

21st March 1935

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume III, 1935

(9th March to 28th March, 1935)

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1935



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1935

Legislative Assembly.

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT.

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB, KT., M.L.A.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

LIEUT.-COLONEL SIR HENRY GIDNEY, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

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.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

RAJA SIR VASUDEVA RAJAH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—9th March to 28th March, 1935.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
SATURDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1935—		TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	1959—91	Questions and Answers	2159—96
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1991—2023	Short Notice Questions and Answers	2196—98
Motion for Adjournment re Arrests in Calcutta of prominent workers connected with the All-India Trade Union Congress—Ruled out of order	2024—29	The General Budget—List of Demands—concl'd.	
Statement of Business	2029—30	Demand No. 39—Army Department—	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>		Indianisation and over-expenditure	2198—2244
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)—		Demand No. 79—Baluchistan—	
Grievances of the Inferior Services	2031—57	Repressive policy in Baluchistan	2244—48
Position of the Bengal Mussalmans in the Office of the Postmaster General. Bengal and Assam Circle	2057—63	Demand No. 16—Customs	2248
Demand No. 18—Salt—Damage done to the poor Zamindars of the Khushab and Pind Dadan Khan Tahsils in the District of Shahpur and Jhelum in the Punjab on account of the Salt Range and the Khewra Salt Mines	2064—75	Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	2248
MONDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1935—		Demand No. 18—Salt	2249
Members Sworn	2077	Demand No. 19—Opium	2249
Questions and Answers	2077—2113	Demand No. 19A.—Excise	2249
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2113—15	Demand No. 20—Stamp	2249
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>		Demand No. 21—Forest	2249
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>cont'd.</i>		Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	2250
Grievances of working classes	2115—32	Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	2250
Necessity of adapting the administration to meet modern economic needs	2132—57	Demand No. 25—Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2250
		Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2250
		Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2250
		Demand No. 28—Executive Council	2251
		Demand No. 29—Council of State	2251
		Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2251

TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH,
1935—*contd.*

The General Budget—List
of Demands—*concd.*

Demand No. 31— Foreign and Political Department	2251
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2251
Demand No. 33— Public Service Com- mission	2252
Demand No. 34— Legislative Depart- ment	2252
Demand No. 35—De- partment of Education, Health and Lands	2252
Demand No. 36— Finance Department	2252
Demand No. 38—Com- merce Department	2252
Demand No. 39—Army Department	2253
Demand No. 40—De- partment of Industries and Labour	2253
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2253
Demand No. 42—Pay- ments to Provincial Governments on ac- count of Administra- tion of Agency Sub- jects	2253
Demand No. 43—Audit	2253
Demand No. 44—Ad- ministration of Justice	2254
Demand No. 45—Police	2254
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2254
Demand No. 47— Lighthouses and Light- ships	2254
Demand No. 48—Sur- vey of India	2254
Demand No. 49— Meteorology	2255
Demand No. 50— Geological Survey	2255
Demand No. 51— Botanical Survey	2255
Demand No. 52— Zoological Survey	2255
Demand No. 53— Archæology	2255
Demand No. 54—Mines	2256
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2256
Demand No. 56—Edu- cation	2256
Demand No. 57—Medi- cal Services	2256
Demand No. 58— Public Health	2256

PAGES.

TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH,
1935—*contd.*

The General Budget—List
of Demands—*concd.*

Demand No. 59—Agri- culture	2257
Demand No. 60—Im- perial Council of Agri- cultural Research De- partment	2257
Demand No. 60-A.— Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Market- ing in India	2257
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2257
Demand No. 62—Indus- tries	2257
Demand No. 63—Avia- tion	2258
Demand No. 64—Com- mercial Intelligence and Statistics	2258
Demand No. 65—Census	2258
Demand No. 66— Emigration—Internal	2258
Demand No. 67— Emigration—External	2258
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2259
Demand No. 69— Miscellaneous Depart- ments	2259
Demand No. 70— Indian Stores Depart- ment	2259
Demand No. 71— Currency	2259
Demand No. 72—Mint	2259
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2260
Demand No. 74— Superannuation Allow- ances and Pensions	2260
Demand No. 75— Stationery and Print- ing	2260
Demand No. 76— Miscellaneous	2260
Demand No. 76-A.— Expenditure on Re- trenched Personnel charged to Revenue	2260
Demand No. 76-B.— Miscellaneous Adjust- ments between and Central and Provincial Governments	2261
Demand No. 77— Refunds	2261
Demand No. 80—Delhi	2261
Demand No. 81—Ajmer Merwara	2261

PAGES.

TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH,
1935—concl'd.

The General Budget—
List of Demands—concl'd.

Demand No. 82— Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2261
Demand No. 83— Rajputana	2262
Demand No. 84— Central India	2262
Demand No. 85— Hyderabad	2262
Demand No. 85-A.— Aden	2262
Demand No. 86— Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India	2262
Demand No. 87— Expenditure in England—High Com- missioner for India	2263
Demand No. 88— Capital Outlay on Se- curity Printing	2263
Demand No. 89— Forest Capital Outlay	2263
Demand No. 90— Irrigation	2263
Demand No. 91— Indian Posts and Tele- graphs	2263
Demand No. 93— Currency Capital Out- lay	2264
Demand No. 94— Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour.	2264
Demand No. 95— Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Light- ships	2264
Demand No. 95-A.— Capital Outlay connect- ed with the Institu- tion of the Provinces of Orissa and Sind	2264
Demand No. 96— Commuted Value of Pensions	2264
Demand No. 96A.— Expenditure on Re- trenchment Personnel charged to Capital	2265
Demand No. 97— Delhi Capital Outlay	2265
Demand No. 98— Interest-free Advances	2265
Demand No. 99— Loans and Advances bearing Interest	2265

PAGES.

WEDNESDAY, 13TH MARCH,
1935—

Statement laid on the Table	2269—71
Motion re Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways—Adopted	2272—76
Motion re Election of the Public Accounts Com- mittee—Adopted	2276
Motion re Election of the Standing Committee on Roads—Adopted	2276
Motion re Election of two Members to sit on the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body —Adopted	2277
The Indian Tariff (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced	2277
The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the mo- tion to consider not con- cluded	2278—2339

THURSDAY, 14TH MARCH,
1935—

Statements laid on the Table	2341—42
The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the mo- tion to consider not con- cluded	2342—2411
Statement of Business	2411—12

THURSDAY, 21ST MARCH,
1935—

Questions and Answers	2413—58
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2459—70
Motion for Adjournment re Firing at Karachi— Adopted	2470, 2501 —25
Motion re Election of the Standing Finance Com- mittee—Adopted	2470—71
Motion re Election of Members to the Court of the Delhi University —Adopted	2471
Motion re Election of a Member to the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore—Adopted	2471—73
The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the mo- tion to consider not concluded	2475—2501

FRIDAY, 22ND MARCH,
1935—

Death of Mr. T. A. K. Sherwani	2527—30
-----------------------------------	---------

	PAGES.
SATURDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1935—	
Statements laid on the Table	2531—37
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2538
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	2538—39
Election of Members to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body	2539
Bill passed by the Council of State	2539
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2540—65, 2567—96
Statement of Business	2565—67
MONDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	2597—2639
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2639—58
Short Notice Question and Answer	2659—61
Statement of Business	2662—65
Election of the Public Accounts Committee	2665
Statement laid on the Table	2665—70
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted	2671—2714
TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	2715—58
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Financial adjustments between India and Burma—Adopted	2758—61, 2802—25
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for 1935-36	2761

	PAGES.
TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—contd.	
Election of Members to the Court of the University of Delhi	2762
Government's Right to make any modification in the business of the House	2762
Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways	2763—90
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2790—2825
WEDNESDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	2827—55
Short Notice Question and Answer	2855—57
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Reservation of the Highlands of Kenya for Europeans—Withdrawn	2857—59
Election of a Member to the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore	2859, 2898 —2913
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2859—98
THURSDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	2919—57
Statement <i>re</i> Tribunal for Indo-Burma Financial Settlement	2958—60
Motions for Adjournment <i>re</i> —	
Working of the new Constitution by Indians despite disclaimers—Ruled out of order	2960—64
Confidential report made on Members of the Legislative Assembly—Ruled out of order	2965—68
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2968—3025

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 21st March, 1935.

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.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

SYSTEM OF HAVING A SECOND GUARD IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PASSENGER TRAINS.

891. **Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that the system of having a second guard in East Indian Railway passenger trains has been discontinued?

(b) If so, are Government aware that this has involved great risk to passengers boarding trains at ill-lighted stations at night when, for want of proper information from the centre, the guard at the back signals the train to move off?

(c) Do Government propose to take steps to re-introduce this system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are informed that Second Guards have never been employed on East Indian Railway trains carrying passengers. Conductor Guards have been employed by night on mail trains, and there has been no change recently in this respect.

(b) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that external train lighting enable the Guard to satisfy himself if passengers are entraining or detraining, before giving the starting signal.

(c) Government agree with the Agent's views on this matter.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that these external lights, instead of helping passengers, interfere with their free movement, because they get into their eyes.

Mr. P. R. Rau: That seems to be a matter of opinion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: It is a matter of fact. Will Government kindly take some steps to make sure that passengers are entrained before the train moves on? Would they instruct the station master or some member of the staff at the station to give a signal to the guard from the centre of the train that all passengers are on board before the guard at the back signals the train off.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I shall ask the Agent to consider this matter.

CLOSING OF THE PASSAGE LEADING TO THE DHARMASHALA AT THE ETAWAH RAILWAY STATION.

892. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: (a) Are Government aware that the East Indian Railway authorities have closed the passage leading to the *dharmashala* at the Etawah Railway Station directly from the station yard, causing much inconvenience to the passengers?

(b) If so, do Government propose to instruct the railway authorities to open up a passage under such reasonable conditions as they may like to impose on the managers of the *dharmashala*?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) No.

(b) I have forwarded a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for considering the suggestion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: I am sorry I did not catch the reply. Does the Government deny the fact?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Government are not aware of the fact. They do not deny it. They have forwarded the question to the Agent for considering the suggestion.

SYSTEM OF GRANTING CONTRACT FOR THE SALE OF FOOD-STUFFS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

893. *Mr. Sri Prakasa: (a) Will Government please state what is the system of granting contract for the sale of food-stuffs on the East Indian Railway stations?

(b) Is it a fact that in the Dinapore Division 270 contractors have been turned out and four contractors appointed for the whole division who appoint sub-contractors under them?

(c) Are Government aware that this has entailed much hardship on those who used to do this business before?

(d) Is it a fact that these contractors sell goods at higher rates than the older ones and are Government aware that the quality of food-stuff supplied, has in no way improved?

(e) Are Government prepared to re-start the old system?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) The system varies on the different Divisions. As regards the Howrah and Dinapore Divisions, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad's question No. 689 on the 5th March, 1935. As regards the other Divisions, petty contractors are appointed at each station.

(b) Four contractors were appointed for the Dinapore Division, but I have no information as regards the number who were displaced. I am not aware of the arrangements these four contractors have made for carrying on their business, but understand that there has been no sub-letting.

(c) This is quite likely but can hardly be considered a sufficient reason for retaining the old system.

(d) and (e). I would refer the Honourable member to the reply I gave to Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad's question No. 640 on the 5th March.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I request you, Sir, to kindly take up Dr. Rajan's questions tomorrow, as he is attending on Mr. Sherwani who is very ill.

1894*—908*.

ATTITUDE OF STATES TOWARDS THE FEDERAL STRUCTURE PROPOSED IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

909. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India will shortly ask individual States clearly to define their attitude towards the Federal Structure proposed in the Government of India Bill;
- (b) whether this enquiry will take the form of asking the Princes to let Government know whether they propose to join the Federation or not;
- (c) whether a draft of the proposed Instrument of Accession has been informally circulated by Government among the Princes; if so, the names of the Princes to whom they have been so circulated; and
- (d) whether a copy of the draft will be placed on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to my reply to question No. 446 given on the 23rd February, 1935.

(b) The enquiry, when it is made, will be on the lines indicated by the Honourable Member.

(c) Yes. Government are not prepared to give the names of the individual Princes.

(d) No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has there been any change in the position since the publication of the White Paper, agreeing to the demands of the Princes and the Secretary of State's memorandum and despatch to the Government of India on the same subject?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is a matter of opinion as to whether the position has changed or not.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government still asking the Indian Princes to join the Indian Federation, or are they leaving them to decide the question, after the Bill is passed by both Houses of Parliament, and assented to by the King?

† These questions will be answered later.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend's question assumes that the Princes were asked by Government to join the Federation. That is not admitted.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the draft of the proposed Instrument of Accession been circulated by the Government among the Princes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That I have answered. Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With what purpose has it been circulated?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: So that they may read the Instrument of Accession.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it with a view to enabling them to make up their mind as to whether they will join the Federation or not?

(No reply.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the attention of Government been drawn to the Secretary of State's statement that the Bill will go on, and that the Princes will be asked to consider the question of joining the Federation, only after the Bill becomes law?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not know that it arises as a supplementary question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is for you to rule.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Under which part of the question does this come in?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Under this head, No. C.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think it arises. The Honourable Member can put down a question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Were they asked to say whether they agree or do not agree with the Instrument of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Does my Honourable friend assume that they have been asked whether they agree or do not agree?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Yes, I do.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: There is no ground for making that assumption.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Then, what is the purpose of sending it to the Princes.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have given the answer to that.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetty: Is it the intention to federate the States even without asking them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think the question is very sarcastic, but it has no sense.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the purpose for which this draft has been circulated among the princes? That question has not been answered.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have answered that; I will answer again. When they get this Instrument of Accession, they will read and see what it is like.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it for the purpose of enabling them to decide whether they will join the Federation or not, or merely to add to their sum of knowledge?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: It is for giving them information. They need not read it if they do not want to.

Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty: Is there any sense in the Government sending this Instrument of Accession?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a proper question.

Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty: That is the suggestion made by the Government themselves.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That question has been answered.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government heard in reply from any of the Princes, to whom they sent this Instrument of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If my friend will put a question on that, I will consider it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether they were asked to reply to it, or was it merely a unilateral transaction?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If my Honourable friend is trying to get at the contents of this document which is confidential, I am not prepared to disclose it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I know that perfectly well. I am simply asking whether these princes were expected to reply to it, or whether it was merely a unilateral transaction?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am afraid the question as put would involve my disclosing a part of the contents of that document, and I am not prepared to do that.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: In view of the fact that the successful passage of the Government of India Bill is dependent on whether Federation is established or not, will the Honourable Member inform this House whether the consent of the princes to Federation is a pre-requisite to the functioning of the Bill?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend assumes that the Bill is dependent on certain matters. That is a matter for Parliament. I cannot express any opinion on that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India send any recommendation to the Secretary of State to proceed with the Bill, whether the Princes join the Federation or not?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not aware of it, but even if I were I would not disclose it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did Government send any communication at all?

(No reply.)

REFORMS OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

910. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) how long the Reforms Department has been working with the Government of India;
- (b) the cost of the establishment and the staff per year;
- (c) how much longer the Reforms Department is expected to work;
- (d) the particulars, kind and class of work on which they are now engaged; and
- (e) whether they are arranging for elections to the Provincial Legislatures early next year?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Reforms Office has been in existence, as a separate Department of the Government of India, since May 15th, 1930.

(b) I lay a statement on the table.

(c) It is impossible to say at present for how long a separate Reforms Office will be necessary. The whole office is on a temporary basis and will not be continued longer than is necessary.

(d) and (e). The office deals with all questions relating to Constitutional reform. It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed.

Statement.

		Rs.	Actuals.
1930-31	.	1,50,753	..
1931-32	.	1,88,248	..
1932-33	.	1,48,114	..
1933-34	.	1,64,927	..
1934-35	.	2,00,100	Estimated expenditure..

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the main items of work on which they are just now engaged, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, I have answered that point that:

"It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed."

In answer to my Honourable friend's supplementary question, I should say that is the main item which I have disclosed in my answer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Now that the Government of India Bill is before the Houses of Parliament, what are the Government of India doing, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Among other things, they are answering questions put here.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is, if I may say so, a cheap sneer. I am asking this: now that the Government of India Bill is before the Houses of Parliament—and we are told heaps of times that they cannot answer any question on that Bill—I am asking specifically, what this costly Reforms Office is doing to justify its existence.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is exactly what I have answered. That is what the Department is doing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is no answer. I am asking—what are the main items in connection with this Government of India Bill on which they are engaged today?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think, Sir, as my Honourable friend did not listen to my answer, I will read it out again:

"The office deals with all questions relating to Constitutional reform. It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed."

In answer to my Honourable friend's supplementary question, I said:

"The main item was electoral arrangements."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: So, Sir, may I take it that, excepting electoral arrangements, there are no other items in connection with the Government of India Bill, on which this Department is now engaged?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think, Sir, "main item" means that there may be some subsidiary items also.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are those subsidiary items, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have not got a complete list; I shall be able to supply them at fairly short notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the electoral arrangements with which they are now concerned? Are they in connection with the Provincial Councils or the Federal Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Both.

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

COST OF BUILDING THE CAPITAL AT NEW DELHI.

911. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the reasons why the estimate of six crores of rupees for the cost of building the capital at Delhi has been exceeded by 7.84 crores;
- (b) the main details of this extra expenditure;
- (c) whether there are any proposals for schemes for increased expenditure on New Delhi, and if so, their cost; and
- (d) whether there is any proposal to make New Delhi the capital throughout the year, and if not, why not;

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The estimate of £4 millions sterling, or roughly Rs. 6 crores, to which the Honourable Member refers, was not based on detailed calculations. It was not, and was not intended to be, an "estimate" in the departmental sense. That the figure has been exceeded is due partly to the fact that it was an under-estimate, partly to the rise in rates and wages caused by the war, partly to the Constitutional Reforms, and partly to increases in the personnel of the Government of India.

(b) As the original estimate of Rs. 6 crores was not based on detailed calculations I am unable to give details of the extra expenditures.

(c) The Budget Estimate for 1935-36 includes a sum of Rs. 52.45 lakhs for Delhi Capital outlay. The sum is mainly for:

- (i) the completion of the Irwin Hospital;
- (ii) the extension of residential accommodation; and
- (iii) services, such as roads, sanitation, and electric light and power, connected with old and new residential accommodation.

(d) The matter was last considered in 1933 when Government decided to take no action until constitutional changes require it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, in view of the fact that so much money has been spent, will the Government of India reconsider, instead of waiting for the reforms, the question of making New Delhi the permanent capital of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have nothing, Sir, to add on that point to the reply given by my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, recently.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know how the constitutional requirements and the increase in the Government's personnel have added to this large expenditure provided for already?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, Sir, I can give my Honourable friend some information on that point. The New Capital Enquiry Committee of 1922 went into the question. They found that the original detailed estimates of Rs. 9 crores had been increased to Rs. 12.92 crores; and that this increase of Rs. 3.9 crores over the first estimate of 1918-14 was due to three main causes. The rise in rates and wages owing to the war accounted for Rs. 2.23 crores, the reforms accounted for Rs. 1.41 crores, and the balance of Rs. 26 lakhs was due to the inclusion of unforeseen items. I may mention also, for the information of my Honourable friend, as a measure of the gradual expansion of the project, that in 1922 it was intended to house 160 gazetted officers and 1,127 clerks. If our programme for 1935-36 is concluded, we shall, apart from the accommodation available in hospitals and chummeries, have house accommodation available for 287 officers and 2,856 clerks.

Mr S. Satyamurti: Has any of the expenditure been incurred with reference to the possibility being kept in view of New Delhi being the Capital of India? Has any of the expenditure on building houses, for example, been incurred with reference to the possibility of making this the permanent Capital of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That question has already been discussed at considerable length on the floor of the House in reply to supplementary questions, and, as I have already said, I have nothing to add to what my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, said recently.

Seth Govind Das: Is it not a fact that when it was decided to remove the capital from Calcutta to Delhi, it was thought that the Capital would remain in Delhi permanently?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think my Honourable friend had better put down a question on the notice paper on that subject.

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

POWER OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO SELECT CANDIDATES IRRESPECTIVE OF THE NUMBER OF MARKS OBTAINED IN THEIR EXAMINATION.

912. Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether their attention has been drawn to an answer of the Secretary of State in the House of Commons recently to a question that the system by which under clause 97.4 of the Government of India Act "The candidates certified to be entitled under the rules shall be recommended for appointments according to their order of efficiency as shown by their examination" is to be abandoned or modified;

(b) whether Government are aware that this clause does not appear in the Government of India Bill.

(c) whether the Government of India were consulted on the omission of this clause from the Bill; if so, what their recommendation was; and

- (d) whether it is proposed to give power to the Secretary of State to select candidates, irrespective of the number of marks obtained in their examination?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) The question was generally discussed with the Government of India.

(d) The intention of clause 233 of the Government of India Bill is to leave the Secretary of State free to recruit for the Indian Civil Service by any method he may consider suitable.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India, in that informal consultation, make any recommendation to the Secretary of State about the non-introduction of this clause 97 (a) in the Government of India Bill?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: My Honourable friend is aware that it is not the custom to disclose, in the public interest, any recommendations made to the Secretary of State by the Government of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I cannot accept that answer. I must ask for your ruling

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has given its ruling already.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, my Honourable friend says—"it is not the custom", etc. It is not right, Sir, to rely on "custom". He must aver every time that, in his opinion, the public interest would be adversely affected, by giving this answer. If my friend means to say that, for all time, they will never answer any questions on this matter, then that is against the Rules and Standing Orders.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think that was intended.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I say—"in the public interest".

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If the Honourable the Home Member says that he does not want to rely on the custom, and if he says that in this particular case he considers that the public interest may be affected adversely by giving the answer, that is different.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is what I intended to convey.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Thank you very much. May I know whether Government have any knowledge of any reasons why this clause has not been inserted in the new Government of India Bill?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think it is for me to interpret the reasons that led to the inclusion of the particular clause in the present Act.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the Government aware that the reason is that too many Indians are getting into the Indian Civil Service in London, and the Secretary of State wants the number of Europeans to be increased, whether they get higher marks or not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think that is the reason.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, what is the reason? How do you say that that is not the reason?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As far as I am aware, that is not the reason.

"WAYS AND MEANS" ADVANCES EXTENDED TO THE TREASURY BY THE IMPERIAL BANK.

Q13. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state:

- (a) whether his attention has been drawn to the article entitled, "World of Indian Finance", in the issue of the *Indian Finance*, dated the 15th February, 1935;
- (b) whether the "ways and means" advances extended to the Treasury by the Imperial Bank now amount, or recently amounted, to six crores;
- (c) whether Government have considered the alternative of adding to the currency;
- (d) the basis of the interest that is charged by the Bank for these advances;
- (e) the reasons why Government let the Imperial Bank have their balances free of interest, and pay interest to the Bank for their advances;
- (f) whether Government are aware that this frequent and frantic recourse to ways and means loans is in total defiance of their policy; and
- (g) whether Government propose to take any steps to protect the interest of the tax-payers and if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) I always read the *Indian Finance* though I do not invariably agree with it.

(b) Ways and means advances reached a total of six crores on the 7th of February, 1935, but have since been completely repaid.

(d) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 18th August, 1934, to question No. 47 asked in the Council of State by the Honourable Mr. Hossain Imam.

(e) Under the terms of its agreement the Imperial Bank of India receives no remuneration for the conduct of the ordinary banking business of Government other than such advantage as may accrue to it from the holding of Government balances free of interest.

(c) (f) and (g). This is one of the occasions on which I am not in agreement with the *Indian Finance* though I am afraid it would not be possible to give detailed reasons within the limits of a Parliamentary answer. I might perhaps say, however, that there seems to be a certain confusion between the two responsibilities of the Government, *vis.*, that for regulating their temporary borrowing operations and that for controlling the currency. As regards the former it is a question of judgment on each occasion whether it is more suitable to increase the takings of three months Treasury Bills or to take a day to day Ways and Means Advance, but it is, in my view, in no circumstances suitable to provide for the temporary exigencies of Government finance by resort to an expansion of currency. This is nothing more than pure inflation and what is more inflation to meet a purely temporary need.

