Chandra Sain of Bhatar . . .	Fined Rs. 5/-, R.I. for a week.
201. Pravulal Sagaogi of Lalgola . . .	Fined Rs. 300/-, R.I. for 3 months.
202. Muralidhar Agarwalla of Bogra . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-, R.I. for 30 days.
203. Jameshar Ali Akanda of Bogra . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for 10 days.
204. Yeakubali Mondal of Bogra . . .	Fined Rs. 30/-, R.I. for 15 days.
205. Ramani Mohan Dey and (2) Kartic Chandra Samanta of Burrabazar, Burdwan . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, R.I. for a week.
206. Jagadanda Hazra of Burdwan . . .	Fined Rs. 5/-, R.I. for 5 days.
207. Giasuddin of Mahadevpur . . .	Fined Rs. 15/-, R.I. for 3 weeks.
208. Panchanan Bajader . . .	Fined Rs. 15/-, R.I. for a month.
209. Gahorali Shaikh . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-, for 2 weeks.
210. Priya Nath Moira and anr. . .	Fined both the accused Rs. 25/- R.I. for one month.
211. Mangal Shaw Bhowmik and anr. of Nabadwip P. S. Nabadwip . . .	Fined Rs. 500/-, R.I. for 5 months.

In Calcutta.

212. Ajit Kumar Sen Gupta, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-
213. Madhodes Tewary, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 10/-
214. Subnaran Sarma, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-
215. Abdul Hai, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-
216. Ram Chandra Shaw, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 100/- or 2 months R.I.
217. Ramdeo Lachminarain, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 100/-
218. Ramdeo Lachminarain, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 100/-
219. Hanumandas Mundra Rekgab Das Mundra . . .	Fined Rs. 250/-
220. Bulaki Das Ibrahim, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 100/-
221. Ganpat Roy Agarwalla, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 15/- or 1 month R.I.
222. Satya Narain Co., Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 10/- or 5 days R.I.
223. Ghasiram Bhuramall, Calcutta . . .	Sentenced to 4 months, R.I. and fined Rs. 300/-
224. Ghasiram Bhurmal, Calcutta . . .	Sentenced to 2 months R.I.
225. Satya Narain Bajpai, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 100/- or 1 month S.I.
226. Joy Kisoro Ajarwalla, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 500/-
227. Debendra Ch. Bhadra, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/- or 1 month R.I.
228. Satish Ch. Banerjee, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 75/-
229. Gopal Ch. Roy, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 75/-
230. Bhudhar Ch. Nandy, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 500/-
231. Sishir Gopal Guha Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 250/-
232. Sanchay Lal Baid, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-
233. Makhan Lal Das, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 15/-
234. Matilal Chiranjilal, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 50/-
235. Rashid Ahmad, Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 25/-
236. Satish Ch. Dey Calcutta . . .	Fined Rs. 300/-

1	2.
237. Radha Shyam Shaw, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
238. Mati Lal Shaw, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 25 .
239. Bajranglal More, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
240. Dongar Mall Bajaj, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
241. Bhaghar Ch. Needy, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 500 .
242. Bireswar Bhattacharjee, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 350 .
243. Hari Krishna Sakul, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 30 .
244. Fatik Chandra Shaha, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
245. Bhagawan Lal, Calcutta	Sentenced to 1 month R. I .
246. Jagannath Ram, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 500 .
247. Hafis Sumsuddin, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 300 .
248. Nandalal Didwania, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
249. Sagarmall Agarwalla, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
250. Adinath Das, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 40 .
251. Fatechand Agarwalla, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
252. Arjun Shaw, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 . in default R. I. for 2 months.
253. Matilal Bhatte, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
254. Shew Prosad Lohia, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 30 .
255. Hari Pada Das, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 30 .
256. Mohammed Idris, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 30 .
257. Srimibash Agarwalla, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 4 .
258. Jangi Lall Ahir, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 10 .
259. Chandra Sekkar Dubey, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 400 .
260. Kamala Kinkar Samanta, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 300 L .
261. Alak Narayan Pandey, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 200 .
262. Banespopal Gupta, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 2,000 .
263. Khosh Nabi, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 250 .
264. Jagabandhoo Das, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 150 .
265. Sadhu Mohan Chatterjee, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 20 .
266. Tulsi Singh, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 30 .
267. Sayed Nurali, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
268. Kumeresh Ch. Sen, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
269. Mangilal Daga, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 2,000 .
270. Sachin Nandan Das, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 20 .
271. Chandanlal Kshatriya, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 20 .
272. Govinda Ch. Das, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 10 .
273. Ful Chand Shaw, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 10 .
274. Gopal Ch. Ghottak, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 40 .
275. Ashutosh Adya, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 40 .
276. Bimal Ch. Burman, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 10 .
277. Srikishan Khetry, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 2000 .
278. Satish Kumar Dutt, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
279. Fida Hossain Md. Ali, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 2,000-8 .
280. Gour Shahai Singh, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 25 .
281. Amulya Ch. Bhowmik, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
282. Abdul Alim, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
283. Amir Chand Pain, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
284. Hirday Narain Sukul, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 250 .
285. Jagannath Chandra, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 150 .
286. Raj Kumar Bajpai, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 15 .
287. Muralidhar Sukul, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 10 .
288. Mayadhar Shao, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
289. Ram Kinsore Dubey, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
290. Mohammad Yussuf, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 15 .
291. Rzam Chandra Show, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 15 .
292. Dharendra Nath Jana, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 50 .
293. Sk. Ranson Ali, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
294. Sk. Zahon, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 100 .
295. Saahadhar Mondal, Calcutta	Fined Rs. 20 .

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 671, asked by Khan Bahadur Shaik Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, on the 5th March, 1945.

NON-PAYMENT OF COMPENSATORY DUES FOR OVERSTAY BY HAJ SHIPPING COMPANIES

No pilgrim waited at Jadda for more than 15 days. The question of payment of compensation did not therefore arise.

Information promised in reply to part (b) of starred question No. 769, asked by Shaikh Rafiuddin Ahmad Siddiquee, on 7th March, 1945.

TRANSFERRING NON-MUSLIMS TO PERSONAL BRANCH OF GENERAL MANAGER'S
OFFICE OF BENGAL AND ASSAM RAILWAY

I lay on the table of the House a statement giving the required information.

[illegible]

Grade	Number of posts filled	Permanent post filled by	Tempory. post filled by	Method of filling.
	Permt.Tempy.			
'ABC' 30-3-45-5-; 60/-	.. 23		1 Mr. Md. Ramjan Ali	Direct recruitment.
23-4-40-5-60/ 2-5-80/-			2 Mr. Sk. Sultan- uddin	Do.
			3 Mr. Abdul Majid	Do.
			4 Mr. S. K. Chakraborty	Do.
			5 Mr. N.G.Sarkar	Do.
			6 Mr. N.G. Ghosh	Do.
			7 Mr. Md. Nowman	Do.
			8 Mr. M. M. Saha	Do.
			9 Mr. K. Dhara	Do.
			10 Mr. S. Rahaman	Do.
			11 Mr. Sk. S. Ahmed	Do.
			12 Mr. A. Mannan	Do.
			13 Mr. M. Hossain	Do.
			14 Mr. B. K. Sen	Do.
			15 Mr. R. C. Roy	Do.
			16 Mr. K. Pramanick	Do.
			17 Mr. K.N. Islam	Do.
			18 Mr. G.N. Chat- terjee	Do.
			19 Mr. S. Rahaman	Do.
			20 Mr. A. Ahmed	Do.
			21 Mr. J. K. Chowdhury	Do.
			22 Mr. Alimuddin Sikder	Do.
			23 Mr. M. Hossain Khan	Do.

Information promised in reply to parts (a) and (c) of starred question No. 790 and starred question No. 794, asked by Mr. Muhammad Nauman, on the 7th March, 1945.

IGNORING CLAIMS OF MUSLIM SUBORDINATES FOR PROMOTION IN CERTAIN
WORKSHOPS OF EAST INDIAN RAILWAY

No. 790.—(a) and (c). The reply is in the negative.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN NON-MUSLIM CHIEF CLERKS OF CHIEF MECHANICAL
ENGINEER'S OFFICE, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

No. 794.—(a) The Honourable Member is probably referring to the transfer of Grade I Chargeman (Welding Group) which took place in September, 1943, and not during 1944. The Chargeman in question had passed the High School Examination (equivalent to Matriculation Examination) and held a proficiency certificate from the Quasi Arc Welding, Co., London. Owing to ill-health following a blood donation, the Chargeman had to be found a sedentary occupation and as he was qualified for the post of Chief Clerk, which was then vacant, he was appointed to it. The circumstances were, therefore, special.

(b) Government are informed that a Chargeman (promoted from the Workmen' grade) was appointed to work as Welding Chargeman as a temporary measure.

(c) The posts of Chief Clerks are normally filled by selection from amongst the clerical staff of the Mechanical Department on the basis of suitability-cum-seniority. The reply to the latter part is in the negative, but it is pointed out that communal considerations are not taken into account when filling such posts.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 819, asked by Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh, on the 8th March, 1945

MONEY REQUIRED FOR REPAIRS OF KHEDEDIA FORT MONUMENTS

(a) and (b). The exact amount of the estimate is not known at present, but the repairs are expected to cost about Rs. 500 and will be taken in hand during the financial year 1945-46.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 928 asked by Sri K. B. Jinaraja Hegde, on the 12th March, 1945.

SAVING DUE TO REDUCTION IN PETROL RATION, ETC., IN MADRAS PRESIDENCY

- (a) 26,680 gallons of petrol per month.
- (b) Public transport vehicles including commercial trucks in the Madras Presidency consume about 2.62 lakhs gallons of petrol per month. Statistics are not available to show the consumption of petrol by those vehicles separately in 1940. Rationing was introduced only in August 1941.
- (c) $3\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of gallons per month.
- (d) 2,137 vehicles.
- (e) 90 gallons.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 1847 asked by Mr. K. C. Neogy, on the 26th March, 1945.

RESERVING FISHING AT CERTAIN GROYNES AT OKHLA FOR EUROPEAN PUBLIC
No such reservation has been made.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER

POSITION RE-EXTRA THREE PIES INCOME-TAX IN FINANCE BILL CONSEQUENT ON WITHDRAWAL OF THE INCOME-TAX AND EXCESS PROFITS TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: (a) In view of the Income-tax and Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill not having been moved, will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state the position in connection with the imposition of the extra three pies on the Income-tax in the Finance Bill?

(b) Did not the Honourable Member, state that the extra imposition was intended to cover the cost to Government of the concessions made in the Bill now withdrawn?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: (a) As the Finance Bill has now become law, tax at the enhanced rate becomes effective from the 1st April, 1945.

(b) If the Honourable Member will refer to the concluding portion of paragraph 47 of my Budget Speech, he will notice that I said that this increase in the surcharge will make up the loss that would accrue as a consequence of the grant of the earned income relief only and not all the concessions contained in the Indian Income-tax Amendment Bill in question.

Sir F. E. James: With reference to the latter part of the answer will my Honourable friend the Finance Member consider the possibility of giving the concessions suggested or provided for in the Bill in respect of grants made for scientific research, an object which, I know, my Honourable friend has very much at heart?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I quite agree with my Honourable friend that I am extremely sympathetic to the object which he has mentioned but the general attitude of Government is that they will not be justified in proceeding to place income-tax concessions in India on the most modern and rational basis if they cannot at the same time secure any assistance in dealing with gross forms of evasion.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: Is this retaliation?

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: Will the Honourable Member state, now that the concession on unearned increments will not be given, whether he will by an ordinance withdraw the three pies that he has imposed on the income-tax?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: The situation arising out of the fact that the scheme of taxation as envisaged in the Budget has not been completely enacted will naturally receive the consideration of Government.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: Do I understand that Government will make an announcement at some later date in this Session as to what they desire to do in connection with this extra three pies they have put on the income-tax? May I point out to the Honourable Finance Member that he cannot have it both ways:

either he has his three pies and gives the concessions, or he takes away the three pies and does not give the concessions?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I should be quite prepared to justify the increase in the income-tax without any concession. That is not, I admit, the position which I took up in the Budget speech, but, as I have said, the situation will have to be considered by Government, and I am not prepared to give my Honourable friend any categorical assurance as to what the result of that consideration will be.

Sir F. E. James: May I ask the Honourable Member to state whether, before he declined to make the motion the other day, he had satisfied himself that he could not get the support of the principal parties in the House for the particular measures that he had proposed to put in the Bill?

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: Yes, I made several efforts to devise a form of amendment which would give Government the minimum which it required, but I regret to say that I found that there was no prospect of an amendment being passed by the House. I consider that I went to the limit of reasonable compromise, and I do not see what further could be done. The House must accept the results of its own action.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Finance Member, without contesting his right to withdraw that Bill or the reasons he had for withdrawing it, now that he has withdrawn the Bill and now that an extra three pies has been imposed without concessions, whether Government will not be justified to give favourable consideration to some change by an ordinance one way or the other, one way being to give the concessions, and the other to remove the three pies? The Honourable Finance Member's speech indicated very clearly why the three pies was put on. One thing or the other must be done.

The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman: I have already said that Government will take the resultant situation into consideration.

RESOLUTION *RE* REMOVAL OF SECTIONS 111 TO 121 OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1935—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion of the following resolution moved by Mr. Manu Subedar on the 2nd March 1945:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that early action be taken for the removal of sections 111 to 121 (both inclusive) of the Government of India Act, 1935."

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir had not finished.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, it is well over a month ago, or about a month ago that I was addressing this Honourable House in support of the Resolution moved by Mr. Manu Subedar. I do not know whether the House wants me to read it again: I presume they know what it is.