As regards the latter it is the duty of a currency authority to meet fully the legitimate demands of trade and industry subject to there being no doubt about its ability to maintain adequate reserves and Government have consistently aimed at carrying out this duty. But here again expansion in advance of the needs of the market is nothing more than 'trying to make yourself fat by buying a bigger belt' as Mr. Keynes describes it.

Finally, I might remind the House that the second function will become the responsibility of the Reserve Bank as from the 1st April, next. The first will remain a responsibility of the Government but it will be of course exercised in the fullest co-operation with the Reserve Bank.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask for the answer given in the other place? I assume that it is not the practice here to refer to the answers given in the other place. In fact, there is a ruling to that effect.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The proceedings of the Council of State are circulated to Honourable Members.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I will read the relevant part of the answer:

"I regret that I am unable to disclose the rates of interest paid on these advances. They are settled by confidential agreement with the Imperial Bank and vary from time to time in accordance with market conditions."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Does the Honourable Member think that it will affect the public interest adversely, if he tells us the rates of interest?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In coming to the decision as to what is best in the interests of the Government, did the Honourable the Finance Member consider which rates are more advantageous and more profitable to the Government, and to the tax-payers, the one or the other method?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Of course.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to extend the currency circulation?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I certainly should not give a notice in advance if I was going to do that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that, in view of the economic conditions during the last year, there is a growing need for extended currency supply in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have answered that question. I said that Government have consistently tried to carry out their duty of keeping the market fully supplied with currency in accordance with its needs. I believe that that object is being properly carried out, and I think it will continue to be carried out.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the amount of increase effected in the currency supply during the last year?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Six crores.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that they are unnecessarily favouring the Imperial Bank by this contract?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think that is an outrageous suggestion.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the confidential document? Why cannot it be disclosed on the floor of this House?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: You cannot carry on your business in the light of every day publicity in this Assembly. It will make things quite impossible.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the exports of gold resulted in any extension of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The exports of gold seem to me to be irrelevant to the question of currency.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have they had any effect at all upon the total supply of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think it is quite possible that, because of the receipt of gold from people who have not hitherto been using it, it may have brought more money into active circulation.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that in the last four years there has been, on the whole, a diminution in the total supply of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is not true.

OPENING OF A FEDERATION BRANCH IN THE FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

914. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state?

- (a) whether it is a fact that from the 1st of April next, a new branch will be opened in the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India Secretariat which will deal exclusively with the formation of the Federation;

- (b) if so, what will be the nature and extent of the work of this branch;
- (c) what is the period for which this branch is being created, and the cost thereof?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) and (b). A separate Branch of the Foreign and Political Department has been created from the 1st March, 1935, to work out the application to each State of the new Constitution Bill and to deal with the work that will arise in connection with the accession of the Indian States to the Federation.

(c) Two years in the first instance; about Rs. 69,000 a year (including the pay of the officer in charge of the Branch).

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the main nature of the work which this separate Branch has been doing, since the 1st March, 1935?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I have already explained that what it is there for is to work out the application to each State of the new Constitution Bill. It is quite obvious that if the States do accede to the Federation, the drafting and so forth of the accession agreements will entail a considerable amount of work.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that the question of accession of any State to the Federation has not yet arisen and will not arise for some time, may I know the reason for the creation of this Branch so soon?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: In order that they may be prepared for the possibility of accession.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I ask, Sir, from what source is this separate Branch being recruited?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: From the ordinary source presumably from which other branches are recruited, that is, through the Public Service Commission.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is this Branch in communication with individual States, with regard to their proposed accession to the Federation?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: That Sir, I am not in a position to say at present.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it because the Honourable Member is unaware or is unwilling to say that?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: It is mainly because he is unwilling to say.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason for this unwillingness?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: No, Sir.

Seth Govind Das: Do Government not think that on the mere assumption that the States will join the Federation, the spending of this money is a waste?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Was that a question or an argument? I did not catch it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I must ask your ruling again, Sir. It comes to this, that the Honourable Member gets up and says: "I am unwilling to answer your question, and I am not prepared to say the reason why". This attitude reduces the privilege of asking the questions to a farce. They must at least give us the reason, as to why they will not answer the question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Perhaps the Honourable Member will give the reason.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: One of the main reasons is that if the Honourable Member is going to raise a point of order, I can do the same. As he knows, questions which concern the relations between the Governor General in Council and the Indian States cannot be put on the floor of the House and cannot be answered. Questions of this kind, as to whether we are in communication with the Indian States and what is the nature of that communication, are, obviously, to my mind, out of order.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: A point of order should not be countered by another point of order. I submit that this does not raise any question affecting the relations of the present Government of India with any individual State or States. We are dealing with the proposed Federation, and I am asking what this Branch is doing, with regard to the future accession of States to the Federation, and I am perfectly entitled to an answer.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards any particular communication between the Government of India or the Political Department and the States, if the Department says that the communication is of such a nature that they cannot, in public interest, disclose it, the Chair must accept that position.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, let him say so!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He has said so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He has not, I submit.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Oh! Yes, he has.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

915. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the present personnel of the Public Services Commission and the monthly salaries of each;
- (b) what examinations, written or oral, were conducted by the Commission in 1932, 1933 and 1934; and
- (c) the amount realised during each of the above years from the candidates in each examination as registration fees, examination fees and any other fees?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I lay two statements on the table containing the information asked for.

(a) Pay and personnel of the Commission.

1. Sir David Petrie, Kt., C.I.E., C.V.O., Chairman, Pay Rs. 4,000 a month.
2. Mr. H. S. Crosthwaite, C.I.E., I.C.S., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.
3. Rai Bahadur B. P. Varma, I.S.E., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.
4. Dr. L. K. Hyder, Ph.D., C.I.E., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.

(b) and (c) Statement showing the fees received during 1932, 1933 and 1934 by the Public Service Commission in respect of the Examinations held by them or the Selection posts recruitment to which was made through them.

Name of Examination or Selection.	1932.			1933.			1934.			Remarks.
	Application fee.	Examination fee.	Application fee.	Examination fee.	Application fee.	Examination fee.	Application fee.	Examination fee.		
1. Indian Civil Service . .	Rs. a. p. 2,240 0 0	24,700 0 0	3,015 0 0	23,100 0 0	Rs. a. p. 2,632 8 0	22,680 0 0	Rs. a. p.			
2. U. P. Civil (Executive) Service . .	1,115 0 0	5,850 0 0	875 0 0	3,859 0 0	650 0 0	5,080 0 0				
3. Indian Police and U. P. Police Service . .	3,253 8 0	6,450 0 0	1,892 0 0	6,529 0 0	2,317 8 0	4,399 8 0			There was no examination for the U. P. P. S. in 1934.	
4. Selection of Army and Railway Apprentices . .	1,100 0 0				
5. Selection of Army Apprentices	193 0 0	..				
6. Indian Military Academy and Royal Indian Marine and Indian Air Force (held twice every year) . .	5,970 0 0	16,900 0 0	3,217 8 0	16,850 0	5,060 0 0	15,400 0 0				
7. Indian Audit and Accounts Service, etc.	6,075 0 0	5,880 0 0				
8. Superior Telegraphs Engineering and Wireless Branches of the Posts and Telegraphs Department .	450 0 0	2,550 0 0	600 0 0	4,155 0 0				

9. Indian Railway Service of Engineers and Superior Telegraphs Engineering, etc.

.. 1,312 8 0 9,375 0 0

10. Ministerial Service

.. 25,590 0 0 .. 33,195 0 0 .. 6,990 0 0

11. Special 'Dufferin' Examination

.. 400 0 0

12. Selection posts

.. 2,055 0 0 .. 4,582 0 0 .. 12,284 0 0 ..

The number of posts for which recruitment was made during 1923, 1923 and 1924 was 11, 19 and 26 respectively.

Total

16,182 8 0 83,090 0 0 14,181 8 0 87,670 0 0 34,526 8 0 70,064,8 0
98,272 8 0 1,01,851 8 0 1,04,591 0 0

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE
IN REGARD TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OFFICE.**

916. *Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Will Government be pleased to state whether they have carried out fully the recommendations of the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee of 1931 in regard to Public Services Commission office?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I lay on the table a statement containing the information asked for.

Statement showing details of retrenchment in Demand No. 33--P. S. C.

Reductions recommended by the Retrenchment Committee.	Reductions accepted by Government.	Remarks.
1. Reduction of the number of members from five to three.	The number of members has been reduced from five to four.	..
2. Reduction of the status of the post of Secretary to that of Assistant Secretary or reduction of the special pay to Rs. 200 for an incumbent recruited from an All-India Service.	In view of the technical and responsible nature of the work it is not possible to employ a Secretary of the status of an Assistant Secretary to the Government of India. The special pay of Secretary, P. S. C., was fixed on the analogy of the special pay attached to the posts of D. S. in the Government of India. It has therefore been decided that the special pay of persons now in service who may be appointed to the post should not be altered so long as the special pay attached to posts of D. S. is not altered. So far as new entrants are concerned, the decision that may be arrived at in the case of D. Ss. in the Government of India will also apply to this post.	..
3. Reduction of at least two posts of stenographer.	One post of stenographer has been abolished. The abolition of another post was dependent on the reduction of the number of members from 5 to 3. As the number of members has been reduced only to 4, it was not possible to abolish another post of stenographer.	..
4. Reduction in the cost of other ministerial staff.	Not accepted, as it was not possible to reduce the strength.	..

Reductions recommended by the Retrenchment Committee.	Reductions accepted by Government.	Remarks.
5. Reduction in the strength of inferior servants.	The number of inferior servants is fixed in accordance with the general scale applicable to other offices. Consequent on the reduction of one post of Member, one post of 2nd class Jemadar and two posts of peon were abolished.	..
6. Reduction from Rs. 500 to Rs. 200 of the provision for medical treatment.	Accepted.	..
7. Curtailment of touring and reduction of the scale of Members' reserved railway accommodation to a coupe compartment of two berths or when a coupe is not available two first class berths. Chairman to continue to get a reserved four-berth compartment.	Accepted with the modification that if no coupe is available Members should get a full four-berth compartment. The provision for travelling allowance has also been reduced.	..
8. Permanent location of the office in Delhi, all but one of the Members being allowed to recess in the hills.	The question is a general one. As the Government of India have decided not to locate any portion of staff in Delhi, it is not possible to locate the office of the P. S. C. there.	..
9. Reduction of the provision for contingencies from Rs. 14,800 to Rs. 12,000.	The provision for contingencies has been reduced to Rs. 14,000.	It has been necessary to raise the provision on this account since 1934-35 on account of— (i) increase in postal rates; and (ii) increase in general expenditure consequent on the holding of examinations for recruitment to services, which was not done previously by the P. S. C.
10. Enhancement of fees charged to candidates from Rs. 5 to Rs. 7-8-0	Accepted.	..

FORMATION OF A NEW SECTION IN THE HOME DEPARTMENT TO DEAL WITH THE QUESTION OF COMMUNAL RECRUITMENT.

917. *Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: (a) Is it a fact that Government have decided or have under contemplation the formation of a new section in the Home Department to deal with the question of communal recruitment in offices of the Government of India and to keep the Public Services Commission as merely an examining body?

(b) If so, what was the necessity of attaching this section to the Home Department and not allowing the Public Services Commission to perform the above functions?

(c) If the Public Services Commission is merely going to be an examining body in future, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of reducing the personnel (both the members and the subordinate staff) to its proper proportions consistent with the reduction in their duty now proposed by the creation of a separate branch in the Home Department?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) A temporary section has been created in the Home Department to deal *inter alia* with the work arising out of (i) the Home Department Resolution of the 4th July, 1934, on communal representation in the services and (ii) the assignment of candidates recruited by the Public Service Commission for ministerial service in the Government of India Secretariat and Attached Offices and questions connected therewith.

(b) and (c). Questions connected with communal representation in the services are not part of the functions of the Public Service Commission, a point which has been recognised in the new Constitution Bill, clause 255 (3) of which is to the following effect:

"Nothing in this section shall require a Public Service Commission to be consulted as respects the manner in which appointments and posts are to be allocated as between the various communities in the Federation or a Province."

Work arising out of (ii) above, *vis.*, that of assignment of candidates recruited by the Public Service Commission was previously undertaken by the Public Service Commission, but it was found that this arrangement was not satisfactory and interfered with the ordinary work of the Commission as an examining and advisory body. Its removal has caused only a slight reduction in their work and one post of clerk in that Office has been left unfilled. I may further point out that the strength of the Commission was reduced by one Member as a measure of retrenchment a short time ago and that since then its work has increased largely in all respects.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: If the Public Service Commission has nothing to do with the choice of the candidates for the different jobs, then, Sir, what is the object in having a Public Service Commission at all and holding examinations under its aegis? Is it merely to hold examinations and for nothing else?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Public Service Commission holds examinations, but it does not assign the successful candidates to particular offices.

Mr. Lalchand Navai: May I know if there is any intention to increase the number of Members of the Public Service Commission?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is no present intention.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Does the Honourable Member find that the examinations held by the Public Service Commission are more reliable than the results of the examinations held by the Universities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is asking me to express an opinion.

UNORTHODOX QUARTERS AND BUNGALOWS ON CERTAIN ROADS IN NEW DELHI.

918. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the unorthodox type quarters and bungalows on Mahadeo Road, Allenby Road and Talkatora Road were built for occupation all the year round or merely for the winter season?

(b) Are Government aware that in many of these types of houses, the doors open directly on to the lawn with the result that on days when it rains, water gets into the rooms to the annoyance and inconvenience of the tenants?

(c) Are Government also aware that in these houses the front or back rooms, as the case may be, are practically uninhabitable during the summer as the sun beats directly into the rooms?

(d) If the answer to parts (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to take the necessary steps by providing protecting shades or awnings over the doors opening directly on the lawns in order to minimise the inconvenience to tenants?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The quarters referred to are intended for occupation during the whole year.

(b) The doors of some rooms open directly on to the lawn, but no definite complaints either of annoyance or inconvenience have been received. It is understood, however, that, during wet weather rain does drive into some of the rooms and steps will be taken to remedy this defect when funds are available.

(c) No.

(d) I have already said in dealing with part (b) that certain improvements will be carried out when funds are available.

CLERKS' QUARTERS IN TIMARPUR, DELHI.

919. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state for how long the clerks' quarters in Timarpur were built to last? Is it not a fact that they were built to last for a maximum period of ten years and that rents were recovered accordingly from the year 1912?

(b) Is it not a fact that the cost of those quarters has been recovered in full long ago?

(c) If so, do Government propose to consider the desirability of reducing the rents of such quarters?

The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce: (a) No specific period of years was prescribed, but the intention was that the quarters should last until replaced by permanent quarters in New Delhi.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

REMOVAL OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FROM PUSA TO DELHI.

920. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) what section of the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research will be retained at Pusa and with what staff, after the main institute is removed to the suburbs of Delhi;
- (b) what they propose to do with the vast area of land at Pusa;
- (c) what they propose to do with the High English School and hospital there; and
- (d) by what time the main institute at Pusa is likely to be removed?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) No section of the Institute will be retained at Pusa but a Botanical sub-station will be maintained there.

(b) All the land other than that required for the sub-station will be disposed of in accordance with the rules regulating the transfer of State lands set out in the Finance Department Resolution No. D./8428-A., dated the 10th December, 1925, and letter No. D./3009-A., dated the 28th October, 1929, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

(c) The Government of India will discontinue their annual contribution towards the maintenance of the High School. The hospital will be closed.

(d) By 1937.

Mr. Lalchand Navakrai: May I know how far the construction of this new Imperial Agricultural Institute has progressed in Delhi and how long will it take to set it in working order?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already informed the House that it will be ready by 1937, and as regards the first part of my Honourable friend's question, the position is that the ground is being cleared, the foundation stone has been laid and the building operations will start shortly.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Government of India propose to have also an experimental farm attached to the Institute when it is transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As a matter of fact, the agricultural work of the Institute will be done partly here and partly at the sub-station which is already in existence at Karnal.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government realise that the experiments of all the crops that are now being made at Pusa cannot be made here in Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend evidently did not listen to what I said in answer to part (a) of the question, namely, that a Botanical sub-station will be maintained at Pusa in order to carry on the experimental work on those crops which are peculiar to the soil and climatic conditions of the region.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to take up experiments on any new crops when the Institute is transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I think the number of all staple crops in this country is pretty well known and has been the subject of experiments for a long time. The Government cannot, therefore, invent any new crops for such experiments.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: Are there any additional crops on which experiments will be carried on here?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I do not know whether there are any additional crops.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: What are the reasons why the Institute was transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend was not in the House last August when I explained that matter in my speech lasting thirty-five minutes.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will the Government of India accept the suggestion that the Institute should be allowed to exist and flourish as a provincial concern?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If the Government of Bihar and Orissa is prepared to maintain the Institute as a provincial concern, nobody will be happier than the Government of India.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Was the Government of Bihar and Orissa consulted?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It is not for the Government of India to accept the suggestion; it is for the Government of Bihar and Orissa to decide whether they will accept the financial responsibility.

Prof. H. G. Ranga: If that Institute is transferred to Delhi and the experimental work is to be carried on here in Delhi, and, at the same time, another part of the experimental work is carried on in the sub-station, will it not involve additional expenditure to the Government of India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend does not appreciate the fact that crop experiments cannot be centralised in any one place. They have to be carried on in different centres.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: If the Government of Bihar and Orissa likes to maintain the Institute, will the Government of India allow any subsidy?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of India cannot allow any subsidy in regard to a matter of provincial administration.

INQUIRY INTO THE CASE OF MR. BHARTHI, ex-GUARD, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

921. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: (a) With reference to the starred question No. 795 of Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen, dated the 12th September, 1933 relating to the case of Mr. Bharthi, ex-Guard, East Indian Railway, will Government please state if they have completed their inquiry into the case?

(b) Is it a fact that the Railway Board gave advice to the Agent, East Indian Railway, that the sending of advance copies of appeals does not call for disciplinary action?

Mr. P. B. Rao: The answer to both parts of the question is in the affirmative.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it a fact that every railway employé is entitled to address, by means of an advance copy, any appeal to the Railway Board?

Mr. P. B. Rao: I am not aware of any orders preventing it.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: But is it or is it not a fact that this is accepted by the Railway Board as a legitimate channel of representing a grievance?

Mr. P. B. Rao: The legitimate channel of representation is through the railway administration.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: That is beside the point. I want to know: Is it or is it not a fact that every railway servant is entitled to send an advance copy of an appeal to the Railway Board without courting the displeasure of the Agent?

Mr. P. B. Rao: I have already replied to that. There is nothing to prevent a railway servant from sending an advance copy of any memorial to whomsoever he likes.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Therefore, it is a fact that any Railway Agent who shows his displeasure towards any employé who does that is acting contrary to the policy and orders of the Railway Board.

Mr. P. B. Rao: I have already replied, in answer to part (b) of the question, that the Railway Board have advised the Agent that the sending of advance copies of appeals does not call for any disciplinary action.

SCALES OF PAY OF POSTAL CLERKS AND SIGNALLERS AND OF TELEGRAPHISTS.

922. *Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhary: (a) Are Government aware that in Great Britain the Postal Clerks and Signallers are given a higher scale of pay than Telegraphists, on the ground that the duties of the former involve more complexities and heavier responsibility than those of the latter?

(b) If so, will Government please state the reasons why the Postal Clerks and Signallers in India have been given a lower scale of pay than that sanctioned for Telegraphists?

(c) Do Government propose to equalise the scales? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have no precise information.

(b) and (c). Departmental telegraphists are given a better scale of pay in recognition of the fact that they are required to possess a higher degree of operative skill and technical attainment than postal clerks or signallers, and Government do not, therefore, consider that there is any case for equalising the scales.

TELEGRAPH MASTERS AND THEIR PERCENTAGE IN COMPARISON WITH TELEGRAPHISTS.

923. *Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: Will Government please state the total number of appointments of Telegraph Masters, and their percentage in comparison with the total number of telegraphists, both general service and station service taken together?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The cadre of Telegraph Masters has been fixed for the year 1934-35 at 255 which represents a ratio of 17 per cent. as compared with the total number of telegraphists.

REVISED SCALES OF PAY FOR FUTURE ENTRANTS IN THE POST OFFICE, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

924. *Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: Have Government arrived at any decision with regard to the revised scales of pay for future entrants in the Posts Office, Railway Mail Service and Telegraph Service? If so, will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the revised scales? If not, when is the decision likely to be arrived at?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Government have sanctioned revised rates of pay for non-gazetted Government servants of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department who enter or have entered service on or after the 16th July, 1931. A copy of the orders has been placed in the Library of the House.

PERCENTAGE OF MUSLIMS IN BIHAR AND ORISSA AND IN THE PURNIA DISTRICT.

925. *Maulvi Bad-uz-Zaman: Will Government please state the percentage of the Muslims in Bihar and Orissa and in the District of Purnea, respectively?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to pages 132-133 of Part II of Volume VII, Census of India, 1931, a copy of which will be found in the Library of the House.

**EXEMPTION FROM CUT IN SALARIES OF SUBORDINATES SUFFERED FROM
EARTHQUAKE IN BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

926. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: (a) Are Government aware that the Local Government have granted exemption from cut in salaries of their subordinates who have suffered from the last earthquake in the Bihar and Orissa Province?

(b) Are Government aware that grave discontent prevails among the staff under Central Government, serving in the said province, who have similarly suffered from the earthquake, on account of their non-exemption from the cut?

(c) Are Government aware that the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs made a definite promise to his staff serving in Bihar that they will get all reliefs that the Local Government would grant to their employees?

(d) Do Government propose to grant the exemption to their employees in Bihar and remove their grievance?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes. Orders will issue shortly.

**MEMORIAL SUBMITTED BY THE CLERKS OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
ACCOUNTS OFFICER, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

927. *Mr. Fakir Chand: (a) Is it a fact that a memorial submitted in November, 1934, by the qualified clerks of the Chief Accounts Officer's office, North Western Railway, Lahore, for a revision in seniority (fixed for the purpose of promotion to Accountant's grade) alleged to have been based on the mis-interpretation of rule, is still lying undisposed of with the Chief Accounts Officer, North Western Railway, Lahore, and has not so far been forwarded to the higher authorities with his remarks? If so, what period do Government consider as reasonable for the disposal of such papers?

(b) Do Government propose to have the matters expedited?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are informed that certain memorials were received in December, 1934, and are under consideration. The Chief Accounts Officer has been asked to expedite disposal.

**STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS DURING SUMMER IN "D" TYPE QUARTERS
IN NEW DELHI.**

928. *Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that residential quarters in New Delhi were constructed primarily for the use and convenience of the staff of the migratory officers of the Government of India?

(b) Is it also a fact that for some years past the practice has been not to allow the occupants of 'D' class quarters to store their household

affects in the godown of their quarters during the summer season when they move up to Simla?

(c) Are Government aware that the tenants of these quarters, who are refused permission to store their surplus and heavy effects not required at Simla, in their godown, are put to great inconvenience at the time of the move up of the offices?

(d) Is it a fact that the reason why the permission referred to above is not granted is that the "D" class quarters are usually allotted to the local people for some months in the summer season?

(e) Is it also a fact that the temporary tenants referred to in part (d) above usually pay much less rent for the quarters, because they are in receipt of less pay than the winter occupants?

(f) If the replies to the preceding parts be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions that in future the quarters should be allotted to temporary summer residents subject to the stipulation that the godowns of the quarters will, if required, be retained by the winter occupants? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce: (a) No.

(b) Storage is permitted in those quarters which are not likely to be allotted for the summer season.

(c) I am prepared to take it from the Honourable Member that some inconvenience is caused to the tenants in such cases.

(d) Yes.

(e) They pay the rent due under the rules, while migratory tenants pay nothing during the summer.

(f) No. It would be unfair to the summer tenants, and would involve loss of rent.

INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL POINTS OF ELECTRICITY AND PROVISION OF FLUSH LATRINES IN CERTAIN QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

MR. *Rao Bahadur M. C. Bajaj: (a) Is it a fact that for some years past the Government of India have had under consideration the question of installing additional points of electricity and providing flush latrines in 'C' and 'D' class quarters in New Delhi?

(b) Is it also a fact that these installations have been provided in the new quarters on Minto Road, rents for which are charged at the same rates as for the old quarters?

(c) When do Government propose to provide these installations in the old quarters?

The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) It is hoped that the installation of additional electric points in the old quarters will be completed by the end of this month. Modern sanitation will be provided in 1935-36 provided the necessary funds are voted by this House.

DESIRABILITY OF BUILDING COW-BYRES IN THE LAND BEHIND THE IRWIN ROAD AND BAIRD SQUARE QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

980. *Rao Bahadur M. G. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that a large plot of land is lying vacant near the *dhobi ghats* behind the Irwin Road (Orthodox) quarters and Baird Square?

(b) Do Government propose to make a park there? If so, when? If not, do Government propose to consider the desirability of building cow-byres there for the use of the tenants of the quarters in that locality?

Mr. G. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) It is not intended at present to turn the plot into a public park. The provision of cow-byres is a matter for the Municipal Committee of New Delhi.

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE DELHI CAMP ALLOWANCE FOR ALLOTMENT OF QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI TO THE STAFF OF THE ATTACHED OFFICES.

981. *Rao Bahadur M. G. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that the Delhi Camp Allowance allowed to the staff of the Attached Offices of the Government of India is taken into account in calculating the rent chargeable for the Government quarters allotted to them, but not for the purpose of allotment and classification?

(b) Is it a fact that the allowance is of a more or less permanent and regular nature and that its grant in the winter season can be foreseen just like that of pay?

(c) Do Government propose to change the allotment rules to remove the anomaly referred to in part (a), either by taking the allowance into account for both purposes, or by leaving it out for both? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (c). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to my reply to question No. 666 which was asked by Rao Bahadur B. L. Patil on the 10th April, 1934.

(b) In some of the attached offices, the Delhi Camp Allowance is renewed from year to year, while in some the allowance is sanctioned as a permanent measure for so long as the offices continue to move between Simla and Delhi.

COMPENSATORY AND LOCAL ALLOWANCES TO THE STAFF OF THE ATTACHED OFFICES IN NEW DELHI.

982. *Rao Bahadur M. G. Rajah: (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the following information regarding the compensatory and local allowances on salaries of Rs. 101, Rs. 201, and Rs. 301, to the clerical staff of the Attached Offices in New Delhi:

- (i) full rate (pre-cut) of Delhi Camp Allowance admissible to old entrants;
- (ii) present rate (after cut) of Delhi Camp Allowance allowed to old entrants; and
- (iii) rate of consolidated allowance allowed to "new entrants"?

(b) Is it a fact that the "out" in the Delhi Camp Allowance, was introduced on account of financial stringency?

(c) Is it also a fact that the cut in pay also was introduced on account of financial stringency, but it has been decided to restore it with effect from the pay for April, 1935?

(d) Do Government propose to restore the cut in the Delhi Camp Allowance also in the next financial year? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) (i). I lay on the table a copy of the reply given to part (a) of Pandit Nilakantha Das' unstarred question No. 272 on the 21st March, 1930, which gives the information asked for.

(a) (ii). The Delhi Camp Allowance is given at the same rates subject to a ten per cent. cut.

(a) (iii). The new rates of house-rent allowance are Rs. 15, Rs. 20, and Rs. 25 per mensem on pays of Rs. 101, Rs. 201 and Rs. 301. It is an allowance admissible to those not provided with Government quarters. In addition, a conveyance allowance of Rs. 25 a month is granted to those working in New Delhi but residing in Old Delhi Notified Area.

(b) Not entirely. The main reason for the cut was the fall in the prices of staple commodities, which happened to coincide with the beginning of the financial stringency.

(c) The answer is in the affirmative.

(d) I am afraid I can give no undertaking in the matter. The question will be considered in due course.

Reply to Pandit Nilakantha Das' unstarred question No. 272 on the 31st March, 1930.

(a).

Secretariat Attached Offices.			Army Headquarter Offices.		
Pay.	Rate of allowance.		Salary.	Rate of allowance.	
	Rs. s. p.			Rs. s. p.	
Rs. 57 or less	16-10-8	per mensem	Rs. 50 or less	16-10-8	per mensem.
Rs. 50 to 75	27-0-0	Do.	Rs. 50 to 80	20-0-0	Do.
Rs. 75 to 100	28-10-8	do.	Rs. 80 to 120	33-5-4	do.
Rs. 100 to 150	40-0-0	do.	Rs. 120 to 180	40-0-0	do.
Rs. 150 to 200	50-0-0	do.	Rs. 180 to 200	50-0-0	do.
Rs. 200 to 250	52-5-4	do.	Rs. 200 to 260	60-0-0	do.
Above Rs. 250	56-10-8	do.	Rs. 260 to 350	66-10-8	do.
			Rs. 350 to 500	83-5-4	do.
			Above Rs. 500	100-0-0	do.

INDIANS APPOINTED AS HOME MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

16

923. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will Government be pleased to state whether any Indian has hitherto been appointed to the Home Membership of the Government of India and several Local Governments in this country, and if so, how many and when?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No Indian has so far been appointed as Home Member of the Government of India but Indians have held this post in several Provinces and I lay a statement on the table containing the information desired by the Honourable Member.

Statement showing the number of Indians who have been appointed as Home Members in the Provincial Governments since 1921.

Province.	No. of Indians who held the post.	Year and date.
Madras	2	30-3-25 to 16-5-34 and 16-8-34 to date.
United Provinces	4	3-1-21 to date with brief intervals on two occasions.
Burma	4 (Burmanes).	Since the introduction of reforms in 1923.
Central Provinces	3	17-12-20 to 4-10-30 and 8-10-30 to date.
Assam	4	<div> 3-1-21 1-3-24 1-4-29 31-3-34 </div> } Date of appointment.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Why has no Indian been appointed as Home Member in the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The appointment of Home Member in the Government of India is not made by the Government of India.

MARTIAL RACES.

934. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: What is a martial race, as understood by the Government of India and which are the martial races of this country recognised as such by them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, I will repeat the answer that has been given in the past to similar questions in this House.

Government do not recognise any particular class, caste or community as martial or non-martial; but units of the Indian Army have always been organised on a class basis; and as there are limits to the size of that army, only a limited number of classes can ordinarily find a place in it. The classes enlisted at present are shown in the Indian Army List at the heading of each unit, and they are those which, in the opinion of the military authorities, produce the most efficient soldiers.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are we to take it that Government do not think of some classes as martial and some classes as non-martial?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I said that Government do not recognise any particular class, caste or community as martial or non-martial.

BREACHES IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

985. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) What is the number of Beharees in the Army of India?

(b) Is the recruitment of soldiers still going on in Bihar, and if not, why not, and since when?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) 180.

(b) The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative; the other parts, therefore, do not arise.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW HOWRAH BRIDGE.

986. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they have given final approval to the project of the new Howrah Bridge at Calcutta, and if the estimates have received their sanction?

(b) When is the construction of this new bridge likely to be taken up?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: (a) The project does not require the approval of the Government of India, nor do the estimates need their sanction.

(b) The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government, and the Government of India have no official information on the subject.

SPECIAL BENEFITS DERIVED BY CHANGING THE STANDARD TIME AT DELHI DURING THE WINTER MONTHS.

987. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons that led them to change the standard time at Delhi by an advance of 30 minutes during the preceding two months?

(b) What special benefits, if any, did Government and the public derive thereby?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to Mr. Azhar Ali's question No. 870.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION OF GUARDS IN THE HOWRAH DIVISION.

938. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Indian Guards of the East Indian Railway under the Divisional Superintendent, Howrah, appealed to the Railway Board, complaining against racial discrimination in the matter of recruitment and promotion? If so, will Government be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No such appeal has so far been received by the Railway Board.

GUNNER GUARDS IN THE HOWRAH DIVISION.

939. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) What is the total strength of gunner guards under the Divisional Superintendent, Howrah?

(b) What is the percentage of the posts held by Anglo-Indians and Indians?

(c) What is the scale of pay for the gunner guards?

(d) Are the gunner guards not supposed to work trains on main line?

(e) How many Indians are on the maximum of Grade II and how many are there in Grade I?

(f) What is the total number of guards in Grade I and in Grade II?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer my Honourable friend to the reply given by me to question No. 163 asked by Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoris on the 23rd July, 1934.

SECOND CLASS PASSES FOR GUARDS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

940. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the guards on the Eastern Bengal Railway are entitled to second class passes when their pay and mileage allowances exceed Rs. 125 a month?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the guards of the East Indian Railway, are entitled to get second class passes when their pay and mileage allowance exceed Rs. 116? If so, why is that privilege not granted to the guards of the Eastern Bengal Railway, which is also a State-managed Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave on the 23rd July, 1934, to Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoris's question No. 164.

PASSES FOR EMPLOYEES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

941. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the East Indian Railway, employees drawing pay of Rs. 116 and above are entitled to four return or eight single

journey passes, whereas employees drawing pay of Rs. 75 to Rs. 115 are entitled to three return or six single journey intermediate class passes and those drawing pay of Rs. 74 and under are entitled to three return or six single journey third class passes?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for granting a similar number of passes for those receiving less pay?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that no restriction of pay is made for officers who are entitled to first class passes? If so, why is there any restriction of pay on subordinate staff in the matter of grant of passes?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave on the 23rd July, 1934, to Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhuria's question No. 165.

CASE OF MR. K. C. DAS, AN ASSISTANT STATION MASTER AT NAIHATI, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

942. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the East Indian Railway authorities issued notification No. 80 in the weekly Gazette, dated the 24th January, 1934, to the effect that those who fail for the second time in the Chandausi Examination, it will be taken as definite proof that the man is unfit for the post he substantively holds and, if no other suitable post is available, he will be discharged?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why Babu K. C. Das of Naihati, an Assistant Station Master of 16 years' standing, who only failed at the first examination, was degraded to the post of a number-taker, and was not given a second chance, as the rule permits?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether similar practice is observed on the other State-managed Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). The information is being obtained, and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

UNIFORM RULE FOR ALL RAILWAYS FOR TESTING THE TRANSPORTATION STAFF LIKE THAT IN VOGUE ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

943. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the Railway Board is prepared to examine the question and issue one uniform rule for all Railways in the matter of testing the staff attached to Transportation like that in vogue on the Eastern Bengal Railway?

(b) Is it not a fact that on the Eastern Bengal Railway officers and inspecting officers, when visiting a station on inspection, hold oral-examination of the staff attached to Transportation working?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). The question will be examined by the Railway Board.

IMPORT OF FOREIGN SUGAR AFTER THE IMPOSITION OF EXCISE DUTY.

944. *Sardar Sant Singh: How much foreign sugar has been imported into India since the imposition of excise duty on Indian sugar, during each month up to the 31st January, 1935?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: The information asked for by the Honourable Member as far as available is contained in the monthly accounts relating to the Sea-borne Trade of British India and the Kathiawar Trade Statistics, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

SUGAR-CANE FROM RAMPUR STATE SOLD TO CERTAIN FACTORIES IN THE UNITED PROVINCES.

945. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Is it a fact that sugar-cane from Rampur State was sold to sugar factories in the western parts of the United Provinces?

(b) Is it a fact that this cane was conveyed by Railway to the factories?

(c) Is it a fact that no minimum price has been fixed under the Sugar-cane Act for sugar-cane from Rampur State?

(d) Is it a fact that the State has imposed an export duty of two annas per maund on sugar-cane exported to British India by Railways? If so, has this duty caused any decrease in the export of cane from that State, and what is its effect on those factories?

(e) Does the State charge any excise duty on sugar produced in the Rampur State?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) and (b). Government have no information.

(c) Rules made by a Local Government under the Sugar-cane Act, 1934, can apply to British territory only.

(d) and (e). Government have no information other than that contained in the Rampur Press Communique in the *Statesman* of the 21st February, 1935.

Sardar Sant Singh: Will Government kindly inquire whether sugar-cane from Rampur State was or was not sold to sugar factories in the United Provinces?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: All the information that is available or is required is contained in this press communiqué of which I have a copy here and of which I shall be glad to lay a copy on the table if the Honourable Member so desires.

Sardar Sant Singh: Then, will the Honourable Member lay the copy on the table?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Certainly, Sir.

Extract from the Session dated the 21st February, 1935.

SUGARCANE SALE.

Press Report Sent by Rampur State.

Rampur, February 20. The Chief Minister of Rampur State in a Press Communiqué says:

"The attention of His Highness's Government has been drawn to a statement in the Press that the export of sugarcane from Rampur State to the U. P. will be the subject matter of interpellation in the Assembly. It is stated that there is no minimum price for sugarcane fixed in the Rampur State. This is not true. His Highness's Government has passed a Sugarcane Act and framed rules thereunder on the lines of similar legislation in the U. P., and the minimum price fixed from time to time has never been less than that fixed in the U. P."

The export duty has been instituted to discourage speculators buying sugarcane in the State at fancy prices, and applies only to cane grown in a certain defined area, most of which the cultivators contracted to sell to the local sugar factory at the beginning of the present season and for which the factory made advances to the growers. The factory has agreed to buy all the sugarcane grown in this area but the non-contracted cane will be purchased not at the minimum price but at a price fixed from time to time by a special committee, which includes two representatives of the growers. The price fixed by this committee will in no case be less than the minimum price prevailing in the U. P. In fact, it has been higher throughout." A. P. I.

REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF PASSES BY THE RAILWAY AUTHORITIES.

946. *Sardar Sant Singh: Is it a fact that the Railway authorities have reduced the number of privilege passes to three? If so, has the Indian Railway Conference passed a resolution to raise this number? If so, what action do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. For more detailed information I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Bhai Parma Nand's unstarred question No. 65 on the 22nd February, 1935. The Indian Railway Conference Association has made certain recommendations in regard to the modification of the rules for the grant of passes, which are now under consideration.

REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES OF THE HINDUSTANI SEVA DAL.

947. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the statement made by the Honourable the Home Member that the Hindustani Seva Dal is connected with revolutionary activities in some provinces and so Government are not able to remove the ban on that organisation, will Government please state:

- (a) in which provinces the Hindustani Seva Dal is connected with revolutionary activities;
- (b) in which provinces it is not connected with such activities, and
- (c) whether Government are prepared to remove the ban on it in such provinces in which it is free from revolutionary activities? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Hindustani Seva Dal has been banned in Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab. As I have explained already in the answers given by me on the 14th February, 1935, to Mr. S. Satyamurti's supplementary question, the organization in these provinces is of a revolutionary character and its activities have included incitement to violence.

(b) I do not know whether it is functioning in any other provinces but, if so, its activities are presumably unobjectionable.

(c) Does not arise.

Seth Govind Das: Have Government seen the recent statement of Dr. Hardikar, the founder of the Hindustani Seva Dal?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that the Hindustani Seva Dal being an all-India organisation, when it is banned in one province it is banned in other provinces also?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is not so. The ban is only imposed in four provinces.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware why the ban on the Hindustani Seva Dal has been removed in Madras?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: So far as I am aware, it never existed in Madras.

Seth Govind Das: In view of the recent statement of Dr. Hardikar, do Government propose any change in their policy?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On the information of the Honourable Member, when did the Hindustani Seva Dal in these four provinces start revolutionary activities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I presume they started before they were banned. I forget the exact date of the ban, but it was some time in 1932.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the question of the ban on these associations ever reconsidered?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes: it is reconsidered by the Local Governments concerned.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When was it last reconsidered?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That I cannot say: it is the function of the Local Government to reconsider these matters.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is there any time limit—once in six months or a year or anything like that?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks these questions have been answered.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Was this ban imposed, after the Civil Disobedience Movement was started, or before?

The Honourable Sir Henry Oak: Before the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am asking whether it was before the Congress started the Civil Disobedience Movement or after.

The Honourable Sir Henry Oak: The Congress started the Civil Disobedience Movement, as far as I am aware, about 1920.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir,

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

RECOGNITION BY GOVERNMENT OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE.

948. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What are the conditions for Government's recognising a Chamber of Commerce?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: The usual conditions are that the chambers of commerce concerned should be of good standing and sufficiently representative of important commercial interests.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Andhra Chamber of Commerce recognised by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: I must ask for notice.

RESERVATION OF HIGHLANDS IN KENYA FOR EUROPEAN SETTLERS.

949. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Carter Commission recommended the reservation of highlands in Kenya for European settlers?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the total amount of Indian capital and the total amount of European capital invested in Kenya?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether representatives of the Government of India, or the representatives of Indians in Kenya, were included in that Commission, and if so, what were the recommendations of such representatives in the matter of reservation of highlands in Kenya for European settlers in that place?

(d) If no such representatives were included in the Carter Commission why was it not done? Did the Government of India press for the inclusion of such representatives in that Commission? If not, why not?

(e) Were the Government of India consulted in the matter of the appointment of the Carter Commission? If so, what were the views of Government on that subject?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) The reservation for persons of European descent of the area known as the Highlands is not a recommendation of the Kenya Land Commission. It is part of the policy of His Majesty's Government as laid down in the White Paper (Cmd. 1922) of 1923.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) to (e). In 1931 the Joint Select Committee of Parliament on Closer Union in East Africa recommended that in view of the nervousness among the native population in Kenya as regards the land question, a full and authoritative enquiry should be undertaken immediately into the needs of the native population, present and prospective, with respect to land within or without the reserves, held either on tribal or on individual tenure. The Kenya Land Commission was appointed in April, 1932, in consequence of this recommendation. The personnel of the Commission and its terms of reference will be found in its report, a copy of which is in the Library. The Government of India were not consulted as regards its composition or functions, presumably because the Commission's work related primarily to questions concerning the native population.

WHEAT AND RICE IMPORTED INTO INDIA.

950. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of wheat imported annually into India during the five years preceding the date of the passing of the Wheat Import Act, and the quantity of wheat imported into India annually during the succeeding years up to date?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how the importation of wheat into India during those two periods compares?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of rice, husked and unhusked, imported into India from each of the countries like Japan, Siam and Indo-China, during the periods from the 1st April, 1933, to date?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: (a) and (b). The Honourable Member is referred to Volume I of the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India for the years ending 31st March, 1930 and 1934 and the monthly accounts for January, 1935, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

(c) Figures of imports of rice, including paddy from April, 1933 to March, 1934, from the countries mentioned in the question are contained in Volume I of the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India for the year ending 31st March, 1934. As regards figures from April, 1934 to January, 1935, a statement is laid on the table.

Imports of Rice including Paddy into British India from Siam, Indo-China, Japan and other countries.

In Tons.

	Siam.	Indo-China.	Japan.	Other Countries.	Total.
1934-35—					
April, 1934	30,782	3,856	671	4	35,313
May	19,142	884	523	..	20,549
June	19,784	10,706	4	10	30,504
July	13,217	7,286	705	1	21,209
August	25,102	9,515	8		34,625
September	25,095	4,736	8	8	29,847
October	44,792	18,065	4	4	62,865
November	29,802	7,114	6	3	36,925
December	32,708	28,078	5	21	60,812
January, 1935	7,149	217	6	..	7,372
Total (10 months)	247,573	90,427	1,940	51	339,991

MOTOR CARS IMPORTED INTO INDIA.

951. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** Is it a fact that the number of motor cars imported into India is increasing annually? If so, are Government in a position to give the total amount of money which has gone out of India annually as the price of motor cars imported and the price of parts of motor cars imported into India during the last five years?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India, Volume I, for the year ending 31st March, 1934, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government considering any proposal to promote the motor manufacturing industry in this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: Not that I am aware of.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government aware of any Government which grants subsidies for production of motor cars in their country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: My Honourable friend will have to give me notice of that question.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government prepared to consider the question of granting subsidies to any firm in India for the production of motor cars in India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: No such application has been made.

Seth Govind Das: If it is made, then, will Government favourably consider it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: That is a hypothetical question.

CONTRACT FOR CARRYING THE COASTAL MAIL.

952. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Is it a fact that the contract for carrying the coastal mail is given to European firms only?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the names of the companies which have been given the contract for carrying Government mails between Burma and India?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the year when the contract for carrying such mail was made last and the period for which it has been made?

(d) When will the contract expire?

(e) Do Government propose to give the contract of carrying such mail to the coastal ports of India and Burma to Indian companies? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) The British India Steam Navigation Company and the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company.

(c) The contract with the British India Steam Navigation Company was made in the year 1924 for a period of ten years. The mail service between Chittagong and Rangoon was run by the British India Steam Navigation Company as part of the contract but towards the end of 1933 arrangements were made by that Company with the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company to undertake jointly the services between Chittagong and Rangoon. It was settled by negotiation with both these Companies that the existing contract and arrangements would be continued for a period of two years from the 1st February, 1934. In this connection the Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given to Mr. K. O. Neogy's starred question No. 309 in this House on the 2nd March, 1934.

(d) 31st January, 1936.

(e) It will be open to Indian Companies to tender if and when tenders are called for the conveyance of mails between the coastal ports of India and Burma when the present contract expires. As stated in reply to part (a) above there is no bar to the giving of such contracts to Indian Companies.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are there any Indian companies now to which such contracts are given?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have already mentioned one in reply to the Honourable Mr. Bajoria's question: I have said that in regard to this particular contract, it is shared by the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company, which is an Indian Company. In regard to the mails between other coastal ports, I think there are a number of contracts which have been given to Indian Companies. The Bombay Steam Navigation Company is one of them; but if my Honourable friend wants details of these contracts, I am afraid I must ask for notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government accept the policy of giving preference to Indian companies, in order to encourage Indian coastal shipping in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would remind my Honourable friend that the Posts and Telegraphs Department is a commercial department.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that several Indian companies also had put in their tenders last time when the British India Steam Navigation Company was given this contract?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I must ask for notice of that question.

PROMOTION OF SUBORDINATES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

953. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paltwal:** (a) Will Government please state whether senior and lower subordinates of the East Indian Railway are promoted by selection or seniority of the service?

(b) Is it a fact that these promotions have been given sometimes by the seniority of service? If so, why?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Both.

(b) I cannot see what objection my Honourable friend has to seniority of service being taken into consideration in making promotions.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: In view of the fact that some railways do not maintain classified lists of subordinates, how is it possible, when a selection is being made, to ascertain the seniority of these men?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I am not sure that my Honourable friend's assumption in the first part of his question is correct.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I inform the Honourable Member that I have received letters from Agents that that is correct?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: It may not be a question. But it is information badly needed by the Honourable Member.

PROMOTION OF SUBORDINATES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

954. *Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Will Government please state the names of persons who got their promotion on the East Indian Railway during 1933-34 by (i) selection, and (ii) seniority of their service, division by division, with the names of posts to which they have been promoted and the pay they are entitled to get?

(b) Is it a fact that some persons who were promoted on account of seniority of their service were degraded later on? Will Government please state their names and the reason or reasons for the action taken?

(c) Is it also a fact that the claims of some persons who had had officiating chances in higher grades in different capacities, were overlooked when permanent vacancies occurred, and preference was given to their juniors? If so, why?

(d) Will Government please state the names, posts, and the pay of (i) persons who have thus been preferred to their seniors and (ii) those whose claims have been overlooked?

(e) Were the persons who received preference over their seniors selected? If so, by whom, and on what grounds?

(f) Is there any standard prescribed for such selection? If so, what?

(g) Does this standard govern the whole East Indian Railway?

(h) Is there any selection board? If so, who are its members, and how many of them are officers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (e). Government have no information, and do not consider that the expense and labour involved in getting it will be commensurate with any advantage to be obtained from it.

(f) and (g). Selections are made according to merit, due regard being given to seniority and all other relevant considerations.

(h) A Selection Board is called together only when necessary. It is understood that normally senior scale officers compose the Selection Boards.

PASSING OF WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS BY SUBORDINATES IN RAILWAY SERVICES.

955. *Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the subordinates in railway services have to pass written examinations?

(b) Is any record kept of these written examinations, including the numbers obtained by the examinees?

(c) Are the results of these examinations communicated to the examinees?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes, in some cases.

(b) Yes.