When I was speaking, the last point I was trying to make or which I made, was that, when we went to England to attend the First Round Table Conference, we did not receive the support that was due to us from India. Mr. President, I will remind this Honourable House that those who went to England then, were characterised as traitors to their country by a certain section of the press. But in the next Round Table Conference, the second one, we had the good fortune of having Mr. Gandhi as one of our colleagues. Now, the criticisms in India of the work which we were attempting to do were not very helpful. I mentioned, when I was speaking a month ago, that there was some talk in this country of repudiation of the sterling loans of India. Well, in India it was perhaps not realised what a panic that one statement made in England. The result was that not only had we to interview the Governor of the Bank of England, but the Prime Minister actually made a statement in the House of Commons assuring the investors of the stability of their investments. Sir, I need not go into details. I have not got the time, but I am sure this Honour-

[Sir Cowasjee Jehangir.]

able House heard my friend the Honourable Planning Member with great attention. He explained in detail the way in which India's position deteriorated during the four years in which this matter was being considered in England. In the first year there was a suggestion that there should be an appropriate convention based on reciprocity. Finally it ended by the British Government including in the Act of 1935 these clauses against which we still protest. I need not here go into all these stages of deterioration, which have already been so lucidly explained. But I would like to draw the attention of this Honourable House to what happened in the second year. Again the public in England, and perhaps the Government, took fright at what was going on in this country and began to discuss another kind of discrimination—administrative discrimination: that was in the second year; and if I may be allowed, I will just repeat here a few words that I addressed to the preliminary session in 1931 on this question of administrative discrimination. This is what I said then:

"What do you mean by administrative discrimination? It is practised every day by you. 'Buy British goods' will be interpreted as discrimination. Prime Minister, what would your House of Parliament say to you if you gave a big contract to a foreign firm, because it quoted 2 per cent. less? I should call you unpatriotic; I would say you had neglected to do your duty; but you would be accused of discrimination under this clause. You must eliminate this clause; you cannot work it."

Well, as the Honourable House knows, there are certain safeguards against what is called administrative discrimination which will be impossible really to work in the interests of this country.

Now, fourteen years have elapsed since those days, and great changes, especially in the last five or six years, have taken place in the world. The world has moved at a pace at which it has never moved in its history. In 1931-32 the very word 'dominion status' was not allowed to be mentioned. It was not even included in the preamble to the Bill of 1935; but today we have received a solemn pledge that dominion status will be granted to this country after the war is over, and it has been admitted

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: General): May I know which pledge the Honourable Member is referring to?

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: The Cripps proposals: many a statement made in the Houses of Parliament have corroborated that statement and I will read out one if you like

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Read out the pledge.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: I will read out a statement which is as good as a pledge. As I have said, fourteen years have passed, and now we have received this assurance of dominion status and the Under Secretary of State for India, speaking in the House of Lords in connection with these safeguards, said:

"To make an offer of complete self-government and to exact guarantees for special British interests was inconsistent."

Therefore it has been admitted that it is inconsistent with dominion status to have these sections in the Act.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Negative pledge!

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: We have been told that Government is planning for the future and a new department has actually been brought into existence with a very distinguished man at its head, and we were told that planning is to take place just now and may be put into execution after the war. That means that planning is to take place under the present constitution with these sections of the Act as the constitution of this country, and these plans are to be put into execution when dominion status is the order of the day in this country. May I ask how it is possible to plan with such sections in the Act if such sections are inconsistent with dominion status? Therefore, you are planning today under conditions which are inconsistent with the time when those plans will be put into execution. That is the position; and if that be the correct position, we can come to but one conclusion and that is that these sections in the Act and some of the provisions in the Instrument of Instructions should be taken as a dead letter from now and immediately. It is unnecessary to have a change in the Act or an amendment in the Act. An executive action saying that the Government in England is prepared to allow the

Government in India, the Governor General and the Governors, to treat these sections as a dead letter from now will meet the position, and then planning can go on on the basis of dominion status for this country. Therefore I wholeheartedly support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, which talks of the repeal of these sections. It may be said that repeals of sections of the Act are inconvenient. We have seen many sections of the Act repealed and amended during war time

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): The Act has been changed ten times!

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: But even then in this case, so far as I can see, it can be done by executive action, the Secretary of State giving instructions that these sections of the Act shall be treated as a dead letter. That can be done immediately and should be done

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

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: I will finish. It is inconsistent to talk of offering India dominion status and discussing the question of retaining now or in the future these sections. It is such arguments that cause doubts in the minds of my countrymen. You cannot keep your cake and eat it. You cannot take credit for offering India dominion status after the war and argue about retaining these sections now or in the future. You cannot tell your allies that you have offered India dominion status, and that it is for India to take it, and also argue that certain safeguards will have to be included in any future constitution. It is illogical, it is inconsistent and it throws grave doubts upon the intentions of those who make the offer. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind after the statement made by the Under Secretary of State for India in the House of Lords that there is no intention on the part of the British Government to include any such sections in any future Act. Having been satisfied on that, we now claim and we now demand that these sections shall be treated as a dead letter from now onwards.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I rise to support this Resolution. Mr. Manu Subedar has raised a number of vital issues on this Resolution at a most opportune moment, now that we are thinking of developing our industries. What are these provisions—sections 111 to 121 of the Act? These provisions contain in a nutshell the history of British exploitation of India for the last 200 years; exploitation,—organised, scientific and calculated. These sections bear Parliament's stamp on what Lord Curzon proclaimed with brutal frankness—the yoke of exploitation as a handmaid of administration. This chapter of the Government of India Act, I should like to call it, is the Britishers' charter for India's economic serfdom. It is a fetter on the Indian Legislature, both Federal and Provincial. According to these provisions, neither the Federal Legislature nor the Provincial Legislature has got the power to legislate for the benefit of India's trade and industry.

Now, that we want to construct new industries and to reconstruct old industries which had been destroyed during these years, the question is—can we do so with these provisions on the Statute Book? As the Act stands at present, I have been told the other day by the European Members, it is not possible for the Government of India to take any measures whatsoever for helping indigenous industries against the powerful competition of foreign companies, whether it be shipbuilding or aircraft or the motor industry or the Indian chemical industry or the film industry. The Honourable the Development Member declared in unmistakable language that it is not possible for the Government of India to take any measures for protecting Indian industries, so long as these sections exist. It therefore follows necessarily, from the point of view of India, that these provisions must go lock, stock and barrel and they must go now and immediately. What is the Government's answer to this Resolution of Mr. Subedar? The answer of the Development Member, I understood, is this. A trade agreement is part of a general political and constitutional settlement. Therefore His Majesty's Government will negotiate a trade agreement

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta]

with the future Government of India and therefore he says we must wait till that time and until that time these sections will continue on the Statute Book. In other words, he turns down this Resolution of Mr. Subedar.

Let us now consider and visualise what will be the position of Indian industries if we accept this position, and if we wait till the new constitution comes. The position will be this: that between now and the uncertain event of a new constitution, British companies with 100 per cent. British capital and directorate will establish themselves and control industries in this country and what is still worse, powerful combines and cartels with international ramifications will be established in this country. As regards the intrusion of foreign capital, I take the liberty of quoting a memorable utterance by President Wilson on this point:

"A country is dominated by the capital invested in it. It is a fundamental idea that in proportions as foreign capital comes in and takes hold, foreign influence comes in and takes hold. Therefore, processes of capital are in a sense processes of conquest."

So, in fact, it will be another conquest, in addition to the conquest that there is already.

We in India are told that we are now to plan and not to execute but unlike India, all other countries are already not only making plans but they have begun to execute their plans. Therefore our industries will be doomed and foreign industries will get a fresh start, with fresh capital for exploitation, between now and the new constitution. What is the meaning of development of industries? It is development of industries, owned, controlled and managed by Indians. Therefore, if the position formulated by the Honourable Development Member is accepted, then the inevitable result will be immeasurable and irreparable damage to our industries. Sir Ardeshir Dalal is a shrewd business man and he knows that it will not do to wait. He realises that immediate action is necessary. He says that we cannot wait for a constitutional settlement. He also says that if we wait the industrial development of the country will be hampered. Having said this, he says at the same time another thing. He first spoke as Sir Ardeshir Dalal of Tatas' industries and signatory of the Bombay Plan but as a Development Member he is haunted by the spectre of His Majesty's Government, the Government of India and his European colleagues. He is overwhelmed with doubts and difficulties. His courage fails him. He says that although an immediate solution of this problem is necessary, the problem is difficult. It is not only difficult but delicate and that the difficulties cannot be minimised. As I have stated, the trade agreement is an integral part of a general constitutional settlement. That is what he says: If we seek an immediate change and an immediate new agreement, and if we seek to encroach on the Britishers' protected field, then our spirit may be misunderstood. It is just possible we may lose their good will, their sympathy and support and expert advice and so on. He says that in post-war years we are in need of their capital goods and expert advice.

We cannot afford to incur that displeasure. We have heard the warning from Prof. Hill, who is believed to be most favourably inclined towards Indian industries. He says: "If you want capital goods, if you want our expert advice be on a strictly share basis, and that share basis should be 50:50." In industry, well, it cannot be out of love or for a minor share in controlling but it would be on a strictly share basis, and that share basis should be 50:50." In other words, British industry and Indian industry will be equal partners. Therefore in his anxiety to avoid a catastrophe, the Honourable Member for Planning and Development says, put off the evil day, and on behalf of Government he pleads for further consideration. Now, Sir, what is this further consideration for? Is it a new problem which requires further consideration, which requires further time. I am afraid this plea of Government is not quite *bona fide*, it is only putting off the evil day. Why is it done? Did not Mr. Amery himself in 1942 commit himself in connection with Cripps proposal that "guarantee of special protection of British commercial interests in India will not be a condition for acceptance of any new Indian constitution"? If that is sincere and honest assurance, then accept this Resolution and start with a clean slate. We are not

opposed to a new agreement. There must be some agreement. We are not opposed to that agreement. Mr. Hill proposes to have a new agreement when India will be free. If that is so, why not do it now when you are still in power? The only question is that the negotiation should be with a National Government and not with a subordinate Government, or an agreement between a principal and agent.

Now, Sir, it has been said by the Honourable Member for Planning and Development that Indian opinion has never reconciled itself to this. Then, will he fight for the removal of these obnoxious sections? Will he vote with us? I say, Sir, an immense responsibility lies on the Development Member. He has to develop Indian industries, and he has to be on his guard in developing Indian industries that he does not develop British industries at the expense of Indian industries. Within certain limits he can make or mar Indian industries at the moment. India expects him to do his duty on behalf of India. I invite the Honourable Member to support this Resolution and vote with us in the 'Ayes' lobby.

Sir Henry Richardson (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I do not pretend to address myself to the Resolution now before the House with anything but misgiving—a misgiving which has not been relieved by the statement made by my Honourable friend the Member in charge of Planning and Development when he spoke on the 2nd of March last. A number of claims have already been put forward for the Resolution by the Honourable the Mover, and I will not attempt to traverse all of them in the short time available to me to give the House my views on this most important matter touching the welfare of the community which I represent. An opportunity will, I hope, be given to other speakers of my party as the debate proceeds.

Now, Sir, in our opinion, if the debate is to be of practical value it is important that its scope should be confined strictly to the immediate object of the Resolution; we are not discussing the Indian constitutional problems in general, we are not even discussing the position of British business in a completely self-governing India. We are concerned only with the question as to whether Sections 111 to 121 should, at this particular juncture, be removed from the Government of India Act.

My Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar in a speech of studied and commendable moderation, based his case upon two different types of arguments—one he characterised as the sentimental argument and the other as the practical argument.

The sentimental argument for the Resolution amounts roughly to this: that the existence of these statutory restrictions upon India's power to plan the economic life of the country is derogatory to the national dignity and as Mr. Manu Subedar put it, contrary to that new spirit of the world in which India so richly shares.

That argument must command the respect of every independent people; nevertheless logic compels us to recognize that any reciprocal arrangement, whether in the Act or outside it, must involve some restrictions and limitations. The remedy lies not in the removal of a particular block of sections but in the complete re-orientation of methods. We in this Group stand fully committed to the principle that India must frame her own constitution, and it is in the speedy application of that principle rather than in tinkering with particular chapters of the Act that we see the means of satisfying India's legitimate pride.

I turn now to the practical arguments for the Resolution. Here, unfortunately, neither the Honourable the Mover, nor the Planning and Reconstruction Member, was as explicit as we could have wished—each seemed to display a certain unwillingness to state what he would propose to do after the removal of the present restrictions. Greater clarity in this matter would have made this debate more real. It is all very well to come to this House and say "These sections prevent us from planning India's post-war development"—but the Honourable Member can hardly expect our support if we are left in the dark as to what he proposes to do after the disappearance of these restrictions. The

[Sir Henry Richardson]

sections concerned merely prohibit discrimination in one form or another, against British interests. What particular aspects of this prohibition interfere with India's planning? To put it in another way, what particular forms of discrimination do the Honourable the Mover and the Honourable the Planning and Development Member want to practise, in order to further India's development? We are not told, but we are given a vague hint.

There is a danger, we are told, that Indian business will be unable to compete with great non-Indian combines which will establish themselves by legitimate commercial means and that the Government of India will be powerless to help by reason of Sections 111 to 121. Mr. Manu Subedar may be right in fearing the action of great combines but I doubt whether he is right in supposing that they will necessarily be non-Indian. It may well be that great Indian combines will be the principal menace to the growth of new Indian concerns in a self-governing India. Such methods are by no means confined to one country. It may be that some protection of small companies against great combines of any nationality will be needed. That, however, is an entirely different issue from that of the relation of Indian business to British business as such. Mr. Manu Subedar has very skilfully confused the issue. We are not at the moment discussing legislation against combines: We are discussing discrimination against British interests.

When my Honourable friend talks of helping Indian business against non-Indian competition, what has he in mind? Does he want to interfere with and restrict non-Indian business? Or does he merely want to help Indian business in some positive way?

Let us remember that sections 111 to 121 are purely negative in their action—they merely prevent discrimination. Discrimination may be of two kinds—one positive and the other negative. If you were to say to a British company "Because you are 100 per cent. British, you shall not sell motor cars or buy jute, or manufacture tea", that would be *positive* discrimination. If, on the other hand, you were to say: "We will give a subsidy to all Indian match manufacturers but not to British match manufacturers in India", that would be *negative* discrimination.

It may be that in our deliberations we ought to distinguish between these two kinds of discrimination. It may be that the position regarding the grant of subsidies does require re-consideration and perhaps modification. When, however, we come to positive discrimination—the imposition of restrictions on British companies—I must state our position very definitely. We claim the right—born of our long connection with India—to carry on and develop business here in fair competition with other interests. If the object of the Mover is to place obstacles in the way of British business in this country and by positive discrimination against us, to give Indian business an advantage, let me tell him quite plainly that we are not prepared to accept that position. We claim no commercial privileges as compared with any other community, but we do claim, and we shall continue to insist that we must be left free to carry on business in this country without discriminatory restrictions. That is a position from which we shall not be willing to move.