(c) Examinees are informed of the results of the examinations. Government are not aware whether the marks obtained by each examinee are communicated to him.

RENT-FREE QUARTERS OR HOUSE RENT FOR TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

956. *Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: Is it a fact that Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors are entitled to rent-free quarters, or house rent, since the introduction of the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway? If so, are they getting these privileges? If not, why not?

Mr. P. B. Rao: The rules with regard to the provision of quarters and the rent recoverable for quarters, when provided, are contained in Chapter II of State Railway Code (Revised), a copy of which is in the Library of the House. If the Honourable Member can give me definite instances of these rules not being observed in respect of any staff on the East Indian Railway, I shall make the necessary enquiries.

EXAMINATION HELD AT CHANDAUSI FOR THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS' COURSE.

957. *Mr. Sri Prakasa (on behalf of Sirdar Jogendra Singh): (a) Is it a fact that recently an examination was held at Chandausi for the selection of candidates for Assistant Station Masters' course?

(b) Are Government aware that while it was advertised in newspapers that applications would be received up to the 4th January, 1935 on forms to be had from the office of the Divisional Superintendent, Moradabad, on payment of a fee of rupee one, but the forms were only issued up to the 28th December?

(c) If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for this arbitrary action contrary to the previous notification and the authority which was responsible for it?

(d) Is it a fact that a large number of applicants who came after the 28th December, 1934, had to go away disappointed and had to suffer unnecessary financial loss and inconvenience for no fault of theirs?

(e) Is it also a fact that it was advertised in the newspapers that only such candidates will be taken as possessed a speed of at least 20 words per minute in telegraphy? If so, will Government be pleased to state if any persons with a lower speed have been selected in preference to those possessing a much higher speed, and the reasons therefor?

(f) Is it a fact that some of the applicants who fulfilled the required condition of speed, were not even called for the test at Chandausi? If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for not doing so and also whether the fee of rupee one realised from them was refunded?

(g) Is it a fact that the applicants were asked to appear before the Selection Board at 11 A.M.; but were not put before it until 2 P.M. and the Selection Board remained sitting till 8 P.M., causing unnecessary hardship and suffering to the applicants?

(h) Will Government be pleased to state how many of the candidates, selected, are relations of railway servants?

(i) Is it a fact that a certain number of candidates were also selected as signallers from amongst the applicants? If so, is it a fact that candidates with lower speed were selected in preference to those possessing a higher speed? If so, why?

(j) Will Government be pleased to state whether they contemplate taking in such candidates as have passed the speed test and were not selected for the next Assistant Station Masters' course?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for information and will place a reply on the table of the House in due course.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY AT THE KASHI AND MOGHULSERAI RAILWAY STATIONS.

958. ***Maulana Shaukat Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that the Electric Supply Company, Benares, have offered to supply electric energy to Kashi Railway Station, East Indian Railway and even to the Moghulserai Railway Station at cheaper rates than it is possible to generate at Moghulserai?

(b) Is it a fact that the East Indian Railway are spending more money on running cables to Kashi and Benares Cantonment Stations when the Supply Company's mains are already in the vicinity at Benares?

(c) What will be the capital expenditure on these cables to Kashi and Benares Cantonment Railway Stations?

(d) Are the railway authorities satisfied that their generative cost with all capital expenditure will be lower than the rate offered by the Supply Company, at Benares?

(e) Is it not a fact that the Moghulserai Railway Power Station was made much too large in the first place and that the extension to the Kashi and Cantonment Stations is an attempt to cover up this mistake?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Government understand that offers have been received but the rates are not cheaper.

(b) Yes. The Administration have found this cheaper.

(c) The estimated capital expenditure on cables from Moghulserai to Kashi is Rs. 81,000 and from Kashi to Benares Rs. 16,000.

(d) Yes.

(e) No. It had the usual provision for future extensions.

The second part of the question does not arise.

ADULTERATED GHEE.

959. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Are Government aware that the practice of selling adulterated ghee has gone beyond all bounds, so much so that it has become impossible to get pure and natural ghee in all cities and towns?

(b) Are Government aware that by means of this adulteration of vegetable with natural ghee, a great economic fraud is practised upon the people, both rich and poor?

(c) Are Government aware that the measures adopted by local bodies have proved ineffective to check this evil?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of finding out some radical remedy, such as giving harmless colour to the vegetable ghee to make it distinguishable from the ordinary ghee for common people?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) to (c). Government have no precise information.

(d) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to parts (a) and (c) of Mr. Sham Lal's starred question No. 149 on the 12th February, 1935.

NON-REPRESENTATION OF NON-MUSLIMS OF THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE IN THE CENTRAL LEGISLATURE.

960. ***Bhai Parma Wand:** (a) Is it a fact that ever since the Montford Reforms were introduced in India, a Hindu, Sikh or any one else from amongst any other minority communities in the North-West Frontier Province has never been nominated either for the Council of State or for the Legislative Assembly, and that a Muslim has always been nominated to represent that province?

(b) Are Government aware of the grievances of the Hindus of the Frontier Province for their non-representation on the Central Legislature ever since the introduction of the Montford Reforms?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The facts are as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) Government have no information.

REDUCTION OF THE INDIAN NON-OFFICIAL ELEMENT IN THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

961. ***Bhai Parma Wand:** (a) Will Government please state why the Indian unofficial element in New Delhi Municipal Committee was reduced from five to three in 1932, during these days of reform?

(b) Are Government now prepared to increase this number?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to part (c) of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's starred question No. 67 on the 6th September, 1932.

(b) The constitution of the New Delhi Municipal Committee is under consideration.

UNDER-REPRESENTATION OF HINDUS IN THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

962. ***Bhai Parma Wand:** (a) Is it a fact that according to the last census the population in New Delhi is as follows:

	Hindus.	Sikhs.	Muslims.	Non-official Europeans.
about	40,000	2,500	12,000	2,200

(b) Will Government please state why there is an under-representation of Hindus in the New Delhi Municipal Committee, as compared with other communities, as, for about 40,000 Hindus, there is one representative, L. Jagdish Prasad, for about 2,500 Sikhs a representative, Sardar

Bahadur Sardar Sobha Singh, for about 12,000 Muslims a representative, Khan Bahadur Ch. Akbar Ali, and for about 2,200 non-official Europeans a representative, Mr. Bloomfield?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to his starred question No. 900 on the 23rd March, 1933.

**POPULATION OF HINDUS AND MUSLIMS AND THE POLICE FORCE IN
NEW DELHI.**

968. ***Bhai Parma Hand:** (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing separately the total population of Hindus and Muslims in the Delhi Province?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing separately the number of Hindus and Muslims working as:

1. Constables,
2. Head Constables,
3. Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors of Police,
4. Inspectors, and
5. Deputy Superintendent of Police.

in the Delhi Province?

(c) If the Police force is not according to the proportion of the population of these two communities, are Government prepared to take steps to remove this defect?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The total population of Hindus and Muslims in the Delhi Province is:

Hindus.—405,849; Muslims.—206,960.

(b) The numbers of Hindus and Muslims in the various ranks of the Delhi Police are:

1		2		3		4		5	
Constables.		Head Constables.		Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors.		Inspectors.		Deputy Superintendents.	
Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.
662	908	85	121	27	39	3	2	...	2

(c) Officers of the rank of Assistant Sub-Inspectors and above are obtained on loan from the Government of the Punjab and no question of communal representation arises in their case. As regards Constables and Head Constables, who are recruited locally, Government are unable to accept the position that recruitment should be determined by the population ratio of the communities in the Province.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

LABOUR AND SOCIALIST ORGANISATIONS IN CALCUTTA DECLARED UNLAWFUL.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) Are Government aware that 13 labour and socialist organisations in Calcutta have been declared unlawful bodies, including organisations like the All India Trade Union Congress, Port and Dock Workers' Union and the Railway Workers' Union?

(b) What is a Communist organisation according to Government?

(c) Are all labour and peasant organisations Communist organisations? Or, are only some of them? If the latter, which?

(d) Are even trade union organisations Communist organisations? Or, are only some of them? If the latter, which?

(e) What are the reasons for declaring the 13 organisations unlawful?

(f) Will the arrested persons be put on trial in the ordinary public courts?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes. The statements which have appeared in the Press are correct.

(b), (c) and (d). As it is not possible to compress into an oral reply a full statement of the policy adopted by the Government of India and the Local Governments for dealing with communist organisations, the reasons underlying it and the action taken in pursuance of that policy, I lay a statement on the table which answers the points raised in these questions. Local Governments have taken no action against *bona fide* labour organisations or *bona fide* trade unions.

(e) The notification of the Government of Bengal declaring certain associations and unions unlawful has been issued because of their revolutionary activities and because of their advocacy of the programme and methods of the Communist International and the Communist Party of India. They have been organised by Communist agitators and have generally during recent months been advocating the overthrow of the established Government and economic system in India by means of meetings and demonstrations at which Communist slogans have been shouted; Communist emblems displayed and revolutionary speeches delivered; pamphlets have also been distributed of a most inflammatory nature, advocating militant action. I may quote an example. On the 21st July, 1934, after Mr. Gandhi had addressed a public meeting at Deshbandhu Park in Calcutta, a procession arrived and a large crowd collected to whom leaflets, issued by the Calcutta Committee of the Communist Party of India, were distributed which said that "The masses of the country were being prepared for armed revolution. The Communist Party sought to bring about the destruction of the British Government and the Capitalists by means of armed revolution". It concluded with the words "Down with Gandhism. Destroy the British Raj. Join the Communist Party. Be prepared for armed revolution". The true character of the banned associations was displayed on the 10th of March, 1935, in demonstrations staged to protest against ban; at this violent speeches of an uncompromising and militant communist character were delivered by leaders. Local Government are in no way attacking genuine labour unions but only such as utilise cloak of labour to spread subversive propaganda of communist type and are led by avowed communists many of whom have

already been convicted in substantive cases. They are willing to consider lifting the ban from associations abandoning such propaganda and eliminating communist personnel. Of 13 associations declared unlawful by the Government of Bengal only three are registered trades unions and that there are altogether 52 other registered unions now operating in Bengal.

(f) It is understood that the persons arrested have been released. Whether any prosecutions will be instituted is a matter for the decision of the Local Government.

Statement regarding the policy of the Government of India and local Governments in regard to "Communist" organisations, the reasons for it and the action taken in pursuance of it.

On the 23rd of July, 1934, the Government of India declared the Communist Party of India, its Committees, Sub-Committees and Branches to be unlawful associations under the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 on the ground that they had for their object interference with the administration of the law and the maintenance of law and order and constituted a danger to the public peace. The reasons for this action were explained in detail in the reply given by the Honourable the Home Member to a question by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 14th of August, 1934. Briefly the reasons were that it had been held judicially by the Allahabad High Court in the Meerut case that the Communist Party of India aimed at the violent overthrow of the present order of society and bringing about the independence of India by means of armed revolution and sought to secure this object by means of mass action, strikes, demonstrations, etc., culminating in a general strike and an armed insurrection. In amplification of that statement, it is desirable to quote certain extracts from the Draft Platform of Action which first appeared in December, 1930, in the "International Press Correspondence", the official organ of the Communist International and copies of which were circulated at the Karachi Congress in March 1931. It contained, for example, the following :

"In its struggle to win leadership of the masses, the Communist Party of India calls upon its supporters to make resolute use of any legal and semi-legal opportunity for public action and mobilisation of the masses around working class slogans. On every occasion they must expose the treacherous part played by the National Congress. As one of the practical means of explaining to the toiling masses the exploiting and treacherous policy of the Congress Leaders, the Communist Party of India recommends to its supporters to make use of their activity in the trade unions, municipal councils and similar institutions. The Communist Party of India calls upon its supporters and organisations to develop mass revolutionary activities and struggle of the working class for their political and economic demands, mass refusal by the peasants to pay taxes, levies, rents, debts, particularly in districts where there are large landed estates, thereby mobilising and preparing the mass of the toilers for revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The Communist Party of India deems it essential to organise mass trade unions based on factory committees, with the leadership elected directly by the workers and consisting of advanced revolutionary workers. The trade unions must become regularly functioning mass organisations, working in the spirit of the class struggle. The Communist Party of India works for the transformation of the All-India Trade Union Congress into a fighting All-India centre of the labour movement on a class basis."

In regard to the peasants, the draft platform stated that :

"In order to disorganise British rule and maintain revolutionary pressure against it, the Communist Party of India calls upon the peasantry and agricultural proletariat to engage in all kinds of political demonstrations, and collective refusal to pay taxes and dues. The Communist Party of India calls for refusal to pay debts and arrears to government, the landlords and the money-lenders in any form whatsoever."

"The Communist Party of India calls upon the revolutionary working class youth to build up the Young Communist League. The Communist Party of India calls for the country wide organization both of mixed and of separate

workers, peasants and students' detachments, both to defend the people's demonstrations, strikes, etc., and in order to make systematic preparations for the armed struggle of the Indian people."

Government had evidence to show that attempts were being made by Communists in various parts of India to carry this programme into effect and that as in other countries such as the United States of America they were endeavouring to secure control over workers organisations to create thereby revolutionary organisations of workers which would control *bona fide* labour organisations. They were also attempting to inculcate revolutionary and communist ideas into the peasants in particular in the Punjab, were starting Youth Workers Leagues, e.g., in Madras and Bombay, and in industrial centres in Bombay and Calcutta were endeavouring to obtain control over trade unions or to start communist unions.

In view of these facts Government recognised the necessity of taking action not only against the Communist Party of India but also against subsidiary organisations which were working in support of its programme and adopting the methods which it had suggested.

The Punjab Government, therefore, on September 10th, 1934, declared unlawful five associations. These included the Anti-Imperialist League and the Punjab Kirti Kisan party, which had recently become active and were trying to secure control over all communist activity in the province and to spread communist ideas in the villages. Thus the Amritsar Kirti Kisan Sabha which was also declared unlawful had organised two propaganda tours in the villages in that district and was about to organise a third when the notification was issued. As soon as the notification was issued, a search was made of the offices of each body, but it was not found necessary to take any further action or to institute prosecutions, for all five associations subsequently declared themselves to be dissolved and have ceased to function.

In Madras the local Government on the 20th November, 1934, declared unlawful the Young Workers League which had as its published object the overthrow of British imperialism and its Allies by mass action. This association had been organised by a Communist about whom the following finding was recorded in a criminal case:

"There can be no doubt from the evidence on record that he has imbibed all the doctrines of the Communist International and that he came to Madras—the evidence leaves little doubt—to spread the doctrine of Communism in its worst form, having discovered here a virgin soil where he believed the seeds would sprout with rapidity and vigour."

There was also reason to believe that this League which was in no sense a *bona fide* trade union of labour organisation was in touch with the Communist International.

In November the Government of Bombay took similar action against five associations and published a communique on November 8th, 1934, from which the following is an extract:

"The Communist Party of India is known to work through a number of local organisations and the Government of Bombay have considered it desirable that the action taken against the Communist Party of India should be carried into effect against bodies which are locally active in fomenting unrest in pursuance of the ultimate object of the party. A full examination by Government of the record of each of these five associations has established that none of them is a genuine labour organisation, that they are all wholly controlled by communist and that they have been actively furthering the objects of the Communist Party of India."

Finally the Government of Bengal for the reasons given in the oral reply to Pandit Nilakantha Das' question No. 1669 have taken action against 13 associations which are under the control of local Communist agitators.

This account of the action taken by local Governments shows clearly that no action has been taken against *bona fide* trade unions or labour organisation, but only against those which are working in support of the objects of, and adopting the methods recommended by, the Communist International. That the activities of Communists are resented by many *bona fide* labour workers is shown by the following statement issued by a Railway Workers Union which took steps to expel the Communists from their Union:

"We now come to realise that these organisers are not primarily interested in the immediate work of the genuine Trade Union Movement. Belonging as

they do to the Communist school of thought and openly professing the Communist philosophy involving an undisguised preaching of violence they were primarily interested in exploiting the Union for their specific objective. We find them giving the slogan of a political general strike in season and out of season, when we definitely know that the workers in their present disorganised condition cannot be effectively mobbed to a strike even for their own economic demands."

Their activities in India are similar to those in other countries and an interesting account of their activities in the United States of America and of the resentment felt against them by *bona fide* labour workers will be found in a book entitled "Reports on Communist Propaganda in America as submitted to the United States Government by William Green, President American Federation of Labor". The following pertinent statement may be quoted :

"Wherever communists can gain a foothold in trade unions they seek to capture those unions. Where they cannot get a foothold in existing unions they seek to organize new unions. In practically all of the basic industries strictly communist labour organizations have been created. These organizations do not enter into agreement with their employees, except in rare cases where agreement is meant to serve as subterfuge. The purpose of communist labor organizations is not to safeguard and improve the present order but to undermine it and destroy it.

No authority knows or possibly ever will know in what direction the communist effort will extend next or at what hour the communist high command will consider it expedient to launch into the field of open violence.

We know that we see a constant revolutionary menace."

The action taken by the Government of India and by local Governments with their full approval will, it is hoped, tend to hamper the work of communist agitators, prevent the spread among the uneducated working classes and the uneducated cultivators of revolutionary communist ideas and that by so doing the growth of *bona fide* labour organisations working for the good of the workers.

Prof. W. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Labour Organisers of a particular Railwaymen's Union have applied to the Government of Bengal to appoint a Conciliation Board to settle the disputes between the R. S. N. Company and the I. G. N. and Railway Companies, and is it not a fact that the Government of Bengal on receipt of this particular application must have realised that this particular organisation cannot be a communist organisation, but that it is a real, genuine labour organisation?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I should require notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are all these organisations equally guilty of the acts which the Honourable the Home Member mentioned in his long statement?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think it is not possible for me to say that all of them are equally guilty, but they are guilty.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the overt acts alleged against every one of these organisations, such as to make the Government believe them to be of a revolutionary character?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Some of them have been deliberately secret acts.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the overt acts which any of these organisations have been found to be responsible for?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already quoted one where they distributed highly revolutionary and inflammatory leaflets at a public meeting.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Which organisation was responsible for that leaflet and its distribution?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Calcutta Committee of the Communist Party of India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable the Home Member aware of the fact that the *Indian Masdoor*, a weekly paper, is being published by the All-India Trade Union Congress?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I am not aware of it. I don't see any connection with it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the *Indian Masdoor*, which cannot be considered a Communist organ, is being published by the All-India Trade Union Congress?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already said that I am not aware of that publication.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are any of these organisations connected with, or affiliated to the Calcutta Communist Organisation?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, but I do not know whether they are ostensibly affiliated to it, but they certainly pursue the objects which the Communist Party of India have in view.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government punishing the holding of opinions of a Communist nature, or are they taking action only against overt acts advocating revolution?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Broadly speaking, they are taking action against acts or speeches or propaganda in favour of a violent revolution.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that the Government are not punishing people or bodies for holding opinions, even though they may be of a Communist character?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Holding an opinion of a Communist character is not an offence, so far as I am aware.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know, Sir. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Short Notice question, Mr. Richards.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is a very important question, and I want to put some more supplementaries.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Mr. Richards. Short Notice question.

REVISION OF BASIC QUOTAS ALLOTTED TO BURMA UNDER THE RUBBER RESTRICTION SCHEMES.

Mr. W. J. O. Richards: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they received from the Burma Rubber Licensing Committee last November a request to ask the International Rubber Regulation Committee to increase Burma's basic quota?

(b) If so, have Government supported the request and made representations in the proper quarter?

(c) Do Government propose publishing the reasons for an increased quota put forward by the Burma Rubber Licensing Committee?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) No, Sir.

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN RICE, PADDY AND BROKEN RICE INTO INDIA.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) Will Government state whether they are aware:

(i) that the accounts relating to the sea-borne trade of British India supplies only the statistics of 'rice not in the husk'; and

(ii) that separate statistics are not given for paddy and broken rice?

(b) Will Government please state from which accounts they were able to know the quantity of broken rice imports?

(c) What is the exact value and amount of imports of foreign rice, paddy and broken rice, respectively, from the years 1930 up to date?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) (i) and (ii). In the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India, statistics relating to 'rice in the husk' and 'rice not in the husk' are shown separately. Statistics of broken rice are not shown separately.

(b) Special statistics have been maintained from August, 1934, from information available in the Custom Houses.

(c) I lay on the table a statement giving the information as far as available.

Statement showing imports of 'rice in the husk', 'rice not in the husk' and of broken rice in India from 1930 onwards.

Year.	Rice in the husk.		Rice not in the husk		Broken rice.	
	Quantity	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Tons.	Rs.	Tons.	Rs.	Tons.	Rs.
1929-30 . .	725	1,06,605	5,635	8,04,950	} Not available.	
1930-31 . .	1,571	1,23,744	7,445	7,97,724		
1931-32 . .	9,042	5,71,036	17,931	16,19,897		
1932-33 . .	11	697	35,510	31,10,087		
1933-34 . .	4,381	2,24,178	84,624	48,99,373		
1934-35 . .	106,172	not available.	226,447	not available.	}	
(nine months April—December). August 1934 to January 1935.		122,846 87,27,482

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that the statistics that they get is only from the invoices received of the goods imported?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not aware of the data from which those figures were compiled, but those are the figures supplied to us by the Customs House officers.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the Government of India deputed any special officer to prepare this special statistics for the imports of broken rice?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: No. The information is supplied by the Customs House officers.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the fact that this will be an important factor in discussing the Bill that is coming on very shortly, will Government call for information as to how they are able to distinguish broken rice from whole rice, and will they circulate that to Members of this House?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Will my Honourable friend repeat the question?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the importance of the question in discussing the Bill which is coming off very shortly, will Government call for information as to how the statistics of broken rice is got separately by the Customs House officers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I shall try to obtain the information.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will my Honourable friend also circulate it to Members?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not prepared to undertake to circulate it to Honourable Members, because I do not know when I shall receive the information. But I shall certainly deal with it when I am referring to the matter in the course of my speech.

RESTRICTION OF INDIAN IMPORTS INTO ITALY, ETC.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) Will Government state whether they are aware that the Italian Government have ordered that during the year 1935, Italian importers will not be allowed to import from India more than 30 per cent. of the goods imported in 1934?

(b) Is the action of the Italian Government due to the fall of our trade with Italy owing to the Ottawa Agreement?

(c) What is the amount of trade that this action of the Italian Government will affect?

(d) Are Government aware that the Italian Government have put a ban upon Indian Insurance Companies from doing business in Italy?

(e) What action have Government taken in these matters?

(f) If no action has yet been taken, what action do Government propose to take?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) The Government of India are informed that the Italian Government have for the period 16th February to 31st March, 1935, restricted the imports into Italy of practically all commodities to about 25 per cent. of the imports for the corresponding period of 1934. It is not known what degree of restriction will be imposed after 31st of March.

(b) No. The object of the restriction, which is not directed against India alone, is, in the words of the official decree, to ensure a fair equilibrium between imports and the means for their payment abroad.

(c) India's export trade to Italy in the year 1933-34 amounted to 5½ crores of rupees.

(d) No. Government have been informed that one Indian insurance company has experienced difficulty in setting up business in Italy, but in the absence of any precise information as to what was the nature of the difficulties experienced, it has not been possible to make any representations on the subject.

(e) and (f). The Government of India have already entered an energetic protest against the recently imposed restrictions and on receipt of a reply from the Italian Government, they will consider what further action should be taken.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that there was a recent Anglo-Italian Agreement which was published a few days ago in the papers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Yes.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the Honourable Member aware that the Anglo-Italian Agreement stipulates that about 80 per cent. of the British exports will be allowed into Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I believe that is correct.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: If that is the case, is it the proposal to make India a pawn in this matter, so that England may strike a better bargain?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: No. We are in direct communication with the Italian Government on this question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Have the Government of India power to approach directly the Italian Government for a trade treaty?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Not directly, Sir, but we have made our own representations through the British Government which is the channel through which we have to approach a foreign country.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When were the negotiations started?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Which negotiations?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: About this prohibition.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: Directly after we received authentic information in regard to the restriction.

Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that there are reports in the papers of insurance companies being banned?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: We have had no authentic information. We have only heard that one insurance company experienced certain difficulties. That insurance company has not thought fit to place before us a full statement of the difficulties which it has experienced.

Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Chettiar: Am I to understand that, if Indian nationals experience difficulties in the matter of trade and commerce in other countries, they should represent matters to the Indian Government and then only the Indian Government will take action?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: My Honourable friend must surely realise that we cannot take action unless a full statement is made to us, so that we may be in a position to see whether a case does or does not exist for representation to the foreign country concerned.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The Honourable Member just said that the ban placed by the Italian Government was against imports from all parts of the world, which is correct. But since that ban was placed, an agreement has been entered into, as the Honourable Member has admitted, between Great Britain and Italy. Why is it, then, may I ask, that it takes so long for the Government of India to negotiate with the Government of Italy for better terms when Great Britain has succeeded already in obtaining a concession as compared with the original quota?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: My Honourable friend must address that question to the Italian Government.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Member why I should address that question to the Italian Government and not to my own Government and why I should not ask for an explanation as to why it takes longer for our Government to negotiate with the Italian Government than it takes the Government of Great Britain?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: For the simple reason that the Government of India do not control the actions of the Italian Government.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do Government possess the necessary power to take immediately retaliatory action in the event of their representations being met with a flat refusal?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: I am not prepared to say what power the Government of India have in that behalf. I shall need to go into the matter much more carefully.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do not the Government of India consider it necessary to arm themselves with such powers, in view of the fact that so many countries, such as Persia, Turkey, Italy, are, on account of financial and currency troubles, imposing severe restrictions against imports from this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. H. P. Mody: This is not a matter of opinion. My question was this. Many countries are imposing restrictions, may be of a general character, but certainly against India, and do not the Government of India think it necessary, in view of this, to arm themselves with the necessary powers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend must realise that if it became necessary for us to secure an even balance with another country, we should probably have the power to effect that, but the position of India being what it is, namely, that she must have a favourable balance of trade, it acts somewhat as a handicap in our negotiations with other Governments.

Mr. H. P. Mody: The position with regard to Persia is identical with what my Honourable friend has just now said; the balance of trade is largely against India, and what action has been taken in this case?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think I have said in reply to a supplementary question that we were in communication with commercial opinion on that point.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is it not a fact that the Government of India are not as well placed as the Government of Great Britain in negotiating such terms?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: If my Honourable friend means to say that the machinery which we have to adopt is somewhat cumbrous, that is so. We have to go through London and then through Rome.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In questions of urgency, will the Honourable Member consider a better method of communication?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: What is the better method?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Of going direct.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Surely, my Honourable friend knows that we have not the power to negotiate direct with a foreign Government.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: But since the matter is urgent and other countries are taking advantage of their powers of communicating direct, will the Honourable Member consider contingencies of the sort arising in the future, so that he or his successor may be in a better position to negotiate than he is today?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: It does not lie in the Honourable Member's power to do so, but no avoidable delay has been allowed to occur so far as we are concerned, because action has been taken by telegram.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is it not a fact that another country, namely, Great Britain, has been able to get further concessions while the Government of India are still negotiating?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think my Honourable friend already knows the answer.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What is the reason for that?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The reason for that has already been explained.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The only explanation that the Honourable Member has given is that the Government of Italy are responsible. Is it not a fact that the Government of India are responsible?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: No, Sir, the Government of India are not responsible.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Can the Government of India, by executive action, restrict the imports from Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I believe, we can.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do the Government of India consider it desirable to do so?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: That is a very different matter. That raises larger questions of policy, and I am not prepared to give an answer to that straightaway.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When did you have information about it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: We had information in the first instance by telegram from our Trade Commissioner in Milan, but we had to wait until by Air Mail we received details and the moment we received details a telegraphic protest was launched.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When did you receive the telegram?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I cannot give you the dates.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that on the first April next these restrictions will be imposed on Indian imports?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Chettias: Is it against the public interest to give the date of the telegram?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: No. If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will give a reply in due course.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: In view of what has already been stated on the floor of the House, will the Honourable Member obtain his freedom from London and be in a position to deal directly with the Government of Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: I do not see how we can free ourselves from the constitutional position as it exists at the present moment.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What I want to know is this. I do not want to change the constitutional position. Would the Government of India make any effort in order to be able to deal with this question direct, and be free to do so by getting the sanction of the Secretary of State for India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: Personally I do not think that such a course is possible, but I shall certainly consider it.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FIRING AT KARACHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of a motion for adjournment of the business of the Assembly from Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur. I want to know whether the Honourable Member wishes to move his motion?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): Sir, before I express an opinion on it, I want to ascertain from you if you will permit me to move it tomorrow, as there is another adjournment motion today which is of greater importance than this.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is whether the Honourable Member wishes to move his motion today?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: I do not propose to move it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is another motion for adjournment which stands in the name of Mr. Gauba. The notice I have received is that the Honourable Member proposes to ask for leave to move a motion for adjournment of the business of the House today for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance as follows: the firing resorted to by the police at Karachi on the 19th instant. I want to know whether any Honourable Member takes objection.

(No objection was taken.)

As no objection is taken, the motion will be taken up at 4 o'clock.

ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, for the financial year 1935-36, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of a Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly not exceeding fourteen in number, to which shall be added a Member of the Assembly to be nominated by the Governor General. The member so nominated shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

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

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, for the financial year 1935-36, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of a Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly not exceeding fourteen in number, to which shall be added a Member of the Assembly to be nominated by the Governor General. The member so nominated shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE COURT OF THE DELHI UNIVERSITY.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I move:

"That the elected Members of this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, four persons from among their own numbers to be members of the Court of the University of Delhi in pursuance of sub-clause (5) of statute 2 of the First Statutes of the University set out in the schedule to the Delhi University Act, 1922 (VIII of 1922)."

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

"That the elected Members of this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, four persons from among their own numbers to be members of the Court of the University of Delhi in pursuance of sub-clause (5) of statute 2 of the First Statutes of the University set out in the schedule to the Delhi University Act, 1922 (VIII of 1922)."

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1935, vice Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

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

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1935, vice Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division : Muhammadan) : Sir, the appointment of an Honourable Member of this House to represent this House at the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, has not received the attention in the past that it deserves. The Honourable Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad was elected for the last term, but he was not given an opportunity to sit at the meeting of the Council. The last meeting, which was a very important one, was announced to be held on the 23rd July, 1934. Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, our elected representative, at once wrote to the Director that the Assembly was sitting on the 23rd July, and, therefore, the meeting might be held a week earlier. No reply was received from the Director as to why they did not listen to his simple request, and hence he tendered his resignation to the Secretary of the Education Department, as I have been told by 'r. Ziauddin, and he sent one copy of his resignation to the Director of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore. Now they treated it with scant courtesy. Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad was, I am told, consulted on this question by the Government, but no step was taken after that for ensuring that the future meetings of the Council will be held at a time when the representative of this House will have the opportunity to attend. Over and above that, Sir, I have been informed that the Director is dealing with the properties and funds of the Institute in a manner which requires a strict scrutiny. There have been complaints against the Director, and a representation, I am told, has been made to His Excellency the Governor General—I do not know how far it is correct, but I have been supplied with a copy. Some of the members of the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, made that representation, in paragraph 2 of which they said :

"That your petitioners beg to approach Your Excellency under Regulation 32, page 13, of the Institute, with the present requisition for inquiring, by means of a special committee appointed for the purpose, into the working of the Institute for the past two years."

I shall not tire the House by reading the whole of it. It is a long one and there are a series of grievances of professors and others on the staff of the Institute which *prima facie* goes to show that there is something wrong with the management of the Institute. Now, unless we are assured that the Director will regard the appointment of a Member of this House with some attention and will facilitate his attendance at the meetings of the Council, there is no use making an election of a Member of this House. It is really a disgrace to the Member who is appointed and who is not listened to by the Director in small matters, as I have just now narrated.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai : Sir, I do not think I ought to detain the House very long. Two points have been raised. First, as regards the alleged indifference of the Director in the matter of fixing dates for the meetings of the Council. The position as regards that is that under the bye-laws of the Institute, which have been framed with the approval of the Governor General in Council, dates are fixed in the following manner. Ordinary meetings of the Council shall usually be held on the third Monday in the months of July, November and March. Now, Sir, ordinarily, the Assembly does not meet in the month of July or in the month of November, though it is in Session in the month of March. Last year, as you are aware, for very special reasons, there was a meeting of the Assembly in July, and that was the reason why the Regulation being what it is, it was not

possible for the Director to meet the convenience of the Honourable Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad in this respect. His hands are tied by the bye-law to which I have referred. But I can assure my Honourable friend that I shall take up with the Director this question of trying to adjust the meetings of the Council so far as possible to the convenience of Honourable Members of this House, because it is obviously our desire that the representative of the House shall be an effective representative, and not merely a ceremonial or nominal representative. Then, Sir, my Honourable friend said something as regards complaints which had been made against the Director. He read out from a memorial which he said had been addressed to the Governor General in Council. I can assure my Honourable friend that no such memorial has yet reached the Governor General in Council. If a memorial reaches the Governor General in Council, the Governor General in Council will, as he is required by the terms of the regulation—I need not read it out—take it into consideration; but there is one point I should like to lay before the House for consideration. This is the first time in the history of the Institute that an Indian has been appointed to the position of Director. That Indian is a man who is eminent in the world of science—Sir C. V. Raman, who is the holder of a Nobel prize and I think of every conceivable distinction that it is open to any scientist to secure. (Applause.) I submit that it is not right that any Honourable Member of this House should pay any attention to complaints made against a person of that distinction; I think that this matter ought really to be left to the Governor General in Council to be dealt with in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Regulation. (Hear, hear.)

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

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1936, *vide* Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform Honourable Members that for the purpose of election of members to the Standing Finance Committee for the financial year 1935-36, the Court of the University of Delhi and the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, the Notice Office will be open to receive nominations for all the Committees upto 12 Noon on Saturday, the 23rd March, 1935, and that the elections, if necessary, will be held on the following dates, namely:

1. Standing Finance Committee, 1935-36, 25th March 1935
2. Court of the University of Delhi, 25th March, 1935.
3. Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, 26th March, 1935.

The elections to the Committees which will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote will, as usual, be held in the Secretary's Room from 10-30 A.M. to 1 P.M. on each day appointed for the purpose.

[Mr. President.]

As regards the agenda, the Chair is informed that certain Honourable Members feel that the interposition of the Demands for Supplementary Grants, while the consideration of the Finance Bill is still continuing, is likely to cause inconvenience. The Chair consulted the Leader of the House and the Honourable the Finance Member as well as the Honourable Member representing the Congress Group whether it would not be more convenient if the consideration of the Finance Bill was continued uninterrupted until it was finished. There seems to be an agreement that that would be the most convenient course. In the ordinary course, it is expected that the consideration of the Finance Bill will be concluded by at least tomorrow, because the Supplementary Demands are also of an urgent nature, and they must be disposed of before a particular date of this month, and so also the Finance Bill. That, the Chair understands, is the course to which the Government also agree and it will perhaps suit the Honourable Members.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member): If I may make a statement, that is exactly what happened in Mr. President's Chambers, and there is no reason why the House should not know what was arranged there.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, we cannot follow what is going on there.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member will listen, he will be able to follow.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): When my Honourable Colleague, Sir James Grigg, and myself and my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, representing his Party, met today in the Chambers of the Honourable the President to find out if we can come to an agreement, what was discussed was that so far as the Government are concerned, they have no objection to the discussions being continued, namely, that the motion for the consideration of the Finance Bill be finished before the Demands for Supplementary Grants are taken up. We wanted to know from my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, whether, having regard to the urgency of the matter, we could depend on their support for closure if it be necessary not today but tomorrow at the end of the day. I gathered that my Honourable friend would give me some information but probably as they are in some disturbed condition over the unfortunate illness of Mr. Sherwani, I have not got that information. But if I may assume that I can at least get the support of my Honourable friend and his Party tomorrow in the afternoon as regards putting an end to this motion for consideration of the Finance Bill, then I can say that we have no objection to this change being made and to the discussion being continued where it had been left and the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill be finished and disposed of before the Supplementary Grants are taken up. That is exactly what I understood and still abide by that arrangement.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair takes it that that is an arrangement which commends itself to the entire House.

(No objection was taken.)

Then the discussion on the motion to consider the Finance Bill will be resumed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Mr. President, it is rather unfortunate that six days should have intervened between the last discussion on the Finance Bill and today, and it is a little difficult to recapture the atmosphere of that discussion. But, I will do my best under the circumstances. I take it that this motion gives this House an opportunity of exercising its constitutional right, to the extent to which it is vested in it, of refusing supplies before grievances are redressed. I propose, in the course of my remarks, to try and satisfy this Honourable House that, both on the merits of the Finance Bill and on the standing grievances in this country which are still unredressed, this Finance Bill does not deserve the support of this Honourable House. The Honourable the Finance Member referred in his speech to the fact and stated that the English practice of dealing with two years was better than our practice of dealing with three years. I agree with him, but there is one respect, I think, in which we are better. Our income and expenditure estimates are prepared and are presented together, so that this House knows exactly how much revenue is sought to be raised, and how that revenue is being proposed to be spent, and on what purposes; and I trust this wholesome practice will continue.

We have, Sir, a Standing Committee on Finance in this House. However, it is not a Statutory Committee and it has not a right of audience as such before this House. It is, at best, a committee which advises the Finance Department. I suggest that this Committee should have its powers and duties considerably enlarged, and a permanent officer should be attached to this Committee, so that this Committee may be able to perform its functions very effectively. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, however much we may economically use the time available to this House during the general budget discussion and the Finance Bill, we cannot exercise that meticulous and pervasive control, which it is the right and the privilege of this House to exercise over income and expenditure, and, I think, therefore, that these suggestions deserve the consideration of the Honourable the Finance Member.

Under the Government of India Act, the Governor General is authorised to allot not more than 15 days for the voting of demands, on the Railway and the General Budgets. As it is, we get only 12 days. Why do we not get all the 15 days we are entitled to? That, I think, will add to the privileges of this House. We shall be able to discuss more demands for grants. I may also suggest that the time set apart for general discussion at least on the General Budget may well be scrapped and set apart as time for the voting on demands for grants. As it is, we have a general discussion on the Finance Bill, and a general discussion on the General Budget. If we get, on the whole, eight or nine days for the voting on demands for grants, I submit it will be very much more satisfactory.

The Honourable Sir James Gifford (Finance Member): May I just make an interruption? Is it the idea of the Honourable Member that the Standing Finance Committee should undertake a serious and exhaustive investigation of a few of the grants or a selection of the grants and then submit to the House materials and ask it to consider them seriously and in a detailed manner and the rest of the grants may come automatically under the guillotine? Is that his suggestion?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No, Sir. I was speaking of the time allotted to this House for the voting on demands for grants. I was suggesting that we should get the full 15 days provided in the Government of India Act, and not the 12 days as we now get and, secondly, that the time set apart for the general discussion on the General Budget at least should be set apart for the voting of demands for grants, as we get an opportunity of a general discussion on the Finance Bill as such. I also suggest that we should get time allotted for each demand. In the Madras Legislative Council, we get two hours or four hours for each demand. It, therefore, enables the House to go forward according to the time table.

Coming to the actual financial position of the Government of India as exhibited by the Budget and by the Finance Bill, I want to present to this House a few striking facts. The total net revenue is estimated at 77 crores, 28 lakhs. This is spent as follows:

Interest on debt, 10 crores 39 lakhs.

For the reduction or avoidance of debt, 3 crores.

For defence expenditure, 44.98 or 45 crores.

Thus this total is 58 crores 87 lakhs. For other expenditure charged to revenue, it is 16 crores 82 lakhs. Well, Sir, that figure is deceptive, because in that figure are included the following items, ecclesiastical, 81 lakhs, political, one crore and 41 lakhs, watch and ward, 2 crores and 6 lakhs, making a total of three crores and 78 lakhs. Thus, more than 62 crores out of a revenue of 77 crores 28 lakhs are spent on purposes which, although in the picturesque language of the Honourable the Finance Member may be called self-preservation expenditure, are certainly not nation building expenditure. We then get roughly ten to twelve crores for the other expenditure of the Government of India.

In his speech introducing the Finance Bill, the Honourable the Finance Member controverted our statement and said that, taking the Central and the Provincial Governments expenditure together, they are between them spending roughly as much as the Government of India spends on defence expenditure. Well, Sir, assuming that that fact is correct, I would respectfully ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether he is satisfied with the total expenditure, on about 220 millions of people, for all their elemental needs of education, sanitation, public health, medical relief, agriculture and industrial improvement, of less than 45 crores?

On this matter I have the high authority of Sir Walter Layton, I hope the Honourable the Finance Member will not question it, because I read the other day that there are only three free traders still left in the British Empire, and they are Sir Walter Layton, Lord Snowden and Sir James Grigg. Lord Snowden is no longer in power, Sir Walter Layton is not in power, but unfortunately for us Sir James Grigg is in office and in power. But let us see what Sir Walter Layton says on this aspect to which the Honourable the Finance Member referred:

"On the expenditure side, debt absorbs 15 crores, defence, 55 crores,"

—that was in 1930, but now it is of course 44 crores.—

"Law and order, and justice 21 crores, general civil administration 27 crores, pensions 7 crores; and, as against that, education throughout India gets about 15 crores, health and medical services 6½ crores, agriculture and industry 2½ crores and the expenditure on civil works amounts to 14 crores."

That is so far as national expenditure throughout the country is concerned.

Comparing this with the expenditure in other countries, may I draw the attention of this House to these striking facts? The total public expenditure on social services in Great Britain, after war pensions are excluded, increased from £22,600,000 in 1891 to £388,500,000 in 1925. In that year, this expenditure made up about one-eleventh of the national income. The public expenditure in Germany on social welfare and housing alone increased from ten per cent. of the total expenditure in 1918-14 to 25 per cent. in 1928-29. In the Netherlands, it was 32·4 per cent. in 1930, in France it rose to 23 per cent. in 1930. I think these figures are fairly striking and the Honourable the Finance Member may well pause a bit and ask himself the question whether he has proved to his own satisfaction that our expenditure on nation building departments is anything up to what is accepted by all civilised countries as a reasonable standard.

Coming to the income side, there are equally striking figures. Our customs revenue is responsible for 51·84 crores; income-tax, which is probably the only direct tax in this country, gets us 16 crores 40 lakhs, and salt, a tax to which the Congress is definitely opposed and which it will take every step in its power to abolish or radically reduce the moment it gets power, gives us eight crores 78 lakhs. These three taxes between them give you practically the whole of the Central Government revenues amounting to 76 crores 97 lakhs. Incidentally I would like to draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member, if I may, to the fact that the cost of collection is going up from three crores in 1921 to three crores 66 lakhs in 1935-36. I may add that in 1932-33, the total revenue of 79·91 lakhs, that is roughly 80 crores was collected, with an expenditure of three crores and 77 lakhs.

I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member, of course, he deprecates plans, but I hope he does not deprecate looking into the future, for, after all, he has got to be here for another three and half years, and, if the Federation comes in the meantime, he may be replaced by a Finance Minister, but even then he may continue as the Financial Adviser or a super-Finance Member which the Government of India Act contemplates.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Not, if I can help it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am glad to hear it. Now, Sir, let us take a few of these sources of revenue. Taking the customs revenue on imports, I suggest that a part of it is collected by taxes on the vices of the people, major and minor. Our import duties on spirits, wines, and liquors give us two crores, tobacco gives us one crore and 20 lakhs.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is not a vice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is a minor vice.

An Honourable Member: It is the mother of vices.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, it is the mother of vices, as my Honourable friend, Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Sahib, says. I think the Honourable the Finance Member must know that the Congress is pledged to total prohibition of all alcoholic liquor, and there will be a genuine movement in this

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

country for controlling, at least, if not for abolishing liquor trade. The industry of tobacco must find a place in this country. If people must smoke, I am sure the country will insist that they must smoke Indian and not non-Indian cigarettes.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Why should they smoke at all?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is more than I can answer, because I myself do not smoke. If people should smoke, I suggest they should resort to the indigenous variety. My point financially is this—that the Honourable the Finance Member or his successor must be prepared for a great deal of reduction of revenue in import duties on both these items.

Then, Sir, we get 19 lakhs by way of import duties on boots and shoes. I hope all Honourable Members in this House are agreed that we ought to develop that swadeshi industry, as much as possible. There will also be a reduction in import duties on those goods.

This morning, Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member, with that blandness for which he has become so famous, told us that he was not aware of any proposal to encourage the manufacture of motor cars in this country. I have no doubt in my own mind that any responsible Government seated on those Benches will take every step in its power to promote the swadeshi motor industry in this country. If that is so, this revenue of one crore and 40 lakhs that the Government are now getting on the imported motor cars must cease one day or another. We will see to it that it ceases, as early as possible. I quite agree, Mr. President, that when we are talking of swadeshi articles, such as, indigenous tobacco, indigenous boots and shoes and indigenous motor cars, it is possible to levy a reasonable excise duty on them, because, comparatively speaking, they are luxuries, and, therefore, the loss of import duties may to some extent be made up by excise duties on these goods manufactured in this country.

Then, Sir, we have a revenue of 12 lakhs on the importation of railway plant. My Honourable friend, the Financial Commissioner of P.M. Railways, is "investigating". His Department usually takes six years to finish investigations, but even six years must end sometime or other; and when these six years end, I believe this country will insist on railway locomotives and plant being manufactured in this country, more and more. This revenue also will and must go. We are getting also 15 lakhs from the import duties on cinematograph films. My Honourable friend, the Baronet from Bombay, presided at a function the other day, which I had the pleasure of attending, in which the film industry of this country protested against the unfair treatment meted out to it by the levy of import duties on raw films. That will have to go, sooner or later. Out of sugar we are getting 1 crore and 75 lakhs of revenue by way of import duties, but I take it that the object of the Government of India is to make this country self-sufficient in the matter of its own supply of sugar. If that is so, I think this import duty also is bound to vanish, or at least to be considerably reduced. They have an excise duty on sugar today; but there is a lot of complaint in the country about it, and I have no doubt in my own mind that, at any rate so far as the inferior qualities of sugar which the poorer people in the country consume largely are

concerned, there must be no excise duty on those kinds of sugar. It is an iniquitous tax on the necessities of the poor people of this country, and, therefore, this excise must be considerably reduced or abolished. I do not know if this House realises that on the import of cotton fabrics alone we are getting by way of import duties five crores and on artificial silk and cloth hosiery, we are getting more than two crores, and on other textiles, 45 lakhs. Therefore, on the whole, we are now getting 8 crores of import duties, on the importation of cloth and silk. The President of the Bombay Millowners' Association said the other day that there is scope for the import of foreign textiles into this country. I humbly but strongly differ from him. I feel that there is enough cotton in this country and enough cotton of the superior quality may be produced. The Imperial Agricultural Research Institute is making very good experiments in that direction. There is labour, there is talent, there is capital, by which we can make this country more or less self-sufficient in the matter of cotton and silk goods for the clothing of the vast millions in this country; at any rate, that is the ambition of every patriotic Indian. If that is so, while it may be possible, there may be some small trade going on in certain counts of goods which it may not be possible to manufacture in this country, I want the Honourable the Finance Member to prepare for a gradual reduction and the ultimate extinction of this source of revenue. Let him not forget that Japan today is importing a lot of cloth and silk goods which India feels can be and ought to be produced in this country.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): What are you going to import then?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Nothing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Wait and see. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bhanubhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Why should we import?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: As my Leader says, why should we import, unless we want to?

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Bohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): How can we export then?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is a matter of arrangement, but this thing is being done in spite of you.

Then I come to the next category of duties on which I am sure there will be practically universal agreement in this country. I refer to the three kinds of excise duties, on kerosene, on matches and on sugar. I am sure all Honourable Members will agree that kerosene and matches are necessities for everybody in this country; and, as I said, the inferior qualities of sugar are used by the poorer people. We get from the excise duty on kerosene, 2 crores and 95 lakhs; on matches we get 2 crores, and, on sugar, 1.50 crores.