Let us consider for a minute how sections 111 to 121 have worked up to now. These sections have been in the Constitution Act for ten years and I doubt whether with the exception of a handful of specialists and students, the vast majority of people in the United Kingdom or India had ever heard of them. So far as I myself know, they have not, during all this time, been the subject of a single reference to the Federal Court which is the legal authority charged with the interpretation of the Constitution. So that, if it is my Honourable friend's case that these sections of the Act have been hanging round the neck of India and impeding her industrial development for a decade, that is a contention which I cannot accept for the simple reason that it does not square with the facts. Honourable Members may be able to bring forward other reasons for the revision or modification or abolition of these dozen sections of the Act, but the allegation that they have acted or may act as a positive deterrent to

the development of Indian commerce and industry carries no conviction at all. Indeed, Sir, it so happens that the period during which these so-called safeguards have found a place in the constitution represents ten years of the most intensive industrial development in the history of this country—development carried out almost wholly through the instrumentality of Indian capital and by the application of Indian technical skill over an ever widening sphere. This is self-evident at Tatanagar, at Calcutta, at Cawnpore, at Delhi, at Bombay, at Ahmednagar, and I could mention many other places where huge Indian-owned and managed enterprises have grown up, adopting the same technique in regard to management as has been so successfully used in the building up of Indian industries by European-managed concerns for many years past, and all this has happened despite the presence of the sections in the 1935 Act which are the subject of this Resolution.

In my view then, the history of the last ten years provides a complete denial of the statement that the operation of these sections of the Act hampers the development of Indian industry, and I cannot resist the conclusion that some of our Honourable friends mean something quite different from what they say. Some of them are perhaps concerned not so much with securing fair play for Indian business interests—an aim in which they have our full support—as with ensuring the denial of fair play to British business interests. I feel that in this matter my Honourable friend, Sir Ardeshir Dalal, should come out into the open and tell us what he really means. Is it his object merely to secure the fullest possible opportunity for the development of Indian industry? Or is it his wish to place obstacles in the way of British business in this country and by discrimination against British business to give Indian business an advantage in competition with us? If that is his object, let him have the courage to say so, so that the world and Britain may know just how the matter stands.

It has always been contemplated that Sections 111 to 121 of the Government of India Act might be replaced by a convention and of course when India becomes completely self-governing, the position of the British community will be a matter for negotiation. When those negotiations take place, each side will have to be a giver as well as a taker. There is much to be gained by mutual co-operation. Co-operation between the two is, in our view, vital to the future of India. We, on our part, shall want to be assured of being able to carry on our legitimate business in this country. It may be that the assurance will take the form of a treaty between the two countries, just as it may be that even under the present Government of India Act a convention might serve the same purpose. We are concerned however not so much with form as with substance, and I say with all the emphasis at my command that we are not prepared to give up the right to carry on our business fairly and without discrimination in this country.

A great era of industrial development lies ahead in India and whatever may be the case in the rest of the world, we here are moving into an economy of expansion rather than of contraction. In such a world there is room both for the new comer and for the old established business. What is required for their mutual benefit is not discrimination against one or the other, but a helpful spirit of understanding and co-operation between them. We on our part are willing to be actuated by that spirit and must refuse to support a Resolution which, in its aim, is a negation of the principle of co-operation.

Mr. H. A. Sathar H. Essak Salt (West Coast and Nilgiris: Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to accord my wholehearted and unreserved support to the Resolution that has been moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Manu Subedar. I am very happy, Sir, that when he moved the Resolution he took the opportunity of reminding this House of the uncompromising opposition that our great Leader, Mr. Jinnah, consistently showed against the inclusion of these sections in the State Book. Sir, I have before me the proceedings of the Federal Structure Committee for 1931 and I just quote a part of a sentence from the statement that he made when he was taken to task by Lord Reading for sticking to his opinion and opposing the inclusion of these sections. There he stated that although he might be a single individual, and notwithstanding the rebuke from

[Mr. H. Sathar H. Essak Sait]

Lord Reading he still opposed. That was, 'Sir, the attitude of Mr. Jinnah, and that certainly should be the attitude of every Indian with regard to this question.

But so far as we on these Benches are concerned, we have a little difficulty and that is this: The Muslim League is committed to the revision of the whole Constitution Act, not only the Act itself but the very basis on which the Act has been formulated. That being so, I want to make it quite clear, not only to this House but to the country at large, that in demanding the repeal of these sections, it does not mean that we accept the other sections of the Act. I am very glad that Mr. Manu Subedar made it quite clear that his object was not to preclude the revision of the Act in the other sections. But I am still not very happy about the time chosen for this motion because the question of the revision of the whole constitution is to be taken in hand now that the war is coming to an end. At this juncture that we should be asking in this House to discuss such a small matter and demand the repeal of what after all, compared to the big issue at stake, is certainly a small matter is something about which I am not very happy. However the demand having been made, we on these Benches accord our full support to it.

Sir, the matter which troubles me, which I have mentioned, was exemplified by the emphasis in the speech of my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, when he stressed on the words 'dominion status' so often. He said that we are going to have dominion status and that the presence of these sections in the Act stands against that conception. We know his political history. He will consider it a great gift if this country is granted dominion status. But, I believe, neither the Congress nor the Muslim League will even look at it if it is offered now. (Interruption.) That difference exists in the outlook between us on this side of the House and my Honourable friend, Sir Ardeshir Dalal. I want it to be clearly understood both in this country and in England that this is an opportunity which India is not going to lose by getting into discussions of such small matters. This motion is before the House; we want it to be passed, but the greater questions which are at issue have to be tackled and we will see to it that they are tackled and settled to the satisfaction of all sections of this country. That being our attitude, whatever purpose I had intended to serve by my amendment is not going to be served at present. I would, therefore, with your permission, ask the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. Abdul Qayum: Mr. President, my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, while speaking on the Resolution referred to various promises and pledges made by Great Britain to this country—promises of full-fledged freedom as soon as the war is over. Various speakers have in the course of their speeches referred to the fact that the war is soon drawing to a close. At a time like this people in this country and outside this country are thinking of peace,—a peace which has been long denied to them, a peace which is coming nearer and nearer. In view of the repeated promises of freedom by Great Britain, it was really strange to hear the remarks which fell from the lips of the Honourable the Leader of the European Group. Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the European Group displayed the mailed fist under a velvet glove. His words were very sweet and the manner in which his speech was delivered also showed that it was a speech which was delivered without any excitement, without any heat, but at the same time the iron-hand was visible under a very thin muslin glove. The House will pardon me for using the word muslin instead of velvet. This is because of the approach of the hot weather!

Sir, he said, if I have understood him correctly, that he had great respect for the sentimental reason which was behind this Resolution, namely the desire on the part of Indians to have industries of their own and to be treated as equals by the rest of the mankind. But he went on to say that when he looked at it from the logical point of view, he could not induce himself and his Party to

extend their support to this Resolution. I waited patiently that something of that logic on the score of which the Honourable the Leader of the European Group was withholding his support to this very reasonable Resolution would be vouchsafed to this Honourable House, but nothing of that kind has happened. The fact is that the Honourable the Leader of the European Group really meant self-interest when he was using the word 'logic'. If the European community in this country, in the year 1945, are not prepared to forego all these privileges,

as a result of which they have a dominant voice in the industry and commerce of this country, it shows that there is absolutely no desire on their part in practice, in spite of pious pronouncements to the contrary, to part with power or to part with the privileges which are mainly responsible for their dominant position in this country. When we begin to mistrust British promises, when we say that we have got absolutely no faith in British promises, we are fully justified, because the long course of British practice, the long course of British business transactions and political dealings in this country, proves that these pious promises were never meant to be translated into action. I may inform the Honourable the Leader of the European Group that it would be much better for their class interests as well as for the European community in India if, instead of hanging on to these sections of the Government of India Act, Sections 111—121, they should change their attitude and begin to rely in the future on something which will be more useful to them, something which will be more remunerative in the long run, viz., the goodwill of the people of this country. Are you prepared to depend on the goodwill of the people of this country or are you going to rely on these sections of the Government of India Act, Sections 111—121, the only sanction behind which is the British Army of occupation in India and the British bayonets and the British guns? Sir, this policy of discrimination is masqueraded as equality between the British subject domiciled in the United Kingdom and the British subject domiciled in British India, between a British company incorporated in the United Kingdom and carrying on business in India and an Indian company incorporated in British India. This so called equality is really a cleverly conceived design to kill all Indian enterprise and Indian industry. After all you cannot have equality between unequals. Indian industries are just beginning to rise. They require development, they require organisation, their resources have to be marshalled, experience has to be pooled, and how can this infant industry in the early stage of development be treated on terms of equality with well established British industry supported by political power and supported by the resources, the experience, the skill and the capital which is behind all those big concerns. My Honourable friend, the Leader of the European Group, in the course of his speech stated that the danger to India was not so much from British cartels and big British firms but from Indian cartels. Among the very sections of the Government of India Act he will find one section, where his community have agreed to the principle of cartels and big trusts, only if they were allowed to share it with the Indian capitalists on a basis of 50:50 proportion. It is this policy which finds expression in this section of the Government of India Act, which has been responsible for the absence of large and heavy industries in this country. If you look at section 115 of the Act, you will find—I will read only the relevant portion:

"No ship registered in the United Kingdom shall be subjected by or under any Federal or Provincial law to any treatment affecting either the ship which is discriminatory in favour of ships registered in British India."

As long as this section of the Government of India Act remains on the Statute Book, how are we going to develop our shipping industry and our ship-building yards in India? We were told the other day in the course of a speech which was delivered by a British Admiral in the Assembly Library that if you want to have a strong navy in war-time, you must have a strong and efficient mercantile marine of considerable and respectable size in peace time, because it is only the mercantile marine and the people who man the mercantile marine, the trained personnel, who can be converted into a fighting Navy when

[Mr. Abdul Qaiyum.]

a war is on. With this section 115 remaining on the Statute Book, it is small wonder that the Indian shipping cannot make any headway at all and that even in the matter of coastal shipping, British shipping enjoys a dominant position as against Indian shipping. So much overpowered are the British community in India and their compatriots in Great Britain by this desire of self-interest, that they would not allow India in peace time on one pretext or another to have any large scale industries like chemicals, automobile factories, shipbuilding industry, aircraft factories. Even locomotives could not be manufactured in India and we discovered, when the matter was first brought up on the floor of this House, that there was such a thing as an Act of the British Parliament which forbade the manufacture of locomotives in this country. What was the position when the war started, when the German submarines became very active and machinery and manufactured goods could not be brought into this country and India was invaded by Japan in the East? In the absence of these heavy industries the position of India became very precarious. The same sort of spirit is at work. Do they have these sections, sections 111 to 121, or some corresponding sections in the constitution of the British self-governing Dominions? Is it not a fact that Australia was able, during this great war, when Australia was practically cut off from the rest of the world, to set up a big aircraft industry and the Australians have become self-sufficient in the matter of aircrafts? Before the war various questions were put on the floor of the House to the Members of the Government of India demanding that aircraft factories should be set up in India and it was really amazing to be told by one Honourable Member after another from the Government Benches that the materials which were necessary for the manufacture of aircraft in this country could not be obtained on sufficiently economic basis in this country. These arguments really conceal the real argument, namely that as far as heavy industries are concerned, Britain must supply us and we must continue to receive it.

Among these very sections we find section 118. My Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar referred to this section 118 in the course of his speech and I think a reference was made to it by Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, I mean the power to secure reciprocal treatment by convention. I have read this section two or three times and I find that it is laid down therein, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, that these sections will remain till such time when a convention is agreed to between Great Britain and India, whereby the provisions which are laid down in these sections become the law or are placed on the Statute Book in India and the United Kingdom, and then these sections will become redundant and not be enforced. What is the use? You force India to enact laws, embodying these very pernicious sections which have been responsible for killing Indian industry and enterprise and it is only then that you would be prepared to forego these sections 111 to 121.

Sir, I find that the spirit which lies behind the attitude of the British in India is not a very helpful one. It is not the kind of spirit which we expect from them. India has changed, and has changed tremendously, and greater changes are in store in this country. If you are going to rely on the type of legislation which is the subject matter of this debate, if you are going to rely on force, then in this country also people will lose all faith in constitutional methods and organise themselves and resort to force to meet your force with equal or greater force, if they can. But there is another method. In this world now no nation can remain in seclusion or isolation. Distances have been abolished, nations are much more interdependent to day than they were before the second world-war began. India may be dependent for certain things on Great Britain, but Great Britain will be much more dependent on India for the very many things which we can give her after the war. Surely without that co-operation it will be impossible for nations to carry on. Now, if you are going to have that type of co-operation, then the type of speech which was delivered by Sir Henry

Richardson is not the kind of speech which is really going to help British industry or British enterprise in this country. You must give up your reliance on these sections of the Government of India Act, and I would urge upon the European community in India to rely more and more on the good will and spirit of co-operation of the people of this country. This present camouflage of equality for the United Kingdom's citizens and incorporated companies is no real equality, but it is a deliberate attempt to stamp out or crush or cripple Indian industrial enterprise. Sir, I am very grateful to my Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar for having brought forward this Resolution, and for having drawn attention to these sections of the Government of India Act, which are no less than a scandal, and I hope something will be done to remove these obnoxious sections from the Statute Book. Sir, I support the motion.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): My Honourable friend Sir Henry Richardson's speech indicates that there has not been the slightest change in the attitude of the British interests in India from the attitude that was taken up by their spokesman in the years 1930 and 1931 at the two Round Table Conferences when they put forward proposals which have resulted in what I may compendiously term as the Benthall clauses of the constitution. Sir, it was on the 15th November 1931 that Mr. Benthall, as he then was, in a frank statement, for which I should like to congratulate him, made it quite clear that unless their rights were protected—I am quoting his words—in the clearest and most unequivocal manner, they must reserve their consent to the transfer of power. Sir, in a less direct language my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Richardson, has virtually given expression to that threat. He says: well, if this is what you intend, you had better tell England about it. Now, Sir, my Honourable friend, Sir Edward Benthall, on that occasion, also made it clear that they could have got whatever they wanted for the mere asking from His Majesty's Government. He referred to the two different courses that were open to them. He said: "we could of course have gone to His Majesty's Government direct, and if we did so, we should have gone with confidence of support in the fullest possible manner." But he preferred, he said, to have their demand agreed to by British Indian opinion as a result of negotiations on this subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member will continue his speech after Lunch.