Now, with regard to these excise duties, I want to draw the attention of this House and of the Honourable the Finance Member to the report of the Committee on National Debt and Taxation appointed by His

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Majesty's Government in Great Britain. They came to this general conclusion:

"In any general conclusion as to the effect of the Customs and Excise duties on the standard of living, it is necessary to bear in mind that the duties contribute substantially to expenditure on education, pensions, unemployment relief, etc., from which the wage-earning classes largely benefit."

That factor is conspicuous by its absence in India. Then:

"Again, it must not be forgotten that some indefinable part of the duties.....is balanced in many cases by an increase in wage-rates due to the tax element in the cost of living."

That element is also largely absent in India:

"When proper allowance is made for these aspects, we consider that the food duties, even at their present reduced level, must still exercise some adverse effect on the standard of living of the poor, although on the whole that standard may be slightly better than in the year 1913-14."

If this can be said of Great Britain, where the standard of living is very much higher than in this country, what are we to say of the effect of these duties on the standard of living in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: What about rice?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We shall discuss it, when the Rice Bill comes.

Sir, this is the majority report. The minority report of this committee, with which I am very much more in agreement than with the majority report, puts our case more strongly:

"We are ourselves of opinion that taxes upon commodities, regarded as part of a general system for raising the money required for State expenditure, are objectionable in principle, and that the important place which they occupy in our tax system can only be defended on the ground that they are survivals from a period when the administration of direct taxation was much more difficult than it is today..... Taxation should mitigate, not aggravate, inequality in the distribution of income."

The general objections to indirect taxation apply with special force to the taxes upon food, upon entertainments, and upon artificial silk."

I say they apply here particularly to the excise duty on matches, the excise duty on sugar, and the excise duty on kerosene:

"They are thus exceptionally regressive, and they take no account of a principle which we regard as essential to any equitable system of taxation, viz., that taxation should not be imposed upon any whose means are not adequate to maintain a certain minimum standard of living."

Will the Honourable the Finance Member lay his hand on his heart and say whether he is not levying the majority of his taxes on people whose means are not adequate to maintain a certain minimum standard of living:

"We recommend, therefore, that, subject to the needs of fresh expenditure, any future surplus of revenue should be devoted to abolition primarily of the food duties, and thereafter of the duties upon entertainments and upon artificial silk. We are of opinion that these reductions should take precedence of any further reductions of direct taxation."

Then, Sir, while that is the position today, under the Government of India Bill, the position of the Government of India or of the Federal Government will be much worse. I have only to draw the attention of Honourable Members to clauses 185, 186, 187 and 188 of the Government of India Bill. Certain succession duties, stamp duties, terminal taxes, and taxes on fares and freights shall be levied by the Federation and collected by them. It shall not form part of the revenues of the Federation, but shall be assigned to the States and the provinces. Taxes on income shall also be divided although the Governor General is given power to decide the manner and the time of distribution. And so far as salt duties, excise duties, and export duties are concerned, it is also provided there that, if an Act of the Federal Legislature so provides, there shall be paid out of the revenues of the Federation to the provinces and to the federated States some equivalent of the whole or any part of the net proceeds of this duty; and one knows the composition of the proposed Federal Legislature and the method of indirect election proposed; and I promise that, when that Legislature meets, it will vote away practically all these taxes, to be distributed to the provinces and to the various States forming the Federation. Therefore, it seems to me that the position, as far as one can see at present is insecure today, and will be almost disastrous if and when the Federation comes into being. At page 292 of this Bill we have the specified sources of revenue which are placed at the disposal of the Federal Government, duties of customs including the export duties, duties of excise, corporation tax, salt, state lotteries—that is a source which I think the future Finance Member of the Government may have recourse to, having lotteries—but except that, I feel that the position is, as I said, very insecure.

We have then the railways which were turned into a separate proposition—a commercial concern: that concern is today so insolvent, that it owes a debt to us of 55 crores, which I can see no prospect of its ever repaying: and the statutory railway authority will be an *imperium in imperio*, and the Government of India can whistle as long as they like, and yet they will get not a pice from this railway authority. The posts and telegraphs is another department, which I am afraid, cannot pay. Although it is supposed to be a commercial department, somehow or other, ever since it was made a commercial department, although there have been years when we had some surpluses, yet on the whole we find, that by some system of accounting, it is now more or less self-sufficient, more often less self-sufficient than more self-sufficient.

Then I put to the Honourable the Finance Member, the modern free-trader, one poser. How long can these imports continue, apart from the swadeshi spirit, apart from what future governments might do? I put it to him—only so long as this export of gold continues: according to him it shall continue: but, even according to him, gold cannot be exported which does not exist: and there are only about 500 or 600 crores more left in India; and after these exports cease, how are these imports going to come? It seems to me at any rate that at that time the customs revenue must fall. When it does fall, the future Finance Member will have to turn to the Army Secretary or to the Commander-in-Chief, who never comes to this House, and tell them "We cannot afford to pay this 45 crores to you: you must cut down your expenditure"; and I put it, as a proposition, based on some careful calculation, that the future revenues of the Government of India considering the proposed division of revenues

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

between the Federation and the Provinces, the taxable capacity of this country and sound principles of taxation, cannot be more than Rs. 50 crores; and even assuming you pay roughly half of it to the military budget, it cannot be more than 20 or 25 crores. This expenditure must be brought down: all this tall talk about the defence of the country is nonsense. Either the Army is too big, or it is too small. If there is a real invasion, it is too small unless you can organise the entire nation behind the Army, or unless there is any truth in your statement that India forms part of the Empire, and the imperial forces are placed at our disposal. On the other hand, for normal purposes, it is really too big except when a war starts; and may I ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether he honestly feels as strong in exercising his control against the Military Department, as he does against the other departments of the Government of India.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Will the Honourable Member be much longer?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, Sir: I will take some time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then he can speak 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. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I was saying, when we adjourned for Lunch that the Honourable the Finance Member should exercise, apart from questions of policy, the maximum financial control possible over the army expenditure in this country. And, on the question of British troops, in India, we have heard an elaborate discussion, and I do not want to go into it again at this stage. But, Sir, I feel that, if, for any reason, British troops are to be retained in this country, the cost of it must be found by Great Britain and not by India. If really military policy dictates, besides the Indian army, a larger army, I suggest one of two courses,—either have an Indian army, consisting both of men and of officers, to the extent which military policy requires it, but if British personnel is forced upon you, I expect the Honourable the Finance Member to stand up to the British Government and say—"You pay the money for it".

Then, Sir, on the question of retrenchment, apart from the question of policy, I should like to get some information from the Honourable the Finance Member, as to whether he is satisfied that full retrenchment has been carried out in the army expenditure, remembering all the time, three

important factors,—the cataclysmal fall in prices which must be reflected in the expenditure of all spending departments,—the payment by Great Britain towards the army expenditure in this country, which practically is equal to the Capitation charges we pay, and the results of the mechanisation of the army. If it means anything at all, it must mean some saving.

Then, Sir, I should like to know whether the nature of the control exercised by the Finance Department over the Army expenditure is exactly the same as in the case of other departments,—for I read, Sir, in the Blue-book which the Army Department has supplied to us in connection with the budget the following sentence:

"The Army Department of the Government of India controls the expenditure under all the heads except that pertaining to the Military Accounts Offices which are under the control of the Finance Department."

Moreover, Sir, I want to know whether, for the expenditure on the army, we are getting full value. Is not the profession of army contractors the most lucrative profession in parts of Northern India today, and are we really getting things at prices at which they are sold in the market, and are the spending departments absolutely free from any kind of corruption?

The Honourable the Finance Member in the course of his brilliant speeches hit upon the right thing when he said that the real problem in this country is its poverty. I entirely agree with him,—all Indians agree with him. But does he not then realise that the natural consequence of it is that the most urgent need today is to increase the purchasing power of the people, and that internal prices must also rise? . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: By calling a penny two pence?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Neither by calling a penny a tuppence, nor by sticking to the ratio at any cost! Whatever happens, he will not raise the ratio. I do not want the Finance Member to call a penny a tuppence, but why does he, who is a great believer in the policy of *laissez faire*, pin his faith in such a manipulation of the ratio? Where is the freedom in it? Why does he not agree to allow the Rupee to find its own level? Why does he want to link it to the paper currency, and where does his doctrine of *laissez faire* come in in his matter?

Then, Sir, we have the provision for the reduction or the avoidance of debt. My own personal opinion,—it may be unorthodox,—is, that until our financial position is much more secure than it is today, until we can find enough money for our national services, we may put off almost indefinitely any provision for the reduction or avoidance of debt. After all, Mr. President, our national debt, comparatively speaking, is small, and most of it is productive or protective. Under those circumstances, Sir, I would suggest to the Finance Member that that provision may well be cut down or removed altogether. Moreover, Sir, has he taken all necessary and possible steps, in view of the condition of the money market in India, to convert all interest bearing loans, that is, loans bearing interest at comparatively high rates, into loans at prevailing rates of interest? I think, Sir, the Government have got some proposals for next year. They have hinted at them in the Finance Member's speech, but I would like him to go further and see if he cannot take advantage of the present condition of the money market to convert practically all our loans into loans bearing the lowest rate of interest which prevails today; and in any case, if it is a case

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

of paying off debts, I suggest to him that we must fight for the external debt first. After all, the internal debt and the payments on it merely mean transfer of money from one hand to another inside the country,—it does not affect the entire national economy; but the Government, by keeping the external debt of the country, are sending away the wealth of the country. I, therefore, think, that if any provision is to be made at all for paying off debt, it ought to be a first charge on it, to pay off all sterling debts.

Sir, the Finance Member protested very vigorously against any kind of economic plan. My friend to my right, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has answered him completely and effectively; but, Sir, I propose to approach this question from a slightly different point of view. There is a method in the Finance Member's madness—he says—he has no plan, but he has a perfect plan in his little head (Laughter), and he knows that that plan must work, and, therefore, he says, that he will not have any other plan. Sir, I put it to him,—he talks of free trade. When he was offered this job, did he tell the Secretary of State—'I am a free-trader, I cannot go to a country where the Government is committed to a policy of protection'? Why did he come here? If he so believed in free-trade, I think, Sir, he would have consulted his own conscience much better had he stayed in England and tried his hand against Mr. Lloyd George or Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, instead of coming here to a country which has stood and will stand by protection under certain well defined conditions . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Evidently, you are a great reader of the *Indian Finance*.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, I am.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And a quoter from?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I said he has a plan. I will tell the House what his plan is. "The ratio shall remain as it is, I will not change it"—is it not a plan?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If you like.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: "The gold export will and must continue, I will put no export duty on it"—is that not a plan?

Several Honourable Members: Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: "I am a free-trader, but Ottawa shall stand; Imperial Preference shall stand". Is it or is it not a plan? "The military expenditure cannot be reduced, it shall not be reduced". Is it or is it not a plan? And the only thing he will do is to spend money on small schemes, on village industries, the details of which are no more known to him than to me!

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): That is a plan!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am saying, therefore, that the Honourable the Finance Member's plea that he is against economic planning is, with all respect, as insincere as it is hollow.

I beg leave for a minute to go back to this theory of the Honourable the Finance Member that the military expenditure cannot be reduced and read to him what his friend Sir Walter Layton has said in the matter:

"Apart altogether from the question of other forms of expenditure in India, the defence charge is undoubtedly high. A recent comparison of the military expenditure of the nations of the world shows that in this respect, India is seventh on the list among the Great Powers and that her expenditure on armaments is between two and three times as great as that of the whole of the rest of the Empire outside Great Britain. . . .

It is frequently urged that expenditure for the defence of India is not a matter that concerns India only, but is also one which is of vital importance to the Empire as a whole and should, therefore, not be at the sole charge of India. . . . It is relevant to my present purpose to point out that the total is at present so large, both absolutely and in relation to the revenues of India, as to be a dominating factor in the financial situation."

On the question of relieving the poverty of the country and of how to increase the wealth of the country, the Honourable the Finance Member laid down some premises and came to the comfortable conclusion of doing practically nothing. He said public expenditure must yield quick results, and asked, are there such projects? I give a two-fold answer to him. Public expenditure in this country on the elemental needs of the people is so much behind even the minimum standards of other countries, that any expenditure on the supply of those needs will yield not only quick but beneficent results, perhaps, not in money immediately, but in the increased purchasing power of the people, in the increased health and taxpaying capacity of the people of this country. My second answer is this. There are such projects today. Speaking for Madras, I can say that the Tungabhadra project has been pending for a long number of years. You can spend crores upon it. A scheme of village roads which will give communications to the thousands of villages which lack any roads today is also an item of capital expenditure, which will yield good results. And, in cities, I can say that there are schemes waiting for slum improvement. In Madras alone, we have prepared a scheme which the Municipal Council has approved of, costing two crores. If, therefore, you tackle the problem of slum improvement, you have got projects on which you can spend your money usefully. Then my Honourable friend said no monetary return can be got from anything we do for the villages. May I remind him that man does not live by bread alone?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Would you mind quoting me correctly?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No monetary return can be expected from anything we do for the villages.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I did not say that. I said that large schemes of agricultural improvement could not be expected to yield immediate returns.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I remind him of the biblical saying that man does not live by bread alone? We have some amount of responsibility, I take it in this country, for doing something for our villages even if we cannot get much return on account of that.

Then, my Honourable friend laid down a series of propositions, namely,—I hope I am quoting him correctly, I took them down the other day—the desire of the world is to be self-supporting; in India, industries, which can stand and prosper, attract private capital; industries which do not or cannot

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

so stand should not be helped by the Government. All is well with the world; God is in His heaven, and I am Finance Member of the Government of India; therefore, I cannot do anything at all:—it seems to me to be a conclusion unworthy of a responsible finance member of any government. And his remedies are still more curious. Evidently he believes in prayer. He said, let us all sit down here and pray for the rationalisation of the world so that International trade can flow and India can share in the resulting prosperity. I have no particular objection to praying, but it seems to me adding insult to injury to come to a responsible Legislature like this, and say at the end of introducing the Finance Bill, I suggest to you, gentlemen, please pray. It is a matter for laughter, but for the fact that it is too tragic for tears.

Mr. K. B. Asaf: Instead of asking you to pray, he has asked you to pray!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I put it to the Honourable the Finance Member, now that he says he has no plan, has he any financial conscience at all? Because I want to ask him how his financial conscience allows him to reconcile himself to the poorest country in the world, having the most numerous bureaucracy, and the most highly paid, throughout the world? Has he ever applied his financial conscience to it? Has he heard of such salaries in any other country? And has he considered that, in this country, which is so poverty-stricken, the death-rate and infantile mortality are such that ought to make any sensitive Government ashamed of its own performance or want of performance? Does he realise that owing to the weak sustaining power of our people, the epidemics claim a yearly toll of life so high, that, in any other place, it was seriously suggested as an alternative to birth control that we can rely upon nature's remedies—epidemics in this country? Does he realise that the poverty in this country is colossal, that we have made no attempt towards tackling it in any scientifically planned manner? And, on the question of illiteracy, has he ever applied his mind to the colossal sums required to liquidate this matter? And to the inadequate medical relief, the poor village communications, the primitive methods of agriculture, and, on the whole, the very poor standard of living? Sir, I put it to him that he may again usefully consult and act upon the conclusions of the report of the Committee on National Expenditure, in which they came to the following conclusions:

"That the rise in the value of money in recent years provides a strong *prima facie* case for the revision of money obligations fixed under other conditions."

Your salaries must go down, your defence expenditure must go down.

"That existing financial difficulties make it necessary for the nation, like the private individual, to consider seriously what it can afford and not merely what is desirable."

"That only by the strictest regard to economy and efficiency over a long period can the trade of the country be restored to its pre-war prosperity and any substantial number of the unemployed be re-absorbed into industry."

Then, Sir, there is one matter on which I desire to make our position perfectly clear. I have been watching, ever since I came here, the Honourable the Finance Member's persistent though courteous attempts to get the House committed to a policy of free trade more or less, or to a policy which will destroy the protection which has been and is being offered to

our industries. On that matter, we, sitting on this side of the House, are perfectly anxious and willing to consider the interests of the consumers and of the poor people of this country; but, at the same time, Mr. President, we are absolutely convinced that those interests are not served by allowing this country to become inhabited by people who will be perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water, for the industrial nations of the world. We do want to build up our industries, our large industries as well as our small industries and when these large industries are built up, we are committed to the nationalization of all key industries. (Hear, hear.) If the consumers have to pay a higher price, that price will not go into the pockets of private capitalists, but will go into the coffers of the State, and return to the people in a thousand fructifying channels. On the other hand, we do want to develop our small industries. Let the Honourable the Finance Member have no illusions in the matter at all. We shall be no party to allowing our industries to be strangled by the cut-throat competition of other countries. Let him also remember that the industries of this country were destroyed by his predecessors in this country by most unjust methods. We, therefore, stand committed to the policy of protection more or less on the lines laid down in the Indian Fiscal Commission's Report. We shall, therefore, do our very best to develop those industries, while seeing to it that the interests of the consumers are protected and that key industries are nationalised, and the profits brought into the coffers of the State.

Then he asked about various plans. I have no desire to elaborate them, but may I, as a layman, try my hand at one simple plan? We have seven lakhs of villages in this country. I suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member to spend at the rate of a thousand rupees a year on each village, for five years, intellectually conscript all the educated young men of this country, graduates and undergraduates and train them in the arts of village work, to serve the villagers; to give them the elements of the knowledge of co-operation, to impart education, to give them some small medical relief, and, above all, protect them from the corruption of the police, revenue and irrigation officials, which goes on throughout the year and throughout the country and tell them, at the end of the five years, these young men and women will have to find their own livelihood in the villages. This plan is the result of careful and prayerful thought on my part for the last many years. I feel that thereby we shall be relieving unemployment. We will make our villages real, live, and self-respecting centres, where the people will be enabled to use their opportunities to the best advantage, to have the benefits of co-operation, to have the benefits of a clean, honest administration, and to have the benefits of education and simple medical relief. It will cost about 10 crores a year spread over 11 years. On the whole, it will cost about 850 crores; at the end of that time, this country will be a much better country in which the men and women will no longer walk as the weak slaves that they walk today, but as independent self-respecting men and women who will be worthy to be citizens of a great and self-governing country.

Coming to the details of the Finance Bill, I only want to say a very few words, Mr. President. So far as the salt duty is concerned, we here represent the salt *Satyagraha* Movement. The Indian National Congress is committed to the principle that salt, the prime necessity of men and cattle, shall not be taxed. It is God's gift to man, and we believe that we can and ought to find other sources of revenue, and ought not to tax salt; and I suggest that it is not financially an impossible proposition. I suggest

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

that the cut in salaries be not restored. I suggest further that this cut be graded, that all salaries below 150 or 200 be exempted from all cuts, that salaries above have graded cuts of 5, 10, going up to 25 per cent., and that income-tax and super-tax be raised if necessary, and that, as a result of all that, we do say that the salt which the people want can be exempted from this duty. In this connection, the Finance Member has tried to throw an apple of discord among us and tried to appeal to the friends from Bengal—why do you want not to have foreign salt and why should you pay for the salt higher than you will be compelled to pay otherwise? I am glad to see that the Honourable Members from Bengal have refused to fall into the trap, and I hope that when the Bill comes up before this House, we shall have the very decisive vote of this House against this attempt to remove the import duty.

The Honourable the Finance Member in an expansive mood told us—I think on the only time on which anybody said so—that they will accept our opinion if we agree with him to remove this import duty. We tell him: “No, thank you. We are not going to allow this import duty to be removed. If we had our own way, we would raise the import duty, so that we can build up a genuine indigenous salt industry, which can satisfy the wants of the millions of this country”.

Then, Sir, on the export duty on skins, we shall have a discussion by and by. I am afraid this is one of those occasions when the Government will try to fish in the troubled waters of provincial jealousies, but, speaking as a Madrasai, I do appeal to all my friends from other provinces that we want this export duty to be retained, in order to enable the Indian tanning industry to be built up. I shall give facts and figures later on, if necessary, or my friends will do it. On the question of the postal rates, I stand by the pice post card. We do not care how you do it, but you must do it, and if we had our own way we want to see that the poor people of this country get their pice post card. Keep the letters at one anna and raise the weight from half a tola to one tola. Do what you like with the higher forms of postage but the poor people of this country must get their pice post card. On the question of income-tax, we shall fight and we shall succeed, at least so far as this House is concerned, to get all incomes below Rs. 2,000 exempted from income-tax. This is all I have got to say so far as the Finance Bill proper is concerned, but I want, before I conclude, to say a few words on the general position as I see it.

Mr. F. E. James: You have not come to export yet!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We shall export what we cannot consume and we will import what we really want. We want to be as rich and prosperous as England, and we will adopt every step to get that prosperity. Let my Honourable friend have no illusions about it. Our ambition is to be no less rich than the Honourable gentleman in his own country which has resorted to free-trade, protection, preference, quotas and what not, so long as John Bull's pocket is filled. I have learnt to profit by that lesson and to see that our country is as rich and prosperous as his. I hope he will see the justice of that.

I am sorry the Honourable the Home Member is not here, but the other day he delivered to us a speech which for bathos is hard to beat. I agree with him that terrorism can have no place in this country, but I

want to remind him that if terrorism is getting under control, Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress are today the greatest forces against terrorism. You may believe it; you may not believe it; but take it from me as one who knows the inside of things that we are the most potent and the most corrective force against terrorism in this country. The Honourable the Home Member asked us to support him. We will, but we have our own conditions. We believe from a reading of history that terrorism can never be met, and will never be met by counter-terrorism, that terrorism can be wiped out, only by enlightened public opinion being gradually arrayed on the side of Government, against all forms of terrorism. The Honourable the Home Member asks us to believe that all those who are detained are terrorists, and, therefore, we must support the Government in that action; and that, if we ask a question about their health, we are secretly sympathizing with terrorists. Sir, this is doing a gross injustice to our position. Let me read to you what a great Secretary of State wrote to the then Viceroy:

"We must keep order"—(*Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto*)—"but excess of severity is not the path to order. On the contrary, it is the path to the bomb."

Sir, I want those words to be written in letters of gold on the entrance to the Viceroy's House: "excess of severity is the path to the bomb":

"It will be insupportable if you, who are a sound Whig, and I, who am an 'authoritaire' Radical (*as they say*), go down to our graves (I first) as imitators of Eldon, Sidmouth, the Six Acts, and all the other men and policies which we were both of us brought up to abhor."

Then, Sir, he referred to the long procession of widows who lost their husbands and the sufferings of other people. Honestly and sincerely, do I express my sympathy, and our sympathy, if I may, with all those unfortunate people whose relations, whose husbands, have been the victims of terrorism, but may I, in no spirit of bravado or spirit of helplessness, try to remind the Honourable the Home Member and the Government of India that we on this side believe that today there are hundreds of wives, of mothers, of sons and of daughters who have got their husbands, their fathers and their brothers detained in custody, on no evidence, on no conviction, but on the mere suspicion of the executive? Do you think, Mr. President—and you are a Bengali, you know—that the feeling in Bengal is really reconciled to all these acts of counter-terrorism on the part of the Government? Are we not entitled to demand that the great doctrine of "*fiat justitia ruat cælum*" "*let justice be done even if the Heavens fall*", may be carried out in Bengal also? Sir, we shall be glad to give our full support to fighting terrorism (*Hear, hear*), provided civilised methods for fighting it are adopted, and people are not arrested and kept in jail on mere suspicion of being terrorists. (*Hear, hear.*) Sir, my friend, Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, an elected Member of this Assembly, has publicly stated that he is against terrorism and has challenged Government to put him on his trial. Government does nothing and keeps him in imprisonment for three years! (*Cries of "Shame, shame."*) And do you think that we can accept your statement that you are honest and sincere in dealing with terrorism and are not using a few murders here and there in order to demoralize the whole of the Bengali race and making them feel that they can have no peace or good Government so long as this Government is in power? (*Interruptions.*)

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Sir, the Honourable the Home Member referred also to a speech of mine and said that I was inconsistent—a virtue for which he said I was famous. Sir, I plead both guilty and not guilty to the charge. I plead not guilty in the ordinary sense; I am not inconsistent in saying “we will co-operate with you to the extent to which we can, for the interest of our country, but if you do not respond I am here to destroy the prestige of the Government”. But, Sir, in a higher sense I plead guilty to the charge of being inconsistent, and I will tell you how. We are here to suggest to the Government measures of reform, measures of sound taxation, and measures of proper expenditure. They accept no advice from us, but, assuming they accept all the advice we give them, assuming that they become thoroughly responsive and responsible, that will not make us accept this Government one moment longer than we are compelled to accept them—because we recognize, in the words of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman that good government can never be a substitute for self-government. Be as responsive as you like, still we will use every legitimate and peaceful means in our power to displace you from the country and to take the reins of government into our hands. (Hear, hear.) In that sense, I grant I am inconsistent. Only, if you are reasonable in the meantime, it will make the transfer easy and pleasant for all concerned. If you are going to be unreasonable, all right, you make it difficult and unpleasant for all concerned. Sir, after the discussion in this House on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, the political future of this country has become darker. Something is going on between the Indian Princes and the Secretary of State and the Honourable the Law Member has cultivated the great art of using words to conceal his thoughts, so successfully, that we do not know what is going on.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): I tried to learn it from you. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): There are many other things which you can learn. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, anyhow, I am glad my friend admits that he is using words to conceal his thoughts. That is all my point,—and that is a valuable admission, that this Government specialises in the art of using words to conceal its thoughts. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the Maharajah of Patiala and various other rulers are negotiating with Sir Samuel Hoare, and Sir Samuel Hoare is negotiating with them! And the Government of India looks on helplessly. It does not know what is going on, and in a brave voice, it says—“they cannot disclose it”. Shall I say—“they have nothing to disclose!” They know no more about it than we do. They are simply used as door-mats, as I said the other day, and they will not say what they do not know. I suggest it would have been more honest on their part to say, “we do not know”.

But the point is this, that today federation is being shaped in the House of Commons by a contract between two parties to it, namely, the British Government and the Indian Princes,—British India being completely ignored, and even in that contract—as my young friend reminds me—the dominant party, the British Government, is dictating terms to the

Indian Princes. Sir, we recognize we have no influence with the Indian Princes, and we have no part or lot with them, but let me warn them, from my place in this House, that "British India" will never forget this conspiracy between them and the British Government, if they succeed in enforcing a federation upon us. We shall fight it. The Indian Princes are not so strong in their own States; their rule is not so impeccable. They do not represent the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest". On the other hand, history convinces us that the Indian Princes are today the artificial survival of the "least fitted". (Hear, hear.) We have here these Princes who want to make the best of both the worlds. Let them, I say, beware, and let the British Government beware, we shall have no peace for both of them, if this conspiracy is concluded behind our backs. (Applause.) I know, Sir, while we talk like this, that the Members of the Treasury Benches laugh, affect to be indifferent (Laughter), and an arrogant Secretary of State said the other day—"the British caravan will pass on even if the dogs bark". Sir, I do not want to use any cheap bravado, but we feel—and I say this very sincerely and honestly to the Members of the Treasury Benches and to the Secretary of State if my poor voice reaches him—that we, on this side of the House, are determined to see that the caravan of the Indian National Congress passes on to the fulness of its goal, whatever dogs, British or otherwise, bark. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the caravan passes on, in spite of the Honourable the Law Member's superior contempt for the Congress, and in spite of the Law Member's not missing a single opportunity of opposing and vilifying it, in spite of the bland answers emanating from the Honourable the Commerce Member which mean that he is after all helpless; Sir, the Congress caravan moves on, though the Honourable the Home Member shakes his fist at the Indian National Congress. And, last but not least, in spite of the Honourable the Finance Member's affected want of plan, there is, I say, a real British, Imperial plan to keep this country perpetually available for British exploitation.

Sir, I also want to repeat on this occasion our demand for a Constituent Assembly. Sir, the *Manchester Guardian*, which is usually a better informed and saner paper on the average than any other British newspaper, wrote the other day that in India the demand for such a Constituent Assembly is not taken seriously, and it quoted Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Sir, Sir Tej Bahadur is a great man, but I think the *Manchester Guardian* and those who agree with that paper would be well-advised to remember that the Indian National Congress stands for a Constituent Assembly, based on adult franchise or on the most democratic franchise possible. It is a democratic method, it is a practical method and it is a rational method. What more can the British Government have than this that the people of the country must meet and settle their constitution? We have no illusions in the matter. We shall make that the central issue in all elections to the Legislatures, whenever they come, and we will press the demand on the Government. If the Government will not yield to our demand, then, God help Great Britain and God help India!—because, if our methods do not succeed, I say, there is no other alternative before India than red revolution. (Hear, hear.) I am not taking in terms of despair or of mere fright, but, knowing the country as I do, unless this demand is conceded in a reasonable time, I see no alternative but red revolution. It seems to me that, when that revolution comes, nobody will be able to say what turn it will take. It is, therefore, up to

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

the Government today to grasp the hand of peace and fellowship which we offer, to agree to the demand for a Constituent Assembly, to scrap this Government of India Bill, and agree to a constitution, under which India can have full self-government, and yet remain friendly with Great Britain. That time is today; very soon it may be too late. Time and tide wait for nobody and I should like to warn the Government here and the Government in Great Britain in the words of the great Persian poet:

"The moving finger writes and having writ,
Moves on; nor all thy piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

Sir, I have done. I oppose the Finance Bill. (Applause.)

Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad Mehr Shah (North Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir,* views have already been expressed on the various aspects of the Budget and the Finance Bill and I need not, therefore, dwell at length at this stage upon facts and figures relating to them. Apart from this, I am by nature inclined to talk less. I have, moreover, a few years' experience of the other House, the Council of State, to guide me and there eloquence does not go to such a pitch as it does in the Assembly.

No matter what political parties we belong to or what political view we hold, on a discussion of the Budget and the Finance Bill it is our duty to realise our responsibility in the matter and to review the schemes now under consideration from a constructive point of view, a view which would be in the best interests of the motherland, law and order and the semindar and commercial classes in the country.

A saying by the late Mr. Gokhale is here worth recalling. He said that on any other occasion the Opposition and non-official Members might criticise the policy of the Government from whatever point of view they pleased, but on delicate subjects, such as the Budget and the Finance Bill, it should be the duty of every responsible Member to keep in view the fact that if he were to present the Finance Bill in place of the Honourable the Finance Member what constructive schemes he would himself be in a position to present. Looking at the speeches from this point of view I find that most of the speakers want the Honourable the Finance Member to increase the expenditure on economic and social items for the good of the country and that, in view of the poverty prevailing in the country, taxes should be decreased as expenditure is increased till Government are in such happy position as to spend crores of rupees for the good of the country and need realise nothing by way of taxes. *

Such a spectacle, Sir, would indeed be very gratifying; but in the dry world of facts and figures such a show of jugglery is unfortunately not possible. Discarding, therefore, all attempts at imagination, I consider it my duty to represent the real views of my constituency on the subject.

Sir, my constituency possesses a peculiar character in the whole of India. It perhaps claims the largest number of military voters in the whole country. That being so, the responsibility of representing their views rests on me, more than on any other elected Member, particularly

*Translation of the original speech delivered in the vernacular.

as it is with the blood of this military section of the people that the foundations of India's political progress have been laid. I, therefore, hope, the Chair, the Honourable Members and Government would regard my voice as the voice of that section of the people who naturally do not believe in any kind of propaganda, agitation or defection, but wish their opinion to be taken in the same spirit as when they offer to lay down their lives for the sake of their King and Country. And then, Sir, I am to express the views of those poor zemindars and petty businessmen whom I have also the honour to represent.

First of all, Sir, I have to thank the Honourable the Finance Member for the grant he has made for rural reconstruction, which to my mind is the best part of the present Finance Bill. It is a fact that the welfare of India depends upon the welfare of her rural population. It is these poor people who are largely responsible for contributing so much to the revenues of the Government and to the progress of commerce and improvement of towns. But, unfortunately, Government have been treating them as a step-child, and that treatment has given them a certain amount of anxiety and uneasiness. The provision made in the Finance Bill for rural reconstruction should, therefore, deserve every commendation from every well-wisher of the country, and upon this, I, on behalf of my constituency, offer my sincere congratulations to the Honourable the Finance Member and this House. You will excuse me, Sir, if I say that this grant does not mean the whole solution of the rural problem but that it is the first step in this direction. It is now up to us to see that this grant in each Province is spent exactly for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.

Fortunately, for the Punjab, the work of rural uplift has been going on very honestly and efficiently for a considerable period under the able guidance of Mr. Brayne, and the value of this work has been acknowledged even by Mahatma Gandhi. It is our good fortune that at present we have a Governor in the Punjab who has given it further impetus and whose solicitude for the rural masses is indisputable. It is expected that the rural policy of Government would further gain in strength at the hands of the Punjab's new and popular Revenue Member. But for deriving the full benefit from the rural grant, and in order to enable one Province to benefit by the experience of the other, it would be just as well for the Government to appoint an all-India Advisory Board to advise how best to spend the grant; and I would be glad if Mahatma Gandhi were to be the chairman of this Board and Mr. Brayne its secretary, so that for once all narrow-minded persons and those prone to create trouble can see for themselves that both Government and the Congress are prepared to work wholeheartedly, with any other agency, for the good of the country and do not consider it patriotic to waste their time in finding fault with each other or meeting the unfair criticism levelled against them by interested bodies.

Sir, the soldier classes in my constituency are glad that under the present Finance Bill the cut that operated against their pay will no longer continue. They are grateful for this to the Honourable the Finance Member and hope that the tax now existing on the income from one thousand rupees to two thousand would also go in the next Finance Bill.

Then, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member will excuse me if I draw his attention, as respectfully and emphatically as I can, to another important matter which has been causing a good deal of distress to

[Sir Muhammad Mehr Shah.]

thousands of loyal and brave soldiers and their families in my locality. I am of course referring to the operations at the Khewra Salt Mines. My able friend, Mr. Piracha, only the other day, moved a Resolution in this House on the subject and many a voice was raised in the Council of State in support of his motion. But I regret to say that it was very cruelly turned down by the Honourable the Finance Member.

Sir, in this connection, I consider it my duty strongly to submit that the idea is gaining ground in the minds of the public, that Government only listen to the voice of the agitators and that no justice whatsoever is done to those who are truly loyal. I would, therefore, appeal to the Honourable the Finance Member to give this problem his further consideration and, with the advice of the Punjab Government, immediately appoint a committee consisting of officials from both the Punjab Government and the Government of India.

Then, Sir, I have particularly to draw the attention of this House to two other equally important questions on behalf of my constituency, and I am sorry for not being able to give full consideration to the present Finance Bill. The first one relates to the reduction of duty on imported wheat. It would tend to a further fall in price and add to the distress of the zemindar classes who naturally suffer by reason of the prices of foodstuff going down. It is the duty of the Government to give this question a further thought as early as possible. Then there is the question of the price of postcards which, notwithstanding repeated assurances on the subject in this House, has not been reduced to two pice each. This means that that poor element of the population which forms the backbone of the country would, as before, continue to be deprived of the facility that goes with cheaper means of correspondence. I have no doubt that with the reduction of the price of the postcard the demand for it would automatically go up, and I would, therefore, request that the matter be given further consideration during the course of the year.

Now, Sir, I would just speak of two other matters. They are Law and Order and Trade and Agriculture, and it is with these subjects that the Finance Bill has largely to deal. If peace reigns in the country the expenditure on Law and Order would be less, and the improvement in agricultural and trade conditions would yield larger revenues. To bring about this consummation both Government and Congress should take a step forward together, and, in so far as the interest of this country is concerned, there is in this nothing below the dignity of one or the other. Therefore, through you, Sir, I would appeal to the Congress to realise that His Majesty the King-Emperor has always had a great affection for India, and that his person is above all politics. Let them, for that reason, sincerely join the Silver Jubilee celebrations and help to create that atmosphere which would just be in keeping with India's best traditions and interests. Let them prove, by their action, that they are a band of large-hearted patriots who would gladly add a feather in their cap by taking a step in this direction. Let no personal pique or personal differences stand in their way. I would at the same time as strongly appeal to Government and say that the person of His Majesty the King-Emperor is above everything else. If, on the auspicious occasion of the Silver Jubilee, they come forward carrying an expression of goodwill and sympathy the coming generations would judge their move not as a weakness but as a great and glorious act on their part.

Then, Sir, if we fail to check the growing unemployment among our educated classes the surplus shown in the Finance Bill would be no more than a mere paper transaction. There is, therefore, every need for tackling this difficult problem.

Sir, before I conclude my speech, I deem it my duty to thank His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief who, in the Council of State, the other day, in connection with the recruitment of Sanyads, declared that there were no restrictions to their recruitment as such in the army. With these words, Sir, I support the Finance Bill.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, the alarming onslaught made on the customs revenue by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, makes me wonder whether he was really in earnest in proposing that the imports should be practically reduced to nothing. He failed to respond to the numerous calls from my Honourable friend, Mr. James, as to what he proposes to do with exports. As we all know, if any country is to survive, it must have a more or less equal balance of export and import. I noticed my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, sitting up and taking notes, and I have no doubt he will effectively deal with some of the arguments put forward by my Honourable friend.

There is just one point on which I should like to make a reference, and that is with regard to cigarettes. My Honourable friend approved of smoking cigarettes, but he strongly disapproved of the import of cigarettes. Well, Sir, the import of cigarettes is very small indeed. But there is a considerable import of leaf tobacco to be manufactured in this country into cigarettes. The reason for that is that at present the country does not grow a sufficient quantity of the right kind of leaf for making up into cigarettes. I have no doubt that when the production increases, that is, the cultivation of the leaf increases, we shall see a considerable falling off in the imports. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, there is one matter that I would like to refer to, and that is the general desire of all parts of the House for retrenchment. I remember in the old days when we had the Inchcape Committee, the wonderful work they did, and, in fact, their report became almost a sacred book to many Members of the then Assembly and subsequent Assemblies. We have had departmental Committees, we have had the Lee Enquiry Commission, in a diverse form, and here I would like to suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member that a Committee be appointed with power to examine and report on the incidence of taxation, and, at the same time, make a clear examination into the present day cost of living as compared with ten years ago. To my mind, that is a very important point to take into consideration. We hear, on all sides, that the cost of living has gone down, but we do not hear of the same reduction in the expenditure and in the salary list. I observe, that in reply to a question in another place, the Government stated that "it had been decided to postpone the further consideration of the question of scales of pay of future entrants to the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service until after the passing of the Constitution Act". Well, Sir, there are very divided opinions on the wisdom of waiting for so long. Talking of retrenchment, it occurs to me that it might be well to practise what we preach and possibly offer up suggestions as regards a reduction in our allowances. We could, however, in a way economise both in speech and in supplementary questions. I wonder whether we

[Sir Darcy Lindsay.]

realise that the cost to the country of the elected Members of this Assembly comes to at least Rs. 2,000 per day, and taking the debate on the Finance Bill, as an example, I have worked out that each of our speeches costs Rs. 200 and some of them a good deal more.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): But the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member costs us 154 crores!

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Then, Sir, some money has been given for broadcasting. I welcome that, as India must not lag behind other countries. But I am somewhat dubious as to the wisdom of erecting a powerful station in this City at a considerable cost, I think it was 8 lakhs 45 thousand and a recurring charge of 176 lakhs.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Not quite as expensive as that. It is one lakh and 76 thousand.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I intended to have said one lakh and 76 thousand. This station, although the plant will be very powerful, yet it is anticipated that it will only be able to operate effectively within a radius up to 200 miles. That, to my mind, is very insufficient, and I should like to have seen the station available for the whole of India. I would much sooner have seen a considerable expansion in village broadcasting. (Hear, hear.) The Bengal Government, to my knowledge, and I saw the plant operating, have experimented in three villages, with quite a small plant, a receiving set and a battery and a loud speaker at a cost, I believe, of about Rs. 700. The receiver receives the news from the broadcasting station in Calcutta and the result is most satisfactory and thoroughly enjoyed by all the people. We could hear the loud speaker at a distance of, I should say, at least 1,500 yards. I would like to see that principle carried out throughout India, and I suggest to the Central Government that they should assist the provinces in the purchase of these outfits and let the provinces look after their maintenance.

Some years ago, at my suggestion, the Department of Education, Health and Lands made an inquiry as to the existence of mineral springs throughout India. I had the idea that India should be self-contained in that respect and have its own spa. Why should we go to Europe to be cured when we have the waters here available? I have a list of springs with me still, and I was going through it only the other day; I find that the waters of a place called Pir Shah,—I believe it is at a station called Spintangi on the Quetta-Sibi line,—are very suitable for the purpose. They contain 8.1 Mac'he units of radium which is considerably more than is contained in the waters of Carlsbad and Badnaheim and other places on the continent of Europe. If the Railway Board were to look into this matter, they might find it a paying proposition to build a pump house and baths and private enterprise would produce hotels and hostels and other conveniences; what is now a non-paying strategic railway might become a real good paying concern. Anyhow I do plead that India, if possible, should have her own watering Spa.

In regard to the desire expressed by some Members that Government should start industries, I am not at all in favour of this. To be successful in manufacture, it is necessary to secure expert knowledge in addition to a business training which, with all due deference, I do not con-

sider, is to be found amongst officials. It is perfectly true that Government could import experts to look after these industries, but the expert very soon becomes inoculated with the Government serum. Another point of vital interest is that the success of such undertakings is the responsibility to the shareholders. I understood from my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, that Government on behalf of the nation would be the shareholders. That, again, I do not think would be a likely proposition. Leave industrial expansion to private enterprise where the enterprise and energy of individuals and continuity of service is what an industry really requires to be successful. The advent of Government into the industrial field, as we know, has been apt to spell ruin. I give for example the coal industry. There is also likely to be a lavish expenditure of public money as has been the case in connection with the Peninsular Works at Tatanagar. They were originally built as a locomotive works and were taken over by Government at a high figure. Government did not, however, continue with the scheme of building locomotives. They scrapped the machinery or passed it on to some of the railway workshops. They put in a very expensive plant for making wagons and underframes competing with concerns that were already working in the country. I would, however, be all in favour of the judicious use of Government money to assist small private industrial enterprises that show prospects of success, but are handicapped for want of capital. I understand that the Punjab Government have quite recently tabled a Bill having this object in view. It is only in recent years that young Indians have gone to Europe and the United States of America to study industry. They acquire a good knowledge, they come back to India and then the difficulty that arises is the want of money and the want of confidence in starting up industries. They do make a start, mostly with family money, but insufficient, and, for that reason the concern comes to grief. It is to assist genuine cases that I think Government might very well step in, either on a sharing basis or a low rate of interest. But to encourage these industries when the knowledge of the people is able to work them is the thing that is required. Frequent reference has been made to the term "exploitation" by the British in India, and this I venture to question. It may have been perfectly true in the old days of the East India Company when, according to records, we are told that men came out to India and shook the pagoda tree and received large profits thereby. But those days are long gone past. It is, however, true that the British have shown enterprise in the development of trade and industries, but the field has surely been opened to all. In certain instances, the capital has been raised in sterling in England, but shares were obtainable by any one at time of issue and are still obtainable in the open market. In the case of many companies, with rupee capital issued in India, a large proportion of shares are held by Indians, both as original shareholders and by subsequent purchase. Because the managing agents may be a European firm, it does not alter the fact that the company is frequently largely Indian-owned. It is common knowledge that many Indian shareholders readily apply for shares if the managing agents are a firm of sound reputation. I would point out that nothing has been said about the many failures and huge loss of money. I can refer to one instance in the Punjab where a company from England started to prospect for oil, and, after the expenditure of over a million and half, they retired, because they could not find the oil. There is one company working in the Punjab which has also spent a considerable amount of money in exploring for oil; it has found a

[Sir Darcy Lindsay.]

certain quantity of oil—not very much; and I only give this as an example of how money has been brought into the country for the development of the resources of the country and been lost. Personally, I would like to see industrial companies operating in India with rupee capital or at least a rupee share register to facilitate transfers when shares are held in India; and the corollary of this would be greater Indian representation on the Board. It is a regrettable fact that in India money is not always forthcoming in aiding industrial concerns, and, it is for that reason, money is sought from outside. I hope to see the day when industrial development will make rapid progress, assisted hand in hand by Indian and Britisher alike, and the effect would be far less talk of safeguards. In the course of a long experience in India, I have found friendship and good feeling in the knowledge that both sides are working for the welfare of India in the development of her national resources, and I am happy to think that this good feeling exists amongst the Members of the House, however bitter the speeches may at times appear to be. How very necessary we are to each other was brought home to me, only a few days ago, by a Member of this House who told me that he had to bring out from home a manager for his sugar factory to assist in the working of that factory.

Now, Sir, I think I have exhausted my Rs. 200 worth, and I hope that I have not offended any feelings. The views expressed are my own, and not as representing the Group. I thank you for the attention that you have given me.

Seth Sheodass Daga (Central Provinces: Landholders): Sir,* it is a matter of no small pleasure to me that I have got a right to speak in my mother tongue and the national language of India. From this point of view, my unfamiliarity with English is a blessing to me. When the Honourable the Home and the Finance Members, with all their stay for twenty years in India and with all the salt that they have eaten of India, are not familiar with Hindusthani, it is not perhaps a matter of any delinquency for me to be unfamiliar with English.

We are at present discussing the Finance Bill. Whatever may be the meaning in English of the word "Bill", "bil" means in Hindi a hole in the ground where rats, snakes and other reptiles make their homes. What harm is caused by these to agriculture and the zamindars and tenants, who depend on agriculture, is not hidden from any one. In order to save agriculture from rats, Government have started a scheme of rat destruction. But the rats that are hidden in the Finance Bill are left unharmed by the Government. These rats also take away their earnings from the agriculturist against their will and cause a lot of harm to them. I will tell the Government that if they mean well of millions of persons residing in the villages, then they should start a process of injection to kill these rats also. These rats are not a bit behind their brothers, the real rats, in bringing about the "downfall", "slavery", "flattery" and "chicanery".

Owing to the peculiar policy of Government with respect to tax and expenditure, the villages of India, which were once famous all the world over, are today paupers and desolates. In those days, there existed in the villages a scheme of indigenous, cheap and wholesome education, and the villagers could manufacture every need of theirs and were not helplessly dependent

* English translation of the original speech delivered in the vernacular.

on others for anything. For instance, they used to maintain their health by cheap and efficacious Ayurvedic medicines. But, now, it has been replaced by useless and costly education where things like these are taught, i.e., a cat has two ears and a dog has a tail. And Ayurveda has been replaced by English hospitals. By this, crores of rupees are possibly earned by English firms, but it serves no useful purpose to Mother India. This also serves the purpose of spreading the system of English medicines in the same way as was done with the Dacca muslin. Similarly, in the beginning, inducements were offered that free medicines and free doctors would be given, and that no fee would be charged for. And when, having fallen in this trap, Ayurveda became dead, money is now demanded for every little thing. If you go and live in the hospital, then, too, money is needed both for medicines and doctors. Till now, there was no money required for operation cases. That too has now commenced. Now, as to family ward, it is built with the money raised by the public, and, for that too, rent is charged. I give an instance from my place as to how a family ward was built. From one gentleman Rs. 6,000 were taken and he was made a Rai Sahib and from his brother Rs. 11,000 are taken to build a family ward, and the condition is that he would be made a Rai Bahadur. The poor fellow had disappointment in June and January last, and now his hopes are centred in the Silver Jubilee. If these things be wrong, here is the Commissioner from Chhattisgarh.

This is from the Government which say that they are *Mā* and *Bāp*, but they cannot protect even our health without money. May I ask from the Finance Member if he would ask for money for the recovery of the health of his son from one whom he really considers as his own son.