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

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

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Sir, before the adjournment, I was dealing with Sir Edward Benthall's statement before the Second Round Table Conference. He continued that the commercial rights of the Britisher in India were not for negotiation, and then he emphasised that those rights had been won by them legitimately "by years of industry and integrity". I am very sorry that I do not find the Honourable the Finance Member in his seat just now, because I should like to ask him as to whether having regard to the accumulated sterling reserves to the credit of India at the present moment, the British rights, whatever they are in regard to commercial matters, are or are not subjects, appropriate subjects for negotiation. We know what has been done in several colonies in this regard where British investments have been bought up by negotiation through the good offices of government; and India is entitled to expect action on those lines being taken. With regard to the question of the rights having been won by "years of integrity", I find that my Honourable friend Sir Henry Richardson makes his claim on long connexion or association with India. Whether it is association, or whether it is integrity, let us examine how we have benefited by the past policy of the British industrialists and commercial magnates in India.

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

I do not want to give any opinion of my own in this connection; but I will content myself by quoting a few lines from statements made by sober and sedate persons like Sir Phiroze Sethna and Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas on this point before the Round Table Conference. Sir Phiroze Sethna was specially referring to the interests which the British commercial people claimed and he said:

"It is a vested interest which was created by discrimination in favour of Europeans against Indians in the past."

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas said that Mr. Benthall was—

"suffering under the reaction of what has been done till now by the present constitution and our predecessors, the racial discrimination which has been exercised by the Government of India ever since India was taken over from the East India Company practically up to to-day".

My Honourable friend Sir Henry Richardson said that no action has been necessary to be taken under these clauses of the constitution during the last ten years. If that is any argument at all, it might be utilised for the purpose of making out that the discrimination that there has been in the sphere of administration, has all along been in favour of the Britisher; and there is nothing in the constitution which entitles us, poor Indians, to ask for protection against that kind of discrimination to which reference was made by men like Sir Phiroze Sethna and Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas at the Round Table Conference.

My Honourable friend did not, I am afraid, do justice to the Honourable Member for Planning when he said that he could not make out what he was driving at, what his difficulties were. I have gone through the transcript of the Honourable Member's speech, and I find that he specifically referred to the question of shipping as a test case. He pointed out that if the provisions of the Act had to be adhered to, then if Government decided to give a subsidy to a comparatively small Indian shipping company to promote the interests of Indian shipping, then they would be compelled to give similar subsidies to the P. and O. and the B. I. companies—two most powerful concerns that have in the past succeeded by cut-throat competition in strangling all attempts at the establishment of an Indian mercantile marine. I should like in this connection to refer to certain articles which Mr. S. R. Bomanji wrote to the *Bombay Chronicle* in 1937, which have been reprinted in the form of a leaflet, which I am prepared to hand over to my Honourable friends of the European Group. There Mr. Bomanji gives his personal testimony as one of the three pioneers who had taken the initiative in starting an Indian shipping company some years ago, and he testifies to the attempts that the P. and O. company made to crush the attempts of Messrs. Tata and Sons, when they started their Bombay-Japan line. Messrs. Tata and Sons issued a small pamphlet giving the details of the case and these are a few extracts from that pamphlet:

"Having been instrumental in destroying the old Indian Shipowning trade, it has been unceasingly employed, ever since its establishment, in raising the rates of freight, and consequently hampering facility of intercourse, between India and the further East."

Again it says:

"With scores of liners, English and foreign, plying in these waters, which our petted and much glorified Anglo-Indian company can afford, and perhaps finds it good policy to tolerate, it is only jealous of a small enterprise like ours, and while it can lovingly take foreigners and possibly future enemies of England to its bosom"—(the reference is to the Japanese interest which the P. & O. Company were then favouring)—"it discards the poor Indian, for whose special benefit it professes to have come to India and from whose pocket it draws the greater part of its subsidy."

This is an extract from a leaflet published by such a responsible firm like Messrs. Tata and Sons; and if my Honourable friend Sir Frederick James were here, I would have asked him to verify these statements, (because I understand he is now connected with that firm) and after having verified these statements give the benefit of his knowledge to his colleagues on those benches. This pamphlet goes on to point out how this policy of the P. and O. company actually ruined the Indian yarn trade and how ruinous the rate war was that was

waged. Then again it refers to another interesting thing. Says this pamphlet:

"It is notorious how a misleading report to the effect that the steamer 'Lindisfarne' run by the Tata Line was unseaworthy and unsuitable for the carriage of cargo was circulated by interested parties; and when a protest was made by Messrs. Tata and Sons, the P. & O. Company through their lawyers apologised saying:—

'we have also since ascertained from an underwriter who had a considerable line on cotton and yarn to China by the "Lindisfarne" that she discharged her cargo there in good condition.

Under these circumstances, we beg to withdraw unreservedly our said letter of 6th June and regret the mistake which occasioned it."

Now, Sir, if we wanted more evidence of this kind, the pages of the evidence volume of the Report of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee would give us ample material for coming to the conclusion that the position which British shipping companies occupy today is not due to the "integrity" to which reference was made by Sir Edward Benthall, but to very iniquitous methods.

Naturally, therefore, the question is, are we or are we not going to make it impossible for firms like the P. & O and the B. I. companies, as referred to by my Honourable friend the Planning Member, to derive any benefit from any policy that India might adopt for the purpose of developing an Indian mercantile marine? I have no time to refer to the relevant evidence, but I may refer to a few pages—page 399, pages 482 and 446 and so on of the evidence volume of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee. And then again I should like to refer to a statement which Mahatma Gandhi made on this point before the Round Table Conference. He said:

"Some of you may have heard of a budding company between Chittagong and Rangoon. The directors of that company, poor straggling Muhammadans, came to me in Rangoon and asked me if I could do anything. My whole heart went out to them, but there was nothing to be done. What could be done? There is the mighty British India Steam Navigation Company simply underselling this budding company and practically taking the passengers without any passage money at all."

"I could quote instance after instance of that character", says Mahatma Gandhi.

That the charge is fully established is admitted even by a deputation composed of Sir John Thompson, ex-Chief Commissioner of Delhi, Sir Alfred Watson, ex-Editor of the *Statesman* and Mr. Edward Villiers, sometime President of the European Association, who gave evidence before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on behalf of an organisation, and this is what Sir Alfred Watson says:

"I am bound to say, speaking as an European, that the Indians have a case for a large share in their coastal shipping; and, although I opposed the Bill very strongly because it savoured of expropriation, I recognise that Indian company after Indian company which endeavoured to develop a coastal service has been financially shattered by this heavy combination of the British interests."

This is a testimony from unexpected quarters. Now, I put it to my Honourable friend Sir Henry Richardson—can he justly claim any consideration on the ground of his long association with India? Can Sir Edward Benthall claim that integrity has characterised their commercial activities in India?

Sir, in the year 1915 when the Industrial Commission was appointed, it was possible for the Government of India to contemplate, and even approve, the idea of Indian industries being started by Indians with the help entirely of Indian capital, controlled and manned by Indians. In the year 1923-24, again, when the Government of India appointed the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee, the Government of India thought that it was possible for the Government to have a genuine Indian mercantile marine set up—and I find that in the recommendations which were made by that committee they definitely suggested coastal reservation for Indian shipping—the recommendation will be found on page 27 of the report of that committee

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

Mr. K. O. Neogy: On page 29, it will be found that that committee suggested that a particular concern—I think it is the Asiatic—which was about to be sold—should be transferred in favour of Indian companies. I understand

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

that although this company has changed hands, it has gone into the hands of the B. I.

Now, Sir, it is a strange irony that what was possible to be done in 1915, and what was contemplated seriously by the Government of India in 1923-24, it is absolutely unconstitutional for us to contemplate at the present moment, and that it is not possible under the constitution as it stands to give effect to the recommendations of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee to which people like Sir John Byles, Senior Partner of a Consulting Naval Architect firm, who was employed by the India Office, and Captain Headlam, later Sir Edward Headlam, head of the Royal Indian Marine were parties. That is an eloquent commentary on the present constitutional position of India. I support the Resolution.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): I support this Resolution from the point of view of the freedom of India, of the Indian Legislature and of the Indian Government. There is no doubt that the sections which are sought to be repealed are sections which impose very large restrictions upon the powers of the present Legislatures and of the present Government of India. These restrictions, if you read the sections, are indeed very extensive. They relate to companies, trade, professions, employment in Government service and all walks of life. No Government which claims to be free will tolerate such restrictions and as we all Indians want freedom of our country, we cannot allow these restrictions to remain. We want these restrictions to go from now, because we want freedom today and there is no reason why these restrictions should be allowed to continue. These restrictions are founded upon the distrust which the British people have for Indians. The British people feel that Indians are not friendly to them and Indian Governments and Indian Legislatures may do harm to their interest. I consider that such a distrust is an insult to the people among whom the Britishers are living. It is an insult to the Indian Legislatures and to the Indian Governments, even the present Government of India. I would like to ask our European colleagues of this House what reason they have to show this distrust of the Indian people. If we can judge from the conditions under which European business has prospered in this country, judge the way in which Europeans in different professions have prospered, if we can judge from the positions which the Britishers hold in Government service in this country, I feel that there is absolutely no justification for the Britishers here or in Great Britain to show any distrust of the people of this country. They have prospered in every walk of life. They are perhaps the one single community in India who have occupied the topmost places in trade, business, industry and in Government service. Their position has been secured by Government by various methods and therefore when these Britishers show distrust of the Indians, they are doing an injustice to the Indian community from whom they have benefited. I would suggest to our British friends in this country and to our colleagues in this House, if they cease to show distrust of the Indian people and if they show that they are prepared to give freedom to the Indian people, the Indian Legislatures and the Indian Government, they have nothing to fear and I would go so far as to say that if they show good will towards the people of this country, they will prosper in this country much more than they have done.

Therefore, I would suggest to them in their own interest that they should give up their distrust of the Indian people and show themselves ready to give freedom to the Indian people. By this Resolution, we are seeking to secure the freedom for the Indian Legislature and the Indian Government. By passing this Resolution, we are not suggesting that the Legislature here and now decides to adopt a policy of discriminating against Europeans whether that discrimination is in favour of Indian interests or not. By this Resolution today, we are demanding that the Indian Legislature and the Indian Governments should be free to follow whatever policy they like, whatever policy they think is in the

interest of this country and the British people must show why that freedom should not be given to the Indian Government and the Indian Legislature. If Indian Government and the Indian Legislature finds that it is not in the interest of India to discriminate against British business in the country, why should the Indian Legislature or the Indian Government discriminate against Britishers? If they find that discrimination is absolutely necessary in the interest of India, then Sir, why should they not discriminate. After all even the Britishers in this country will admit that the Government and the Legislatures in this country must look to the interests of this country and to nobody else. That is the claim even of the present Government that they conduct the affairs of this country only in the interest of Indian people and of India. I therefore feel that our British colleagues in opposing this Resolution have not shown any argument why these sections should not be repealed. As regards justice, my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy has shown that large parts of the vested interests they have in this country, have been created by discrimination. The whole Government was in their hands and the Britishers have discriminated against Indians and built up their interests here. But, Sir, we are not claiming freedom to discriminate against Britishers, although that discrimination may not be in the interests of India. But if Indians want to develop their own industries and if Indians find that discrimination against the Britisher is necessary in the interest of the country, then Indian like any other people in the world are entitled to discriminate. If Britishers will trust Indians and will show good will towards Indians, then they will find that there are a large number of people in the country who do have good will towards Britishers. But if they continue to show distrust towards Indian people, then, Sir, many people who have good will for Britishers cannot show their good will, because we stand for our freedom first. Our freedom comes first, and our good will to Britishers or to any other people comes afterwards. I therefore suggest to our European colleagues that they should depend upon the good will of the people in India, if they do that, then, Sir, they will find that there are many friends of them in this country. Many people in this country have good will towards Britishers. But today they cannot show it because the Britishers are the enemies of our freedom. We cannot show good will towards people who are enemies of our freedom. If you insist upon these clauses being kept on the Statute Book, then you are the enemies of freedom and so long as you insist upon these clauses remaining, we cannot show good will towards Britishers who are against our freedom.

The Honourable Member for Planning and Development told us that the Government of India is considering the question of a treaty between Great Britain and India. I would like to warn him that we would like to have a treaty with Great Britain or with any other country, but that treaty must not be a treaty which is forced upon us under which our freedom will be as much curtailed as it is curtailed by these sections. Sir, I have studied that section also, which talks of convention between the two countries. Sir, convention is a good thing, if it is a voluntary convention, if it is a free convention, but if it is a convention which is forced upon us, then it is as bad as the sections in the statute book. I therefore suggest to the Government of India let them first repeal all these sections. If these sections are repealed then let a treaty be negotiated as a free treaty between two independent countries. We are not against a treaty with Great Britain, but that treaty must be on a voluntary basis, it must be a free treaty and not a conditional treaty. If the Britishers say that if you make a treaty embodying the principles or conditions in these sections, then these sections must be suspended. That is no voluntary treaty. That is as bad as the sections themselves. I therefore warn the Government of India that if they are thinking of making a treaty as a sort of substitute for these sections, a treaty which is not a free treaty, or a treaty which is not approved of by this Legislature and is forced upon this country by the Government, then that treaty will not be respected by this Legislature. I therefore appeal to the Government

[Mr. M. N. Joshi.]

of India to bear this in mind, let them first insist upon the repeal of these sections and then by all means let them negotiate a treaty which will be acceptable to this House. I remember a few years ago the Government of India made a treaty regarding textile industry between Great Britain and India. A Member of the Government of India went to England and negotiated a treaty, that treaty was not approved by this Legislature and still it remained a treaty. If that is the view of the Government of India that they can negotiate a treaty and impose upon this country without the approval of the Legislature, then they will be committing a grave wrong. I therefore suggest to them that they should not negotiate a treaty and make it final before they secure the approval of this Legislature.

The Leader of the European Group stated that they wanted fairness, fair competition. There cannot be fair competition between people who have established interests here, and people who have not got power. In this country all the power is concentrated in the hands of Governor General and the Governors who are all Britishers. Therefore this talk of fair competition is not a sincere talk and it should not be used by Britishers at all who today are getting the benefit of power being concentrated in the hands of British Governors and a British Governor General. I therefore feel that it is in the interest of British traders and Britishers who want service in this country, of the Britishers who want to follow professions in this country that they should give up dependence upon these artificial props, artificial safeguards and they should depend upon the good will of the people of the country. I have no doubt that if they show trust in the Indian people, if they show that they are not against the freedom of Indian people, then they should have no fear in this country. But so long as they show distrust for us, so long as we feel that they are against our freedom,

3 P. M. my fear is that Britishers may find that they have made a mistake in distrusting the Indian people. Trust would have given them much more but on account of the distrust they stand the risk of losing something which they do not want to lose.

Mr. O. P. Lawson (Bengal: European): Sir, I have listened to Mr Joshi's speech on this Resolution before the House. He first asks us why we have this distrust. He calls it distrust and he asks us why this distrust exists. Sir, I am very sensible of the extremely moderate manner in which this debate has been conducted and I am more than anxious to avoid anything which may cause heat. I am also sensible to the expressions of good will that have come from my Honourable friends opposite, and I need not tell you, Sir, that we on this side greatly appreciate those expressions. But it would be idle on our part to shut our eyes to certain evidence which comes constantly before us, evidence that perhaps our competitors in this country are a little too anxious to slip into our shoes. It is not a matter of recent occurrence; it has been growing with the growth of Indian commerce and industry in this country. I might perhaps quote very briefly an extract from the *Eastern Economist* of this time a year ago. Commenting then upon the speech recently made by Sir John Burder, the then President of the Associated Chambers, the *Eastern Economist* said:

"British industrialists might have suffered initial losses as part of subsequent profit. But it is puerile to claim sympathy for something that happened during the course of an economic process. Equally untenable is his expectation of equality of treatment in trade and commerce for his community in India."

Then, Sir, we have had frequent resolutions passed by the Federated Chambers urging expropriation of our interests. And indeed only recently in this House we heard from the benches to our right a Member say, on the debate on inland waterways, that if he were pressed he would have to admit that his attitude was purely racial. Now, Sir, I am confident of the good will of most of my Honourable friends opposite; but in the light of that evidence and in the light of such remarks which include a racial bias we naturally feel that we need protection.

Sir, this debate has taken a very largely business line, but it is not merely business and commercial matters that are covered by those sections. The right of entry, travel and residence, acquisition and holding of property, holding of public office, occupation, trade, business and profession,—all come within the purview of these sections. And, Sir, to me the value is the value of reciprocity. The Reciprocity Bill was piloted through this House, enshrining a similar principle, and it was piloted through not by the official benches but by my Honourable friend Mr. Govind Deshmukh. And I must remind the House that these sections apply not to the dominions, not to the States; they are sections providing for reciprocity between Great Britain and India. Now, Sir, the point that I wish to make is this; Mr. Joshi says there is no freedom until we get rid of these sections. Sir, I confidently believe that very shortly we shall not merely get rid of these sections but get rid of the whole act. But when Mr. Joshi says that there is no freedom until these sections go, I want to know what is going to be put in their place. He says, a freely negotiated treaty. Sir, in due course I hope also that we shall have a freely negotiated treaty. But in the meantime we ask for this protection and I think in justice we can ask that this Act is not amended piecemeal. Now, Sir, national pride, impediments to free planning for this country, have both been put forward as reasons why these sections should be removed. Let me deal first with the question of national pride. This House is aware that recently a Commission, by name the Soulbury Commission, has visited Ceylon. That Commission has received evidence regarding the constitutional future of the island. May I quote very briefly extracts from the submission made to the Soulbury Commission by the Indian Mercantile Chamber in Ceylon? They say:

"Indians have been associated with the internal trade in Ceylon from very early times and have occupied an important place in the commercial life of the island, next only to that of the Europeans."

I think, Sir, we can in justice claim the same position in India. The submission of the Indian Mercantile Chamber continues:

"As regards the Indian mercantile community, it has set the pace of commercial enterprise in the island, aroused her people's interest in commercial pursuits and set an example for thrift, hard work and commercial integrity."

I contend that we can claim the same position. Sir, let me go on and let the House note carefully the next submission of the Indian Chambers:

"It is further necessary to provide for safeguards against discriminatory legislation affecting British subjects domiciled in India or the United Kingdom by providing safeguard, analogous to those provided in the Government of India Act of 1935, to safeguard interests in India of British subjects domiciled in the United Kingdom."

In other words, Sir, the Indian Chambers of Ceylon, the Indian commercial community of Ceylon, are demanding from Great Britain precisely the safeguards which this House now requires to remove from the Act. Sir, I am not trying to make a debating point; this matter seems to me deeper-rooted than that. I think we have got to take a wider view of the whole situation. We have got to consider the repercussions of everything we do. The time is almost gone when we can take this or that action and leave some one else to carry the baby. I think, Sir, that we must remember that there are Indians in Ceylon, a million and a half in Malaya, and other millions in Burma, Indo-China, and other places. I think that we have got to understand what will be the effect even of every gesture that we make, and I ask my Honourable friend opposite to agree that in the present state of things the removal of these clauses could be no more than a gesture. We hope in the near future that the whole Act will be replaced by something new and we equally hope—we certainly on this side hope—that by free negotiation we may continue in this country, as we have done in the past, bearing the burdens equally with Indians.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On terms of absolute equality.

Mr. O. P. Lawson: There is a considerable bogey in the minds of many people that by the operation of these sections, there is danger to the advance of Indian industry. I, on the other hand, contend that it is by the principle of reciprocity that this country is most likely to develop. There is an inclination to the

[Mr. C. P. Lawson.]

narrow view that the sole value of an industry is in the dividends that are paid. That, to my mind, is a totally erroneous view. The value of an industry to this country is the resources that are opened up, the taxation that comes to the State, and the employment that it gives to the people. Let us not blind our eyes to the fact that, for some years to come, this country will need every bit of technical help it can get. There may be a feeling of satisfaction because of the fat sterling balances which exist and can be used. These balance as revenue may sound good, but as capital for planning they will go nowhere. I am convinced that if help is needed in this country, it will best be got by negotiation and certainly not by a policy of the "closed door".

Sir, there are many other points which I could mention but in conclusion I should like to utter just this word of warning. In this talk of sections in the Government of India Act and their central implication, we are apt to forget the diverse nature of the problem that is before us. Members in this House may feel that help from abroad has a certain value and they may adjust their attitude of a closed and open door accordingly. There is no reason to think that all the units that now are and will be in this country will take an identical view, and there is no doubt that the help that is so greatly needed will go where it is most welcome. I think that we have all got to regard this thing in its wider implication and I personally look forward to a future of mutual co-operation.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. C. P. Lawson: . . . to the time when the tumult and shouting will have died, when India undoubtedly will be free and when there will be complete co-operation between Great Britain and a self-governing India.

Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari (Tanjore cum Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I rise to support the motion and in doing so I feel that the task of supporting the motion has been made easy by the type of opposition that this motion has encountered in this House so far. I do not want to beat about the bush; my Honourable friend, Mr. Lawson, has recognized that if I have many faults, I have at least one virtue—that of candour—and it is true that we have been provided with a reply to this motion from the real opposition to the best interests of the people of this country.

Sir, need we mistake that tone adopted by the Honourable the Leader of the European Group when he challenged the Honourable Member for Planning and Development to come out in the open if he dared, knowing full well that the Honourable the Member for Planning and Development will perhaps find that the climate of Delhi is not congenial to his health if he continues to court the displeasure of the European Group. I do not want to embarrass my Honourable friend, Sir Ardeshir Dalal, but facts are facts and facts must be faced.

I would like to refer to one or two matters in reply to what my Honourable friend of the European Group has said. Sir Henry Richardson was quite clear. He said if we based our objection to these clauses on sentimental grounds, he will sympathize with us, but if we based our objection on practical grounds he will say no, and that is exactly the answer which my Honourable friend, Mr. Manu Subedar, has got. Sir, let us say in this House that we are not appealing to anybody's sentiment. It is not a matter of self-pride, but really a matter of accumulated wisdom of years. The moderates and elders in this country have often appealed to the sentiments of the Britisher, appealed to be judged by those principles which he holds near and dear to him, and have asked him to look at India from the same angle and concede to India the same privileges as they themselves enjoy, their bleating to the Britisher was of no avail and now my Honourable friend Mr. Subedar has been bleating perhaps like a lamb—and these painted lions have been roaring in reply to indicate that it is of no avail.

• We understand that if we want we can press upon the Government and Sir Ardeshir Dalal to approach the British Government with a request to them to

act on the terms laid down by section 118 and here and now establish a convention, a convention which will for the time being over-ride the clauses that are offensive to us, but if the convention breaks down for any reason and if one party to the convention feels that anything has been done to violate the convention, these clauses will come back into operation in all their severity. Therefore any insistence of action under section 118 is of no value to us, and Sir Henry Richardson need not feel that we are gullible enough to be persuaded to resort to the way out provided by this section.

My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Richardson, has been telling us that the facility that is granted to British industry is of negative character and that they get no practical benefits therefrom. He asked, 'Where is the case that has been taken to the Federal Court where an infringement of these sections has been found in the matter of Legislation that has been enacted since the 1985 Act came into being.'

Sir, the question of going to the Federal Court was for him and his Group and I know they all along have found no reason to go to the Federal Court. How could this Government which is just a Government which carries out the *hookum* of the Secretary of State and the British Parliament, which can be made to do what the British commercial interests in this country wants them to do, and which have a representative in the cabinet chosen from the British commercial community to keep the community fully informed of the views and proclivities of this Government, how could this Government ever undertake any piece of legislation that would conflict with sections 111 to 121. May I ask Sir Henry Richardson to tell us that if he knows when a Banking Bill is framed, in which inadvertently the framers, perhaps the Reserve Bank of India, not being aware of sections 111 to 121 in the same manner as some of the people in Britain are not, frame clauses imposing certain restrictions not of very serious nature, merely in the matter of furnishing routine returns, in the matter of satisfaction of certain conditions regarding capital structure, leave out the United Kingdom, the Legislative Department of this Government very hastily adds to the words "Banks incorporated in British India" wherever it is found the words "and in the United Kingdom". I will ask Sir Henry Richardson, if he has eyes to see, to get a copy of the Banking Bill and to satisfy himself that those two letters of the Alphabet U. K. have been added hastily, so much so the structure of the whole Bill is vitiated by it. It is an ugly scar on any piece of legislation that is enacted by this House and which every Indian finds hurts not merely his sentiment but his pride also and he even wishes for the day when a revolution will overtake the country, so that he will at least breathe in peace no matter what the troubles the revolution might bring in its wake. May I ask if Sir Henry Richardson remembers, as he ought to remember, about the views of his Group that certain provisions of a Bill that will come before the House in due course contained provisions that carried with them the flavour of discrimination, Sir, he and his Group have telegraphed to the Secretary of State, if rumour be true, and have persuaded other European interests in this country to exert pressure on the Government, so that that spirit of discrimination can be erased from that particular Bill that is to come before the Legislature. With all these recent events I dare say, indelibly imprinted in the mind of Sir Henry Richardson, honest man as he is who is here to represent the integrity of the British nation, how dare he come and challenge us to tell him what they have done, what has been done so far to prove that these provisions have operated adversely to Indian interests.

One word that fell from the mouth of Sir Henry Richardson which, much as I am inclined not to deviate from the subject of discussion, really reveals the crux of the situation. Sir Henry Richardson by a slip of the tongue confused Ahmednagar for Ahmedabad. Ahmednagar, with all that history will tell posterity about that fort, with all that the history of India will tell about it to the people of the world,—that fort is the key behind the whole power, and prestige for which my Honourable friend Sir Henry Richardson stands.

[Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari.]

Sir Henry Richardson told us that there have been ten years of phenomenal development in this country in the industrial field. I am sure if Sir Henry Richardson and his friends had had the power to stop it, they would have. It is only the force of circumstances, those forces which were far too powerful for them to stave off which have probably helped India to become industrialised. In this House we have heard times without number questions from people on this side of the House asking why India has not progressed industrially as Canada and Australia have done during this war. Those people will find the answer in the fact that the British interests in this country did not want it. I understand that the Secretary of State sent a *hookum* last year that those industries which were not on a production basis in June 1944 should not be encouraged. Can we do anything in this country today without the Secretary of State putting his imprimature on it? Could we at least get back some portion of our exports surplus for purposes of financing and starting industries in this country except a bare pittance of 6 crores of rupees, which my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, in a spirit of generosity has proposed to set apart each year for this country? Why really beat about the bush? Why not say that the European community in this country do not want a change. What is the use of saying that a future constitution will come and then the Indian might have all that he wants. It is not about the future that we are speaking. My Honourable friend Mr. Essak Sait was quite right when he said that we are not speaking about the future constitution. If the future constitution comes, it is going to be a constitution under which we would be able to exercise our rights and that appeal which my Honourable friends Sir Henry Richardson and Mr. Lawson made, if not made in a different tune altogether, will be of no avail. Sir, so far as we are concerned, the basis on which the economic *dharma* of this country will be based will rest on the words of the greatest man, so far as this country is concerned, Mahatma Gandhi spoken in this connection. I have before me an article contributed by him to the *Young India* of the 26th March, 1931. Describing the position of the Indian he says:

"In the administration of the country, the Indian generally is a mere clerk. In business he is at best a commission agent."

Further on he says:

"British trade where it is not hurtful to India's interest can be placed, when we reach a state of honourable association, on a favoured basis"—and he winds up by saying—"That is a dream I should love to realise."

Those are the principles on which we are and shall be guided, not on those principles which my Honourable friend Sir Edward Benthall spouted out in the Round Table Conference, to which my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy referred the other day,—

"the rights which we have legitimately won by years of industry and integrity. We are not demanding something new but the retention of something which we already have; and no one would willingly allow themselves to be deprived of something which they have justly earned and which they value very highly. I think you will agree with me that that is a fair claim."

Hitler felt that Czechoslovakia was a country the rights over which he had earned very rightly and legitimately. He felt that a portion of Poland was his due very rightly. It is that totalitarian spirit of which the Britishers in this country accuse the people on this side which has made Sir Edward Benthall spout out those words in the Round Table Conference.

Reading further the speeches of Sir Edward Benthall on that occasion I find that he has enunciated a policy with regard to private property. When he referred to the rights of private property he meant British property in India and when the Chairman, Lord Sankey, interjected with the words "something like the French Revolution of 1789" he exclaimed that he was not aware of it. I cannot blame him for not knowing anything about the French Revolution. He cannot be familiar with the French Revolution. He will only be

familiar with it when it overtakes him and his community with all its consequences.

What is the integrity on which Sir Edward Benthall has expatriated? I have before me a book "A short History of India" written by an Englishman and an Indian Civil Servant, and here is a story of Lord Clive. Clive himself is reported to have spoken of the history of his period as a history of chicanery, intrigues, politics and Lord knows what. And here is mentioned a disgraceful story of how Clive took something like half a million sterling Home and how he cheated a poor man Umi Chand. That is the type of integrity on which the claim of these people is based and that is the integrity which we have to uphold here by agreeing to a convention under the provisions of section 118 which can be broken at their will and the whole gamut of the provisions of sections 111 to 121 will be restored again.

My Honourable friend Mr. Lawson said that Indian competitors want to get into his shoes. I have no idea as to what exactly is his trade and I do not know where exactly he feels that the Indian is trying to get into his shoes. I suppose he was speaking subjectively but I can assure him that he is very safe in this Government's hands. That the entire Government and the Indian Member in charge of the portfolio in which he is interested are out only to protect his interests and nothing else. Sir, my Honourable friend finally said that after all it will only be a gesture if the terms of the resolution are complied with. Yes, it might be a gesture but we feel, Sir, that the existence of Sir Ardeshir Dalal is superfluous—I do not mean in this world but as a Member of the Government of India. The existence of his Department will be superfluous unless the department and the industries which it wants to support cease to be encumbered by the provisions of sections 111 to 121. I think the interim period, between now and the time a new constitution will come into being. Whether it will be a short or a long period, is quite important. Whether it is a gesture or a mere bogey, we in this House want the effect of these clauses neutralised, and if my Honourable friends on my left want live in peace in this country—and the people of this country will certainly let them live in peace so long as the people of this country hold the name and the ideals of that great man Mahatma Gandhi dear—let them come forward and support the motion. Sir, I support the motion.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): My Honourable friend, Mr. Manu Subedar, in the course of a lucid and persuasive speech traced the history of the insertion of the sections 111 to 121 in the Government of India Act, and made out a very strong and convincing case in favour of their deletion. The historical background of such insertion was further emphasized by my Honourable friends, Sir Ardeshir Dalal and Sir Cowasjee Jehangir. It is clear that between the years 1918 and 1930 there was no desire on the part of Britain to impose statutory restrictions on Indian industry and trade in the name of commercial safeguards. But a change came over in the year 1931, and in the course of the next three years their attitude further stiffened. Now, what was the cause for this change? It has been suggested that the boycott of British goods and the irresponsible utterances of some Indian politicians were responsible for this change. If that be so, these sections were incorporated in the Government of India Act, not on a well-throughout basis, but on the basis of temporary irritation. And, now that boycott of British goods does not exist any more, and now that irresponsible statements are not being made by Indian politicians, the time has come when these sections should cease to exist.

What is the nature of these sections? It seems to me that these sections cannot be given proper application without resort to fiction and falsehood. The Honourable Sir N. N. Sircar, then Law Member of the Government of India, at the time of introducing Indian Insurance Bill, said that under section 118(a) of the Act a United Kingdom company was to be deemed to be an Indian company. Then he made a significant comment with the observation: "Whenever

[Dr. P. N. Banerjee.]

white is asked to be taken as black, we say white must be deemed to be black". Sir, this is the nature of these safeguards.

Now, what was the object, the ostensible object, of the insertion of these clauses. The object was to provide against discrimination to be made by Indians against British. Is there any justification for this fear? My Honourable friend, the Leader of the European Group, I am very sorry to say, disturbed the even tenor of the debate in this House by a fighting speech. He said that discrimination by Indians was a real thing. He not only made many misstatements, but he also threw out a challenge to the Honourable the Planning Member. Now, is this a right attitude? Is this a correct attitude? Sir, it is well-known history, told us by English historians, that British capitalists here resorted to many methods other than fair-play in building up their industry. Let Montgomery Martin give the reply to the words that fell from my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Richardson. Let Horace Hayman Wilson, the great historian, give the reply to him. I will not quote from them because their statements are well-known. Even as late as 1926 the inequitable Cotton Excise Duty existed in India. And what was its object? Its object was to hamper the growth of cotton industry in this country. It is therefore the guilty conscience of my friend and his colleagues which creates this fear of discrimination from the Indian side against the British.

Sir, it is clear that Indians are a generous people, and given goodwill they will respond to it, and they will never adopt any measures which will do the British any harm without doing any good to the Indian. Sir, the real reason for the insertion of these sections was that Indians should not be able to get as much protection as was due to them against the unfair competition of the British.

My friend, the Deputy Leader of the European Group, referred to reciprocity. But can there be real reciprocity between India and Britain? The conditions of the two countries are not on a par. The British people have built up so many industries on a large scale in this country: how many industries have been built up by Indians in Britain? There can be no reciprocity. The British people have monopolised the entire shipping of this country: but how many Indian-owned ships trade with Britain or have a share in the coastal trade of Britain? Can there be any comparison between a weak person and a strong person? No. Therefore, it is that India does require protection against unfair competition. That is what we want. We do not wish to hamper British industry, but we want fairplay for ourselves.

Next comes the question of national self-respect. India is determined to win freedom, with the good-will of Britain, if possible and without their good will, if necessary. Now, is it not wisdom on the part of Britain to show their goodwill? My Honourable friends of the European Group talk of co-operation, but can cooperation be one-sided? If there is to be co-operation between Britain and India, there must be some gesture from the European Group; but I am very sorry to find that my Honourable friends of the European Group took up an attitude which is far from welcome to us sitting on these benches. Even at this late hour, if wisdom dawns on our European friends, there will be good both to India and to Britain, but if they persist in their attitude of selfishness there will be harm both to Britain and to India. Let us now hope that they will give up their selfish attitude and look at things from a broader angle of vision. That is what I expect of men who are well versed in the affairs of the world and who have spent a great part of their lives in this country.

Sir, this Resolution seeks nothing more than the deletion of 11 sections of the Government of India Act. What harm can ensue if these sections are removed? I do not think any great harm can ensue because Indian industries are still in an infant stage and they will not be able to oust the British industries in the course of a few years. Therefore let us all unite and let us all agree to

the deletion of these sections which have disfigured the Government of India Act for these last ten years.

I support the Resolution.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Deputy President, I find myself in a somewhat difficult position in this House today. The Government through their spokesman have declared to the House that they are entirely neutral in this matter. Therefore it appears that the only issue lies between us and the European vested interests in this country. It is one of the most extraordinary things that has ever occurred in this House during its life of many years; and therefore it would be right for me, without surrendering anything which we believe in, to speak in terms as measured as I can, because it is no longer a matter of words only. If the Government of India felt as they now feel rightly, that during the course of the Round Table Conference none of the representatives of India agreed to these proposals; but nevertheless by reason of the vote of a house over which we have no control and who govern this country by brute force, one naturally thought that they would put in provisions which, in the matter of constitutional language is called law; and that is where this law is made; and hence it is that the Government of India, at all events now, recognise that the time has now arrived when they cannot resort to the same kind of policy as has hitherto been pursued. If my friends on the other side feel that, one may even be thankful for little mercies, and I expect that after that declaration and after the feeling in this House over this question, the only opponents probably would not have been opponents at all; and I wish to say this, that throughout the many years that I have been here, I have not yet heard one word from my friends of the European Group ever saying that the time has now arrived when India should be free; and yet they profess that "in matters of sentiment we are with you; but in the matter of interest we are with ourselves; so that sentiment is respected only to be broken and enlightened self-interest requires that we shall claim who is right".

I wish to say a few words before I come to define the position which this side of the House, which as Sir Henry Richardson said might easily be the other side of the House, if they mean what they say—and I am entitled to take every word as perfectly sincere—before I come to define our position, I wish to say a few words about what Sir Cowasjee Jehangir spoke before this House. Sir Cowasjee Jehangir reminded this House that some persons of influence in the politics of this country said something which aroused the suspicion of the British people. I think my Honourable friend may have heard that statement, but I think it is right that he should know the circumstances under which that was spoken. The Indian National Congress appointed a National Debts Scrutiny Committee, and I am one of those who sat on that committee for a period of six months, and if a just examination of the imposition of burdens on this country rouses suspicion, there must be something more diseased in those who look and find their suspicion than those who claim a just examination of their rights. That committee has published a report which is, I believe, perfectly well known and probably deserves to be a little better known than the publicity which has been given to it hitherto; and my friends of the European Group of all others ought to have examined that; and even if they have not done so, they should do so now. It was reported by that committee that not only has India been conquered by its own money but for all the wars waged, including the annexation of Burma, the money has to be paid by and debited to Indian funds and during the course of that examination we pointed out that if ever there is going to be any just dealing on what you may call the British standard and not mine, even then most of these burdens would have to be re-examined. For it is quite easy to be very uneasy about sterling balances when they exist in their favour; but I do not see any sign of uneasiness when sterling balances exist on my side and in my favour; so that what Sir Cowasjee Jehangir says amounts to this, that at the time when the sterling debt existed in so far as it was against India it became a matter of suspicion, but when the

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

sterling debt exists in favour of India, it becomes a matter of complete indifference—an extraordinary justice even according to British jurisprudence. So that, I want you to know the exact facts and we know where we stand, and so that we may not think that merely because by habit of life I am earnest in the causes I plead that there is anything but justice. I should like to call attention to the advice tendered to the Europeans here and to the Europeans outside by the *London Times* during the last two weeks. I read out the first cable of the 9th March from the *London Times*:

"Anti-British sentiment if not replaced by better understanding may attain a pitch at which it will imperil that close cooperation between British and India in the world after the war upon which the future of both these countries and indeed of general security largely depends."

The same very highly respected paper in London wrote again on the 20th March and I will read it lest my friends here may not realise the gravity of the way in which they claim their rights:

"Britain should now begin a gradual remodelling of the structure, staffing and procedure of the governmental machine in preparation for the complete transfer of power to Indian hands."

These are the sentiments which I expected my friends to support in this House. My friends talk of a right of free trade in this country, of free competition in this country without restriction. Of course they call it a right and of course they remember that that right is a creature of law and for the moment undoubtedly that right has been conferred upon them by the force of British arms, because they claim the right to legislate and place restriction on our powers of legislation. They themselves, I believe, recognise that if not now, within a very short time, India has got to have a complete right to govern the country through its own representatives and to make its own laws. Remember therefore that what is now claimed as a right can be equally wiped out in a second, by that legislature which will claim to make laws in its own interest. So that, this word 'right' is extremely relative and I wish so much emphasis had not been placed upon it. But let us face the facts, particularly in the light of past experience that we have had in this country. My Honourable friend said that so far as these provisions are concerned, they have done no harm to anybody and hence we might as well leave them alone and when the time for dominion legislature comes we shall see whether this thing can be regulated by a treaty. I will not speak in the terms in which my Honourable friend Dr. Banerjee spoke. I will not say—we have done no wrong, please excuse us and therefore take it away. On the other hand, I am one of those who claim the right and intend to claim the right, when I have the right to legislate unfettered, to legislate in the best interests of this country. When the interest of this country conflicts with the interest of any country, including Britain, I am proud to say we will legislate against you. There is no need to beat about the bush. Indeed we must conserve the resources of this country in our own interest and when I and my countrymen have the right to legislate for themselves, I do not see why they should not.

I give you a most outstanding example of an outrageous character which will clearly show that without the exercise of that right we will not be able to progress. I am fully familiar with the controversy and the agreement that was brought about—and I know all the details, including some secret ones, as they are called—between the P. and O. Co. on the one hand and the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. on the other. It was preceded by a rate cut which threatened practically to destroy the capital of the Scindia Steam Navigation Company. My friends are fully aware of the rates that were then being charged from India to Burma and to the Persian Coast. The whole object was—either you agree to share with us on a small basis or we destroy you, because even though we may lose in the long run, that loss we can afford to bear, so that in the end, having killed you, we will raise the rates again and will have an undisputed supremacy. These are the actual facts of the case and ultimately the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. had to submit to that pressure and come to terms, so that there was an arrangement between them in regard to the nature of the

trade, the nature of the work and the nature of the places where they could go. Is there anybody in this country who can honestly say that when we are faced with unfettered competition with people who have built ocean going ships for many centuries, there is any chance of our shipping trade being kept alive or of its making any progress? Supposing that we wanted to protect the inland trade at all events of this country and wanted to protect the Indian people and help them to build up their own mercantile marine, are we to be told by any other people, except by brute force, that we are not to have the right to legislate in such a way that we can bring about the growth of that trade?

What happened to the sugar trade? My friends are fully aware of that. I remember the happenings of that time. There were certain small British interests in the Java sugar trade and at that time we legislated so as to impose an import duty. It is only by that means that we were able to build up the present sugar industry in India. I do not find my friend Mr. Jamnadas here. He was very proud of the progress of the industry as if he had done something to support it but the fact remains that it is by that means that we have been able to build up some industries. What else is a country to do, which is, though old in civilisation, an infant in its industry and progress? My friends will say—if you get out of our hands, you will get into the hands of our brown competitors. The question arose about the boycott of British cloth. I do not feel shy in the least about it. At that time it was pointed out to me by a very esteemed European friend of mine—instead of paying Rs. 3 to me you pay Rs. 3 to Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai who happens to be one of the mill owners of Ahmedabad and the poor man gets nothing. I asked him a question in return. If Ambalal has got the money, I shall be able to use it some day but if you have given it, it has gone for ever out of this land. It is no use warning me against the brown competitors. I am quite aware of what they are and how we can deal with them when the time comes and when the Legislature is in our hands completely. I am not afraid of that.

So that we are left with this proposition only. It is not a matter of sentiment. What is the good if I get up and honour you in all humility because

4 P.M. by your strength you are able to subdue me. It is not a matter of pride to me that it is so. The question is, do you still think at this time of the world that you should get everything from me, men, money and munitions, except willing co-operation, because you will not trust me. When the war is over, you will still continue to think in terms whether you should have the right or freedom as you call it and crush everybody who comes up in this country in order to satisfy the progress of this country. Is that what you call right? Is that what you call justice? Is that the reward or return for 200 years of progress? I have myself been a witness to the study of 'Expansion of British Empire' by a British Writer, Col. Seely. If I may trust him, I should like you to read that book. He says that but for the exploitation of this country in good time, you would not have been in the world where you are, at all events 25 years ago. I should like every Englishman to study Seely's 'Expansion of British Empire' which is written in cold blood no doubt with a view to flatter the vanity of his own race. He tells us the great truth that but for the exploitation of this country in good time in the 19th century, the earlier and the latter part of it you would not have acquired your position in this world. Instead of being grateful, as if we are going to inflict any injustice, you come and remind us of the right of freedom. I beg of you, friends, you are sitting here also by the same brute force, otherwise, 11 of you are sitting here as the pretended representatives of India but merely to protect your own interests. You sit there in this House, probably you would not find a similar place when a proper Indian legislature comes into being when law is law, that is to say, administered by my own countrymen and by nobody else. I am reminded in this connection of Lord Macmillan when he went to America the other day he said, law approximates to justice when law is made by those for whom it is meant. But if law is made for those for whom it is meant by somebody else, then it is a species of oppression, but none the less equally oppressive in tyranny. It is therefore no use relying on these kinds of laws,

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

may be notwithstanding the Resolution which is bound to be passed by this House, we may still not be able to get the provisions repealed.

But I can tell you this much. I can say that, because the Honourable Sir Edward Benthall is present in this House. Some years ago we were travelling back from Europe by air. I discussed with him many problems including this one. I am not at liberty today to disclose any discussion that took place then and what he thinks about it. But I am at liberty to say this that if a more enlightened and better spirit prevails, then only you will be able to maintain the same Honourable co-operation which you desire, but it must be genuine real co-operation. It is not like the co-operation in which you have invited me here to sit in this Assembly. You tell me, what is the good of you people, you do not co-operate. But I tell you we have been co-operating all these six years out of ten, but not a single thing we passed in this House has ever been accepted by that side. Why do they ask us to co-operate unless what they mean is this, that you come here to embroider us. But that is the last thing we propose to do in the very near future. We can tell you that, so that we are here we are going to co-operate, but you should behave like gentlemen. Wherever you lose, you come and argue with us, come and compromise with us, understand our point of view. But that is not co-operation according to you. It is no use calling people here and when they do come, then say, you do not co-operate, what is the good? I put the same question to my Honourable friends over there, please do co-operate, but do not put on the word 'co-operation' a meaning different from what we do. According to us, co-operation does not mean imposition by a superior on an inferior, that kind of co-operation I will not willingly grant, but if co-operation means equality of opportunity having regard to my own interests to the extent to which I am free to support them, then that co-operation is at your disposal. I still like to hope to hear some day before the House is dissolved, that you stand there for the complete freedom of India. That is your best protection. But I have not heard one word about it, day in day out these ten years. We have been absent for 4½ years. What has happened has happened, right or wrong. The Government think that theirs is the only right stand. If that is your attitude, then you cannot blame us, if we tell you frankly what we are thinking. You are entitled to tell me what you claim to be your right, but when it becomes a right, you will remember that right is a creature of law and law is a creature of legislation, and legislation is a matter wherein, I think, it is restricted by complete power of autonomous legislation. You must remember that any Dominion today can legislate as any of the other Dominions. It is no use to quote to me what some of my Honourable friends claim in some other place. It is a pure debating point. I think my Honourable friend was conscious of that, I will only refer my friends to the *London Times*, a very noted, a very moderate and a very highly respected paper. There is still time for you to profit by it. There is still time for *locus poenitentiae*. You co-operate with us in getting our complete freedom and we will see to it that in so far as your trade here is concerned, we will accept you as honourable friends. But if you are going to oppose this in the manner in which you are doing now, how can you say that there is distrust on my side. What is it that brought this provision in the Act? It is because you are fully conscious how badly you treated us for the last 150 years and more and that is why you think that when India comes to her own, she is not going to give you the same right as you call it. It is really the painful consciousness on your part that you realise how you have been lording over us. If you had not done any wrong to India, why do you anticipate it? What makes you think that discrimination will take place? If you are conscious that you have not done well by India, and if that is so and if you feel there will be some difficulty about your future position if India is left to her own, then the fault is entirely yours and not mine. There is no bitterness, but there is all the earnestness and there is all the sincerity in our ultimate claim to manage our own affairs in our own way in the best interests of India. My Honourable friend Sir Cowasjee Jehangir tells me,

but, oh! these provisions are entirely inconsistent within the meaning of the statute law, let alone freedom. Supposing it is, and he tells me in dulcet words what does it matter, planning is not ours, because after all planning made under those conditions is no good. Suppose you plan something, you plan the establishment of an industry, you plan aircraft industry, you plan any other industry of that kind, if it only means that it is going to be done under those restrictions, then I am afraid that I must tell plainly to the great commercial magnate of my city the plain truth that planning under those conditions is useless. But he wants me to go into a fool's paradise when he wants me to think that this particular provision would be treated as a dead letter. I am not young enough to believe such stories, nor am I credulous enough to believe the stories that I have been treated to. Therefore here and now a plan is made without any restriction and entirely in the interest of India, in the interest of my country, or that plan had better be postponed.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: I rise to a point of personal explanation. My Honourable friend is trying to imply that I meant to say that these sections in the Act are already a dead letter. I did not mean to say that. I did not say that. What I said was that by executive action, from tomorrow these sections in the Act should be treated as dead letter. That is my demand and that is very much the same as the Resolution. So I would beg of my Honourable friend not to put words into my mouth which I had not uttered.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Why does he want to differ from me?

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: I have not differed from it; I supported it. The Honourable Member has got into the habit of trying to put words into the mouths of others which are not correct.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I will not give way any more.

Sir, the position therefore is this. We demand that we should be in a position to legislate in a manner in the best interests of India. If these restrictions come in the way, I think the House will be unanimous, including Government—in saying that they should be repealed. That, Sir, is the Resolution; I support it.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Member for Railways and War Transport): Sir, I well recall the occasion to which my Honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition referred, and I have always felt from that day that I owed him an apology. Whereas I enjoyed the entertainment of his conversation I am aware that I stood him a very bad dinner!

Sir, my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy has an unerring eye for an inconvenient quotation, preferably a quotation of at least twelve or preferably twenty years old. I wonder whether my Honourable friend is a fisherman, whether he belongs to the Okhla Fishing Club; because my Honourable friend rarely throws a fly without getting a rise. On this occasion he has thrown a fly to a very small fish which is hardly worth his consideration. But my Honourable friend sometimes forgets that he cannot always get away with a quotation out of its context; other persons have access to books in the library, and I have just as many books under my desk as he has. I might, for instance, go back to that memorable session of the Round Table Conference to which he referred, and quote from the speech of Mahatma Gandhi who said:

"But having said this I want to associate myself, completely with the British merchants in European houses in their legitimate demand that there shall be no racial discrimination."

But that would not be fair because it would be out of its context. He then goes on and refers to a white elephant, that was not a reference to me but to the city of Delhi! A little further he says:

"And then about the coastal trade too, the Congress undoubtedly has the greatest sympathy with the desire to develop national coastal trade, but if in the Bill about the coastal trade there is any discrimination against Europeans as such, I will join hands with the Europeans and fight that Bill or the proposal which discriminates against Englishmen because they are Englishmen."

But, Sir, it would not be fair to make any thing of that because it is out of its context.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: May I take it that the Honourable Member accepts the formula which Mahatma Gandhi propounded on that occasion as an alternative to the formula which he wanted?

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: I am not giving way, as my time is limited.

I now wish to be rather more serious in my quotations and to say that my own position today as a Member of the Government of India is precisely the same as Mr. Benthall's was in 1931 as a business man, but not in the distorted sense that my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy referred to. What I said on that occasion was:

"We contemplate that if we can arrive at a commercial agreement on general principles between the two countries, not imposed but negotiated fully at this Conference, we should perhaps have established a bond between the two countries which would put the past months once and for all behind us and would enable the traders in both countries to get on with their work on a real basis of identity of interests."

And a little further on I said:

"We contemplate that the result of our discussions would be set forth in the form of an agreement as a schedule to the Act. We believe that this will be a more satisfactory and a more permanent method of dealing with the problem than a restrictive clause in the Act; and it is based on the idea of honourable cooperation."

But, Sir, when we attempted to translate that into fact we found it more difficult. The legal pundits attempted to frame an agreement but they found that the political relationship which existed then, and which exists today, between His Majesty's Government and the Government of India made it constitutionally inappropriate to execute such an agreement, however unanimous the consensus of opinion at the Round Table Conference might have been. We were therefore reluctantly forced back from the ideal of a freely negotiated agreement from which we started and which held the field at the first Round Table Conference to the clauses in the Bill. And the only survival of the initial suggestions is section 118 of the Act which makes provision for a convention but which, I understood from their speeches, does not commend itself to some of my Honourable friends.

Now, Sir, that is in brief my version of the history of the past. Where do we stand today? The position today has been made perfectly clear by the Honourable Mover when he quoted the Duke of Devonshire and by my Honourable friend the Member for Planning and Development when he quoted the Secretary of State, Mr. Amery, who in 1942 said that any such provisions—such as are contained in the clauses—would more appropriately be a matter for negotiations with the future Government of India. Sir, there is no dispute about that at all; I do not think there need be any argument on that point. But the Resolution and the speeches which have supported it press for earlier action, largely on the grounds that the Government of India are entering on a scheme of planning for industrial development and that therefore a change should be brought about. Now, Sir, I have listened carefully to the speech of the Leader of the European Group,—for whom I must say I have great sympathy as he has inherited the rather delicate position in these matters which I at one time held,—and I did not find him unsympathetic to the exploration of the position. An impartial observer would not, I think, find him unsympathetic to the exploration of the position ~~he~~ he knew with greater precision what was intended. Well, Sir, Government have for some time been alive to this problem and they are fully alive to it at the moment. But I am not sure, from certain discussions which have taken place in this House, concerning San Francisco in particular, whether the Honourable Members opposite really wish this Government to enter into a trade agreement with His Majesty's Government. (A voice: "No.") I thought that would be the answer and that is one of the difficulties. Any complete agreement between His Majesty's Government and India must form part of a complete political settlement. Sir Cowasjee Jehangir said that there was no need to alter the Act, that it could be treated as a dead letter. I do not think the problem is quite as easy as that. We live under the rule of law, as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has said,

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Very much so.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: These clauses exist in the Act and they can be challenged in the Courts, and if they are challenged the courts have to interpret them. So you cannot just treat them as a dead letter.

Sir Cowasjee Jehangir: Then they must be repealed. Either you treat them as a dead letter under executive action, or have them repealed. There is no other alternative.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: That is just what I am saying. It is not quite such an easy matter as the Honourable Member suggests, and on reflection he apparently agrees with me. The House will appreciate that the Government of India contemplate such a bold way as my Honourable friend suggests nor if they are to meet with success, can they approach the problem in the bold way which the Resolution suggests, but the Government of India will proceed to frame suggestions with greater precision and will take up the matter with His Majesty's Government. As the Honourable Member for Planning and Development has already assured the House, the matter is actively under consideration.

This is a very complicated and a difficult matter one which calls for the highest statesmanship and it can only be settled in a spirit of mutual goodwill. I think, Sir, that, on the whole, the House has shown a recognition of the importance and complexity of the problem by the high tone of the debate. I would like here to quote in all seriousness another remark of Mr. Gandhi on the same occasion when he said:

"Having said this, I want to close with this remark. I do not despair of finding a common formula that would satisfy the European friends."

I hold the same faith, that with goodwill between the two countries and the earnest endeavour of everyone concerned, a happy outcome will be found. I hope that the Government of India will be successful in securing at least a temporary understanding if we cannot, as I hope in due course we shall, make progress on the principles which would form the basis of a future agreement to be freely negotiated by the future Governments of the two countries. Sir, my Honourable colleague, the Planning and Development Member, who is in charge of this subject, has no easy task. I know of no one who is more suited or more capable of initiating and consummating an act of statesmanship of this sort and I am sure that the good wishes of all sections of the House go with him.

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

Mr. Manu Subedar: We have had an appeal for fairplay from the Members of the European Group, having denied fairplay to Indians during the last 150 years. We have had an appeal from them for partnership having kept us out for the last 150 years from the economic advantages to be gained out of activities in this country. Now we have an appeal for reciprocity from the same quarters, having denied that reciprocity to this country during the last 100 years. Mr. Churchill spoke of principle of British fairplay when he addressed soldiers recently on the German soil. When I think of the raw deal which this country has had in hundreds of matters whenever there was a conflict between the interests of India and England, raw deals which have been recorded in the economic history of India for generation after generation, I feel really that the Members of the European Group are straining our imagination and our credulity a little too far.

Sir, the Honourable Leader of the European Group, Sir Henry Richardson, spoke of logic with regard to the dealing of this question. I wish he had not invoked my logic because then I am going to ask him whether England, having major interests in the trade of many other countries—in South America—in Asia, in South Africa, and elsewhere—, has anywhere a representation in the Central Legislature of the kind and type which my friends here enjoy? Are they not satisfied with the key position in this Legislature and in the Provinces which they are enjoying, which is contrary to the practice anywhere else where they have major trade interests as in India? Are they not satisfied with the

[Mr. Manu Subedar.]

protection which section 298 gives them in common with every other minority? Are they not satisfied with this administrative discrimination, which Sir Cowasjee referred to, which is part of the Instrument of Instruction in the discretion vested in the Viceroy and Governors of the Provinces which we want to destroy but which this Resolution does not at the moment claim to destroy. Are they not happy with these things? I have never been able to understand the position of my Honourable friends in the European Group. Whenever we speak of difficulties of food in this country, they talk of the increase of population. When we speak of protection to industries, they talk of the consumers or they talk of reciprocity, as my Honourable friend Mr. Lawson talked today; they claim protection for themselves as some of them did in the speeches today, but resist protection for Indian industries. When we draw attention to the heavy military charges which have gone beyond the capacity of this country, they immediately try to divert the attention by talking of civil expenditure! Sir, when I talked of cartels and pools and powerful bodies, with or without the combination of Indians, coming and attacking this country, my Honourable friend of the European Group promptly tried to deflect me by saying that there are Indian cartels, why don't you deal with them. Every time we are asked to go and deal with something else than what is the most important thing which we bring up here.

The position of these people is even more subtle and complicated than that. When His Excellency the Viceroy expanded the Executive Council on the plea of Indianization, who was it that got into the Executive Council? One of the European traders in the person of Sir Edward Benthall. It may not be known, Sir, that there was a vigorous protest from the Federation of Indian Industries and Commerce against this very unfair use made of the so-called expansion and Indianization of the Executive Council. It was in response to the Indian agitation that my Honourable friend, Sir Ardeshir Dalal, finds his place there. If his appointment is not going to be just an empty balancing—an empty ballast to the wrong action taken in getting Sir Edward Benthall in the office, then these particular sections must, in our opinion, go before Sir Ardeshir can do any useful work. And look at the most extraordinary position in which the European commerce has found itself today. My friend Sir Edward Benthall has not supported the plea which has been made by the Leader of the European Group. He rather half-heartedly was obliged to make an appeal to no other than Mahatma Gandhi whose words and whose doctrines and whose actions on other occasions he has no sympathy with and he does not derive any strength or support therefrom. These sections are the hall-marks of India's dependence and humiliation, as I said once before, and they should go.

The position of the European Group is very peculiar. Events would occur in the world shattering many more things than the position of the Europeans in this country. Lord Wavell can go to U. K. with a programme the purport of which is not yet known fully. Sir Henry Richardson can talk glibly about the changes of seats in this House, even before the next Session begins; but, Sir, the sections must remain. Anything may happen in the world but the sections cannot go, because they are sacrosanct. This reminds me of the story of the man who had a donkey. He believed in the sacredness of the river Ganges and he was a very devout believer. So he took his donkey day after day to the Ganges and after one hundred baths, he still found that the donkey did not become a horse! Things are moving on and fast in this world but it seems that my friends of the European Group cannot adjust themselves to any situation of any kind. We are put off from the major issues dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan in their speeches on the Finance Bill on the plea that there is not sufficient unity in India. But there are other problems on which there is unity. There is for example the problem with regard to the examination of military expenditure in this country incurred behind our back, about which no information is possessed by anybody. We merely ask for its examination by the Leaders of the Opposition Parties. This demand was made in many speeches on the floor of this House and the

other place, yet in spite of the fact that there is complete unity on this subject, have we got this demand conceded yet? It is a united and reasonable demand. It has been evaded, Sir. As Burke said, "The age of chivalry is gone and the age of chicanery and evasion has come in".

Similarly, Sir, this other demand with regard to these sections, is one on which there is complete unanimity. The House will have noticed only two and half speeches which were made. While the two speeches were full-blooded opposition to the Resolution from the European Group, I must say that Sir Edward Benthall's speech really was a vulgar fraction, if I may say so with regard to it. It was neither the one nor the other. I wish he had said in a full-blooded and direct manner that these sections must remain, they are necessary, they are my right. He did not say that. He was evolving some kind of a substitute but let me say here and now that while we want the repeal of all these sections including section 118, we want no substitute whatsoever. This Government uses India as and when they like. They are using India to secure a vote at the San Francisco Conference—a vote which I am not sure whether it would not be cast for the enslavement, continued enslavement of other nations including people of this country. These people are not above using India when it suits them. But when we ask for this simple thing, a simple repeal of these provisions which, as they themselves said, were only negative, there is evasion. I ask if they are negative, why continue them? You are talking of giving dominion status to this country. If dominion status is coming, why not start with this gesture of goodwill, which is a simple article of faith, which will arouse goodwill and trust also from the other side.

I do not desire to deal with Sir Henry Richardson's speech, because more important persons like the Chairman of the London Chamber of Commerce and the Chairman of the Federation of British Industries have spoken with regard to the relation of India and England in terms very different from those used by my friends here. They are threatening the Planning Member to come out in the open. They ask "What is it you want". "Do you want to discriminate against British industries?" Sir, they are inciting us so that we may come out and say yes, that is what we want. In introducing this motion I made it quite clear and I repeat it now that we have no desire to interfere with any legitimate interests established in this country. Let that legitimate interest trust us. As for reciprocity, when there is a free India capable of arranging on equal terms, capable of negotiating freely, that free India will certainly give all that my friends desire. And, as they themselves said, they have got something to give us and we have got something to give them. I am all for such an agreement as and when India is free. In the meanwhile this blot on the Statute Book should disappear. Here is Prof. Hill, who says that you cannot have things for love. He does not like a minor ordinary share in controlling industry. "If they want to develop they must go equal shares with the people here. Going halves always seems fair" says Prof. Hill. May I ask Prof. Hill and those who are behind him and those who brought him out to this country, why was it not fair hitherto until 1945? How does it become fair today? Why have Indians been kept out of all legitimate opportunities in this country? Who has got the best mines? Who has got the best forests? Who has got the most lucrative utility services, such as electrification tramways, railways, etc.? Who has always the ear of this Government? Who has taken a privileged position? Who is getting the most advantageous military contracts and who is, taking all in all, deriving the lion's share out of the economic activities of this country? These things do not fit in with the simple half shares which Prof. Hill is asking for today. If you want this half share, come first with some goodwill towards us. Sir, I want to read a quotation from that great statesman, Mr. Baldwin, the most distinguished and powerful statesman of England for a long time, so much so that he was able to throw out a monarch from the throne. Mr. Baldwin addressing the union of Conservative and Unionist Association in 1931 says:

"Whatever a Government may do, you cannot prevent a population nowadays, and especially an oriental as opposed to an occidental population, if it considers it has been unjustly treated, from expressing its feelings by refusing to buy goods. The refusal to

[Mr. Manu Subedar.]

buy goods commonly called a boycott, has been brought to a fine art in the East. The Japanese have experienced in China what a boycott means. We have some experience of what it means in India."

He goes on to say:

"There has been a great talk about safeguards. All the safeguards are being examined by the Joint Select Committee but, whatever safeguards we have, the real safeguard is the maintenance of goodwill. If there is not a basis of goodwill, your trade will eventually wither away, and I regret to say that some of the measures which have been suggested, and which Lancashire people have been asked to support, have, in my judgment, been calculated to destroy rather than to further any possibility of goodwill."

And may I say that the speeches of my two friends here are not calculated to increase that fund of goodwill, to rouse any enthusiasm in us with regard to reciprocity for which they have pleaded. Therefore I suggest that the time has come when everybody must take stock of his position and make claims which can be only supported by justice and by the reasonableness of the cause. You cannot gain anything in this country without the goodwill of the masses of this country. I plead that for the honour and for the self-respect of this country, for the honour and self-respect of this Assembly which is governed by these sections, these sections should be abolished at once.

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

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that early action be taken for the removal of sections 111 to 121 (both inclusive) of the Government of India Act, 1935."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE ENACTMENT OF LAWS CONDUCTIVE TO WELFARE OF PEASANTS AND LABOUR.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I want to raise a point of order. The resolution of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya cannot be moved in this House because many clauses refer to action which can be taken only in the provinces.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): These clauses may be rejected or amended.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Can discussion be allowed on giving effect to the findings of the Flood Commission, giving more rights and privileges to the agriculturist, etc.?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member forgets that there is a Department of Education, Health and Lands here.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take such steps as would make the present Government enact such laws as would be conducive to the welfare of the peasants and labour of the country who form the majority of the population on the following lines:

- (1) giving effect to the findings of the Flood Commission,
- (2) radical changes in the land revenue system of the country as a whole, giving more rights and privileges to the actual agriculturist, i.e., tiller of the lands,
- (3) promotion by the State of large scale co-operative production and co-operative distribution by setting up societies registered under Co-operative Societies Act,
- (4) productivity of labour, to be promoted by introduction of modern mechanical means of production by the State.
- (5) all disabilities created by the prevailing Tenancy Act, to be withdrawn for the benefit of the actual tillers of the land and there should be only a unitary system of land tax realisable by the State and all small agriculturists to be amalgamated for the purpose of collective production,
- (6) production in fields and the factories should be more for use of consumers than for uncontrolled profits of the investors,
- (7) there shall not be any landless labour in the fields of production and unemployment of labour shall be adequately compensated, and
- (8) there shall not be any landless tiller of land and all compulsory factory labour shall be either adequately compensated for or shall be employed by the State."

Just a few minutes back we passed a Resolution here which was in relation to discrimination between Indian capitalist and British capitalist. Just now I want to represent the grievances of the poor peasants who form 70 per cent. or even more of the population of India. Here we represent propertied classes

and not the peasants. Of course as Indians we claim to represent all people here, but we come here on the votes of propertied classes.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Franchise is one in three for males and one in ten for females.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: We do not represent the peasants at all. Our esteemed Leader has perhaps made a mistake in this matter. For the last ten years I have been here, and I know of no single enactment in this House which has been for the benefit of the masses, particularly of the peasantry, the landless peasantry. Sir, it is high time for us to take up the cause of these people for whom there is a very small number to speak in the Legislature. All speak for those who have vested interests. Almost every Session we have amendments relating to Indian Insurance Act, Banking Act, Indian Companies Act, but we have not moved any Bill which really related to the peasantry and the unrepresented masses. Of course there are some enactments in regard to labour, and they too are half-hearted.

Now, Sir, I am speaking of an Act which was passed by the East India Company in 1798, now, 152 years ago. This Act which conferred permanent settlement was passed for the benefit of the Company out of which a few men in Bengal reaped great benefit: they were the Zamindars. This Act seems to be anachronism now. The world has passed through various vicissitudes, particularly we have seen how this permanent settlement has caused great havoc in Bengal. In 1948 it is these tillers of the soil who died for want of food. Some of them might have lands.

(Interruption by Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhuri.)

I know you are a big Zamindar. You have failed to look after your ryots.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhuri (Bengal: Landholders): Question.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Had you not failed, these people would not have died.

Now, I shall read the criticism by the Government of India as published in the Flood Commission Report with regard to this permanent settlement:

"The memorandum on the Land Revenue Policy of the Indian Government issued in 1902 referred to the evils of absenteeism, of management of estates by unsympathetic agents, of unhappy relations between landlord and tenant and of the multiplication of tenure holders or middlemen between the zamindar and the cultivator" and it described the Permanent Settlement as a system of agrarian tenure "which is not supported by the experience of any civilized country, which is not justified by the single great experiment that has been made in India, and which was found in the latter case to place the tenants so unreservedly at the mercy of the landlord that the State has been compelled to employ for his protection a more stringent measure of legislation than has been found necessary in temporarily settled areas. At the same time it is not necessary to deny that there have been and are public spirited and charitable landlords who have contributed to the social and educational welfare of the Province."

Sir, there is another observation by one settlement officer of Bakarganj: in the report, he has described the position as the most amazing caricature of an ordered system of land tenure in the world. This has been the feeling for 152 years and today I am moving this Government to do something—this Government which no doubt is bureaucratic, which no doubt is unrepresentative, but which yet is responsible for the weals and woes of the vast population of India. They may be irresponsible to us, to the Legislature, but we know they are responsible for the weal and woes of these 400 millions of people. We have censured them in many cases for their acts of omission and commission; yet we have to tell them that it is their responsibility to take up this matter in right earnest, in all seriousness and to find out ways and means to make an end of this old effect obsolete settlement which was made in Bengal 152 years ago. The question no doubt is very intricate and there is no doubt that the Government will have to take up the responsibility of undoing the thing which the East India Company had done so long ago and which has created a lot of complications in the whole of the revenue system of the land. Except the Government, nobody can take charge of this, and therefore I recommend with all

[Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya.]

earnestness that they should take up this question and try to give effect to the findings of the Floud Commission. The Floud Commission is definite about this matter: they have said in definite language and in unambiguous language that this must go; and though there are people in the commission who formed a minority committee and tried to defend the retention of this, yet the majority of the commission had agreed and definitely said that this should go. With this in hand, the other will follow—radical changes in the land revenue system of the country as a whole. That has to be done by giving more rights and privileges to the actual agriculturists. Why should there be any question about the rights and privileges of the tillers of the land with regard to ownership of the land? From the days of Manu and up to the days of Todar Mul, this land has been in possession of the agriculturists. The state only claimed a portion of the crop—the quota was one-sixth, one-fourth or one-third. But the agriculturists have been divested of their rights in various ways: in Bengal they have been denuded of all that they possessed and the country has been impoverished to an extent from which it is very difficult for us to get them restored. I therefore say with all the emphasis at my command that it is time for us when we are going to claim freedom, we must free this vast mass of people from economic dependence from the idle zemindars. The system has created a class of people who have fattened on the labour of others: all these years they have reaped the benefit of this settlement and now it is time for them to say “Let us have something else in lieu of this system: let us leave the real tillers of the land and the agriculturists more of their produce and their primary wealth of the land: that is the ownership; let them have all the rights and all the privileges”. Why should there be any question about it I do not know. I am sure my friends on my right and my Congress friends and my Muslim friends will all join hands with me to say that it is their right to get back to them all their rights and privileges which they enjoyed before this settlement system which the British Government had created. Today we have already given notice to the British Government to quit India. Mr. Jinnah says “Quit India, but before that divide India”. I shall say “If you quit India, you have to undo the mischief that you have done for so many years and that mischief lies in this Act which has impoverished the country to the utmost”. I am sure at the end of this war we are to have freedom and before that, we must see that this Government which has been so much derided by us on this side, this present Government takes the credit of creating a situation which will make them eternally happy and set a place in history of India's freedom that they have achieved success on one point at least in the civil administration.

In the civil administration, they have failed to feed the people; they have failed to clothe the people; they have failed in many aspects of things; though the emergency of war has covered all sins of omission and commission on their part. But this is not an emergency affair: the agriculturists have helped the war from all points of view. They have given up their own food to meet the demands of the Government; and now it is time for the Government to return their rights and privileges. Sir, the radical changes which are required are many; and within a few minutes they cannot all be stated. I am on the Food Committee and I have always been talking of the necessity of co-operative concerns being started for distribution and of co-operative producers societies being set up. But nothing has been done in that direction. I would therefore request that the Government take up this matter in right earnest and see that co-operative producers societies and co-operative distributors societies are set up. With the advent of the new order, which is called post-war reconstruction I am not at all concerned. I am concerned with the present. We do not know when the war is going to end. We do not know how long we shall have to fight Japan; we do not even know why we fight with Japan, when British and American can easily take charge of them. But we have to fight; and during this period this Government can, if they so choose, if they seriously think so, set up these co-operative producers societies and the co-operative distributors societies

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I think the Honourable Member has ten minutes more. If he wants, he can continue his speech on the next day. He has ten minutes more.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: I will continue later.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Very well: I think the Honourable Member will stop now.

But before the House adjourns, I ought to explain what I meant to lay down in connection with the point of order raised by Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan. I have held, after careful consideration of the whole position, that it is not for the Chair to rule whether any proposed enactment is *ultra vires* of this Legislature, that is, whether it is within the competence of this Legislature or not. That is what I meant when I said in answer to Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan's point of order that the House is at liberty to reject or amend any clause of this Resolution, if the House so chooses.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 5th April, 1945.