Sir, in the present Finance Bill, no relief is given to the zamindars, malguzars and other persons depending on land, and they are the persons who are hit the hardest. When in America the Government are helping their villagers by spending crores of rupees, we are greatly aggrieved and surprised to see the indifference of the Finance Member. Being the representative of landholders, I can say that the policy of the Government with respect to taxation and expenditure is making the villagers poorer and poorer every day. They are made to suffer heavy losses by violation of their rights. Are not Government aware that in Chhattisgarh the burden of land tax and irrigation dues are very much felt by the agriculturists? It is predominantly a rice tract. Owing to their inability to pay taxes and to maintain themselves, lakhs of people of Chhattisgarh have left their hearths and homes for Calcutta, Kharagpur, Kalimati and the Empress Mill of Nagpur. If it is not known to the Government, the Honourable Mr. Drake, who is the Commissioner of Chhattisgarh and who is occupying a back bench, may intimate them. I tell my own experience of irrigation—I have got a village, the land revenue of which is Rs. 900, and, for irrigation, over only 300 acres of land there, we have to pay about Rs. 1,000 per year. In about 20 years, we have paid about Rs. 15,000, and still we are helpless supplicants for water. If in that village Rs. 5,000 only had been spent on tanks—even if it had been raised as a loan—then the whole money would have been repaid and there would have been no trouble of water for 50 years. Tax is, of course, taken. And now let me narrate to you, to what extent the Government think about the welfare of the agriculturists. The inlets of the village irrigation tanks are stopped by building irrigation channels over them, so that no water may go to the tanks and they may be required to take

[Seth Sheodass Daga.]

irrigation water out of helplessness. Last year, there was so much oppression that even though there was excess of rain and the fields were being breached owing to excessive rain, on the report of the *Amin*, a *Sahib* came and Rs. 6 per acre was charged. From these irrigation works no gain has been derived by our agriculturists, but English engineers got big salary and English firms got a lot of money as price for their various machines.

Oppressed by poverty, the women of cultivators, zamindars and malguzars are forced to sell their ornaments which they hold dearer than lives in order to pay the rent and land revenue recoverable by warrants. Thus, approximately, sixty crores worth of gold goes out of India year by year. This Bill does nothing to prevent this flow of gold from India to places far across the seas.

It is with a sense of pride that the Finance Member has announced the allotment of a crore of rupees for rural uplift, but we, on this side, know that today Government have thought of spending a crore of rupees. The reasons for this are well known and have been referred to in this House several times. Even if we suppose for a moment that Government have a *bona fide* intention of uplifting the rural areas (which in our opinion is not the fact), yet let us ponder over the fact as to how lofty is the idea in allotting one crore of rupees over seven lakhs of villages, that is to say, fourteen rupees per village. In fact, the uplift will be of those officers who will get salary and travelling allowance in the employment. I want to tell the Government that if they have genuine sympathy for the cultivators and if they want to improve their lot, they can very well do so even without incurring any expenditure, at least in Chhattisgarh, and the cultivators can also be benefited. I will ask the Finance Member to take a sheet of paper and pen and ink in hand and issue orders for the closing down of all the rice, flour and oil mills in Chhattisgarh. In that case, the cultivators will again take to this work that they were doing before and they will get not only remuneration for the work and save their own money, but will also improve in health, since the machine rice and flour affect adversely the health of the people and they are not as beneficial to health as those made with hand under the old system. I trust all the Doctors here will bear me out. Dr. Khare has even published his views in the papers. The others will also give their opinion. Here we will have both village uplift and health uplift together and the money will also be saved. We have a saying "*harra lago na fikhari rang chokha*". Here alone is the *bona fide* of the Government tested.

If the Government really want that the villagers should be benefited, then it should abolish the salt tax, reduce the price of postcard to one pice and that of the envelope to two pice, maintain the duty on hide and levy an export duty on gold and pay off the debt of the Malguzars and tenants and thus show its *bona fide*.

The Government's income-tax policy is also very harmful. It is nothing but oppression to tax incomes from one to two thousands. Looking to the expenses incurred in realising the tax and the harassment and sufferings that the poor have to undergo at the hands of the income-tax officials, the tax can in no way be called equitable. Every one is harassed by the income-tax laws and the treatment by their officers. There is a lot of dissatisfaction among the public over the treatment meted out, and the

powers exercised by the income-tax officers, and unless these are reformed, the public cannot be convinced of the honesty of the Government.

In our sacred books, the policy underlying taxation is described, and, if it is acted on, it would benefit and enrich the public. Kautilya says that taxes should be realised in the same way as the gardener plucks ripe fruit from the trees, so that the trees do not suffer. The other example is that of bees who collect honey from flowers and store it for the use of others. Similarly, the Government should, by taxing in a way that there is no harassment to the public, spend it for the benefit of the public. If the Government follow these precepts, they would, to some extent, be able to fulfil their duty. But it is useless to expect this from the present Government. So long the public has not the strength to compel the Government, the Government will not follow the right course.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhanunadan):

Sir, I was glad to hear two speeches in the vernacular, but I was sorry to find that the Government Members, especially those who have come from abroad, have not been able to understand those speeches. (Laughter.) Sir, our friends have referred to the doings of the British people in this country. Let me first of all begin with what our friends, I mean, the British officers are doing in this very Assembly. Look at the constitution of the Assembly first. On one side you find the representatives of a mighty organization, which is certainly unlawful, and on the other side you see the representatives of the people who are struggling for freedom. Sir, the Government today is going on with a dual policy of reconciliation and repression, reconciliation in words and repression in full swing. The representatives of the people have been personally so much oppressed by the Government, that their hearts are full of venom for this Government, and whenever they get an opportunity to speak in the House, they forget the real subject matter and they begin to talk of oppression because the venom in their heart naturally comes out first.

Sir, coming now to the Finance Bill, the principles of taxation must be borne in mind, but they are completely forgotten by the Finance Member. I would ask him to learn a lesson from the ancient methods of taxation. In ancient times the King was regarded as beneficent as the sun in the sky. The sun takes water by evaporation from places where water is collected in volumes,—the sun does not take water from the hills and mountains, but when the rain comes, and when the question of distribution comes, the sun distributes the water by process of rain all over the mountains and hills and all places in an equal order.

(It being Four of the Clock.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member may resume his speech tomorrow.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FIRING AT KARACHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before calling upon Mr. Gauba to move his motion, the Chair wishes to remind all Honourable Members that under the rules every speech on a motion for adjournment is strictly limited to fifteen minutes.

Mr. K. L. Gamba (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): **Mr. President,** I move:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Sir, I realise the seriousness of the occasion and the shadow of the great tragedy under which we meet this afternoon. Listening the other day to a very eloquent speech of the Honourable the Home Member, one heard him speak with great emotion and feeling about the innocent relatives of the persons who had been ruthlessly shot down by terrorists and the revolutionaries and, I trust, Sir, that when he speaks today of the victims of the Karachi firing, when he speaks of the relatives of the victims of the Karachi firing,—not a few, possibly hundreds,—he will be moved with the same feelings of humanity and indignation that he expressed on the last occasion.

Mr. President, I do not propose in this debate to raise any communal issues. I realise that there are two definite opinions upon the act of Abdul Qaiyum, opinions which can never be reconciled. For my part, I fully understand and I fully respect the opinion that is held by those who are not of our way of thinking. But all we would say is this,—just as we understand and respect your opinion, if you cannot understand our particular point of view, at least you might give it respect. I do not propose to justify, in the slightest manner, the act for which Abdul Qaiyum has paid the penalty of the law. For the sake of the debate, for the sake of argument, we will assume that he was rightly convicted; that he was rightly convicted under the law; that he was executed under the due process and in due course of the law. We do not grumble with that today. But, Sir, the question before the House is different. The question is whether the execution was carried out, by the executive, in a manner and in circumstances that could not possibly have avoided the terrible tragedy which Karachi witnessed last Tuesday. We know that Government was not unaware of the grave situation in Karachi. I am not justifying that grave situation, I am not saying that it was logical or right. All I say is that there was a grave situation in Karachi, a grave situation that had not arisen suddenly. From the information in the papers, and, I have no doubt from the information of the Government from more sources than one, the situation in Karachi was grave since the first or second of March, and, Government knew full well that when Abdul Qaiyum would be executed there would be persons, who would want to take his body in procession through the town. They knew that there would be a certain measure of popular demonstration—I am not justifying it now. There have been similar occasions which Government has handled, which popular leaders have handled before, and handled successfully. There was a case in the Punjab in which a man was executed for a similar offence, a procession was taken out, a procession of fifty thousand, and it passed off quietly and peacefully. I have received a telegram today from Karachi and it states that there was an understanding, between the local authorities and the leaders of the people at Karachi, that the leaders would be taken into the confidence of the Government as to the day and the place of execution, and that the co-operation of the leaders could be sought when the funeral rites of this man were to be performed.

Mr. A. H. Ghumavi (Dacca and Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Where is the telegram? Read it.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Did the Government carry out this undertaking? Even if there was no undertaking, I submit that the first duty of the Government, on an occasion of this kind, is to take the popular leaders into their confidence. And, Sir, I submit that on every occasion where the popular leaders have been taken into confidence there has absolutely been no trouble. It is only when you mistrust the people; it is only then that you ask for trouble and you get trouble. (Applause.)

Mr. President, what the Government have to prove to this House is twofold: Firstly, that the firing was inevitable and that it was absolutely necessary and it could not have been avoided; secondly, that only such force was used as was absolutely necessary and no more than necessary. I think the Honourable the Home Member will find it very difficult to establish the first proposition, namely, that force was necessary. After all, it is not the exact circumstances of the moment that matter; it is the events, and the general situation surrounding the particular occurrence; and he will have to justify that the situation was such that force could not have been avoided; and that within a day or two days previous the local authorities had taken all steps possible to prevent a crowd of twenty thousand—or one hundred thousand according to different reports—whatever was the crowd—from collecting and moving towards the city; that they did everything possible from the start of that crowd to the very end; and that in the last resort they had to utilise force. That is the case which the House will expect to be proved by the Honourable the Home Member. It is no good his saying that at the last minute the crowd would be entering the city walls, and, in the city, there might be looting and things of that kind, and, therefore, we brought our troops and fired at the last moment when we could not control the crowd. He will have to show to the House that the local authorities did their best to prevent that crowd from assembling, that, in the last resort, they gave due warning; that they gave the necessary information to the crowd and the time to disperse and the opportunity to disperse, and that those steps having failed, they had to resort to firing; and they fired no more than was absolutely necessary. From the reports in the newspapers it is perfectly plain that neither of these facts and circumstances can be proved. I do not know whether the Honourable the Home Member has got any special information to disprove my statement, but, from the reports of the newspapers, I say, that the allegation that the crowd was going to loot is only adding insult to injury. After all whom would the crowd loot? Whom were they annoyed with? They were not annoyed with the Hindus. They were annoyed with the persons who had executed Abdul Qaiyum—rightly or wrongly,—they would be annoyed with the authorities, who had turned down every petition for mercy. They had no annoyance with the Hindus; and why should they go and loot the Hindu shops? After this event, if any real sympathy or support has come it has come from the Hindus of Karachi. (Hear, hear.) They have attended to the wounded, and I can say with gratitude as a Muslim, that right through this sad episode, the Muslims have had the sympathy of the Hindus. So far as I know, I am not aware of any Hindu who asked for the life of Abdul Qaiyum in return for the life of Nathu Ram. So far as I know, no Hindu has ever done that; and, Sir, I can pay tribute to a distinguished Hindu on the floor of this House and that is the Leader of the Opposition. He was prepared to join in a petition for mercy, in order that this man's life may be spared. (Applause.) I say that this thing that the crowd would have gone and looted the Hindu quarter is adding insult to injury.

[Mr. K. L. Gauba.]

Mr. President, I do not know what attitude the Honourable the Home Member is going to take. Certain Members of this House would be prepared to consider the question, whether the Government is ready over this issue to face a commission of inquiry. After all it is no good here making a statement and trying to justify this act in which 35 to 40 persons have lost their lives and about 100 persons have been injured. After all, if the acts of the local officials were such that they can be justified, let them face a commission of inquiry. Any honest, any straightforward Government will not shirk that inquiry; and, Sir, I submit, to the Honourable Members opposite, that they should take this opportunity of saying that they are ready to face a commission of inquiry. I have only to add this thing, namely, that so far as the innocent sufferers of this tragedy are concerned, they were not Abdul Qaiyums or Nathu Rains, they were harmless persons of Karaachi, perfectly innocent. So far as the injured are concerned and their relatives are concerned, Government should pay compensation, as it has done on similar occasions. Lastly I would insist from the Muslim and the public point of view that if any official has been found to have bungled this situation, he should pay the penalty of his fault, irrespective of his position. With these words, Sir, I move my motion.

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

"That the House do now adjourn."

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): It is really very deplorable, Sir, that so many valuable lives should have been lost under such tragic circumstances. My heart goes in sympathy to the victims of the firing and to the bereaved members of their families. Sir, during the last decade, the country has witnessed several such murders of which Abdul Qaiyum was guilty. The country would be much better off if this murder were the last of its kind. We, in this House, have a clear duty to perform and that is to take stock of the situation as a whole and try to uphold ways by which repetition of such crimes is effectively stopped. Sir, the subject of this evening's debate is a very delicate one. In order to appreciate it fully, one has to consider the back ground of the picture.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair, which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

There are two facts requiring serious considerations, namely, that the murder was committed in an open Court where the appeal of the murdered man was being heard; and, secondly, that during the course of the trial, the defence counsel tried to justify the murder when he asked a Muslim witness in cross-examination that such murders are justifiable under Muhammadan law. It is clear to me that the penal laws of this country are embodied in the Indian Penal Code. To seek support of the Muslim law of another country to justify the murder of an otherwise innocent person is a thing unheard of in previous years. Again, the position is further complicated when, later on, after the law had pronounced its verdict upon the murderer, sympathy was shown in quarters where he should have least expected it. Here, I charge the Executive Government as well for having consented to receive a deputation of some Honourable Members of this House interceding on behalf of the murderer.

Why should the Executive have encouraged such an action? What were the grounds which persuaded the Executive to agree to receive such a deputation? (Interruption.) If my Honourable friend will take the trouble of looking up the newspapers, he will find that the Sikhs never waited on the Executive Government and asked for mercy for Bhagat Singh. They did not.

Coming to the incident of firing itself, Sir, when the execution had taken place, the Executive could not take better precautions than to take the body to a distance—I speak subject to correction—of about three miles from the city and bury it quietly. Well, Sir, what were the reasons which led the mob from Karachi town to that far-off distance, to exhume the body and take it in procession to the city? Are the Government going to be censured on this account, as to why the authorities quietly, without making any fuss about it, buried the body at a great distance from the city? Certainly not, Sir. When the authorities found a mob going there and coming back with the body exhumed from the graveyard, what is the duty of the Executive in order to keep peace and order? I know some gentlemen will be surprised really at my attitude. I know they would be. Sir, it is the first time I have to defend the Executive. (Voices: "Oh, oh"!) Sir, my reasons for doing so are very obvious. I cannot ignore the previous experience of such matters where the inactivity or non-activity of the Executive had led to many disastrous results. While speaking, in this connection, my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, asked—why were not the popular leaders of Karachi taken into confidence?—and he said that if they had been taken into confidence, some understanding would have been arrived at and the results would have been different from what they unfortunately were. I may remind my Honourable friend of the incidents of 1927—of what occurred in Delhi when the murderer of Swami Shradhdhanand was executed. Were not the leaders of the community taken in confidence? Is it or is it not a fact that an undertaking was given by the leaders that they would bury the dead body in the graveyard opposite to the jail. Was that undertaking kept? Did not a communal riot also take place afterwards? What have they got to say? (Voices: "When"?) If only we take up the files of newspapers of 1927, we can see what happened in Delhi. The lesson to be learnt from such incidents is that such situations do require and call for a strong attitude.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): On a point of information, Sir. Will my friend, Sardar Sant Singh, prove that there was an undertaking between the leaders of the Muslim community and the Government to the effect that Abdul Rashid's body would be buried in the jail and would not be taken in procession? Will he reproduce any such undertaking?

Sardar Sant Singh: My Honourable friend has asked me to prove this undertaking, and, of course, nobody expects me to do so within the limits of the fifteen minutes at my disposal. I will only refer my friend and ask him to look up the writings in the press of those days.

Several Honourable Members: There was no such thing.

Sardar Sant Singh: I refuse to give way. Then, again, Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, has argued that no annoyance could have been

[Bardar Sant Singh.]

caused to Hindus. Again I would ask my Honourable friend this question— is it not a fact that after the execution of Abdul Rashid was carried out by the Executive Government, the property of the Hindus was looted in the Delhi City?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind · Muhammadan Rural): When?

Bardar Sant Singh: In 1927.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Where?

Bardar Sant Singh: At Delhi.

An Honourable Member: I think you are mistaken. No looting took place.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): It was in November, 1927. There was looting.

Bardar Sant Singh: So this argument of my learned friend, Mr. Gauba, that there was no injury to be feared by other communities by this mob demonstration does not hold water at all. Furthermore, Sir, what I want the House to take into consideration at this stage is that, in such cases, similar things have occurred, similar was the attitude adopted by the Executive; and here I may, with your permission, refer to the case of Bhagat Singh—to which my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has drawn attention. There, the dead body was not given even to the relatives; the body was taken, at dead of night, to some distance twenty or twenty-five miles. (*Interruption by Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi*). I will hear you afterwards. It was taken away there. Why, Sir, should it be claimed in this case that the body should have been handed to persons who were not the relatives of the executed person? In this case, I understand that the body was actually handed over to the relatives, who agreed to the burial and who went with the dead body to the place of burial. It was after the burial that the relatives went to the city and the mob came. My submission is, Sir, that the background of the whole picture is very tragic. Are we, or are we not, going to stop these things in future? Are we going to be a party to such fanatical murders? The reply to this question is the right reply to the further question whether the Government—and it may be the Government of anybody, it may be the Government of Mr. Satyamurti or of Mr. Pant or it may be anybody's Government—the question is—are we going to submit to such things?

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Which things?

Bardar Sant Singh: That there should be intercession on behalf of a fanatic who murders another.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He has been executed.

Bardar Sant Singh: Will you receive a deputation of responsible persons asking you to commute the death sentence?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If it is for "mercy"—always.

An Honourable Member: Why not?

Sardar Sant Singh: But

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: On a point of personal explanation. Sir, I would like to inform the House that what happened was this, that I had a personal letter from my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, asking me if I would receive half a dozen Members of this Assembly, all of whom, I think, I can claim as my personal friends, in connection with this matter. I said to him: "I do not think it will do any good". He said: "Anyhow, he would like to come and speak a word". I said, "In that case, I agree". I could not have done otherwise without grave personal discourtesy to my friends. I would do exactly the same to any other Member—and I repeatedly have—who asked to be allowed to see me with his friends on any matter in which he was interested. (Hear, hear.)

Sardar Sant Singh: I am glad the situation has been cleared up a great deal by the Honourable the Home Member, but still I hold, as a matter of principle, that he should have foreseen the results and the encouragement which the conversations would give to the outside world. (Interruptions.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It gave no result, and it gave no encouragement.

Sardar Sant Singh: I proceed further. Now, let us come to the actual firing that took place. So far, not a word has been said by the Honourable the Mover of this motion to show that the firing was excessive, or that proper precautions were not observed. We should have expected the Honourable the Mover, if he wanted the vote of this side of the House, to tell us in what way the firing was excessive. Without his doing that, certainly we cannot be a party to a censure motion unless it is definitely proved that the firing was excessive. Lastly, Sir, I would ask one simple question. How is it that out of many gentlemen, who are the elected representatives from the Bombay Presidency, not one single person among them has given a notice of this motion?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Why? I have sent in my notice, Sir.

Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq (Bakargunj cum Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): I have given one notice, Sir.

Sardar Sant Singh: I did not hear of them; only one was read by the Honourable the President, and I go by that. (Interruptions.) However, that is not the point. The position is this, that on such occasions, we have to take into consideration the fact that such murders are to be discouraged in the interest of humanity, in the interest of religion, and in the interests of all concerned.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): Sir, I do not want to join in the communal wrangle that

[Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah.]

has been started, and I would make an appeal to the Honourable Members of this House not to treat this question as a communal question. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I support this motion on quite different grounds. The reports I have read prove that there has been indiscriminate firing. (Hear, hear.) The very fact, Sir, that three small children have been seriously injured . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: One—I think.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: . . . and two of them have died, according to the report

An Honourable Member: No. One of them was injured.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: I am speaking from the press report. Sir, the facts as stated are that the mob was rushing towards the soldiers who had bayonets. It is inconceivable that small children could be in front of a rushing mob of 25,000 people. Besides, when small children see soldiers with bayonets, I am afraid they will run away, instead of remaining there. My contention, therefore, is that there has been indiscriminate firing; children might have been standing in some corner, and they were shot. My contention is further strengthened by the very fact that 47 rounds were fired. Now, Sir, what is the number of casualties? 35 have been killed, 67 seriously injured and 38 received small injuries. If there were only 47 rounds fired, so many casualties could not have occurred. Therefore, there has been more firing, and that goes to support my contention that there has been indiscriminate firing. Sir, it is also further admitted that when the firing commenced, the mob dispersed. Was it not in the fitness of things that, when the order for firing was given, they should have fired only a few rounds—say three or four—and I am sure the mob would have dispersed. The firing of these few rounds would have had the same effect as these 47 rounds. If the mob had persisted after they had fired four or five rounds and did not disperse, then they might have been justified in more firing. But they started, as the newspapers say, with 47 rounds. What I am sorry to see is that, if they had acted carefully and cautiously, so many valuable lives would not have been lost. Therefore, it is necessary that the Government should take action against those who are responsible for this indiscriminate firing.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, I wish to intervene at an early stage in this debate, because, from the remarks that fell from my Honourable friend, Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah, it is evident that there is a good deal of misapprehension as to the facts of this very deplorable occurrence. Now, Sir, I entirely sympathise with the feelings that have led my Honourable friend to move this motion. I realise how deeply he feels the tragedy of this occurrence and how natural it is that he should wish it to be discussed at the first possible moment. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that it would have been better if the debate could have been taken at a slightly later date when we should all have been in possession of a more complete picture than we are now of the occurrences of last Tuesday and when we should have been able, I think, to form a calmer and more dispassionate judgment as to the responsibility for what has so unfortunately occurred.

Before I give the House the information that is in my possession,—I admit that it is not as complete as I should have liked it to be and that it supplements only to some extent what has been published in the press—I should like to make one preliminary observation about the Honourable the Mover's remarks. He implied that the local authorities had made a very grave mistake in not taking the leaders of local opinion into their confidence. Now, Sir, I do not know on what he based that assertion? I have no information one way or the other.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces; Muhammadan Urban): He got a telegram from Mr. Abdul Majid and Mr. Hatam Ali, who are both responsible Muslim leaders. I saw the telegram myself.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Well, people are inclined to think that they are the only responsible leaders in the place when, as a matter of fact, the authorities may be dealing with others. I know that the arrangements for the funeral were made with the consent of Abdul Qaiyum's relatives, that the body was handed over to his relatives with their consent and that it was against their wishes and only by using force to them that it was taken away from them. It was forcibly disinterred from its grave, an act of desecration which, I think, will shock everyone and it was carried off in triumph towards the city. Such information as I have consists of three telegrams from the District Magistrate. One of them is dated the 19th, the day of the occurrence, and it really adds very little to what has been published in the press. But it does say that the crowd had swept over the graveyard and disinterred the body. They were roughly 20,000 or more strong and about half of that number, that is 10,000 or more, carried the body off in triumph towards the city. The police were overpowered at that point and had to abandon their ground on the graveyard. The firing by the military took place as the last resource. The number of men who fired was then given as 25 and the number of rounds at 47 in all. My Honourable friend spoke as if he meant that each man had fired 47 rounds. Each man fired less than two rounds as only 47 rounds in all were fired. The casualties were heavy owing to the density of the crowd and the closeness of the range.

Then, on the next day—that is yesterday,—I received a sort of timetable of the riots. Abdul Qaiyum was executed at 4 A.M., and, at 5-50, his body was sent to the cemetery, two miles outside the city. At 8 A.M., after the proper rites had been performed, it was placed in the grave. At 8-30, the filling of the grave was obstructed by an enormous crowd of Mussalmans inflamed by communal feeling, and the police had to be withdrawn from what became an indefensible position. At 9-45 military aid was invoked to prevent the rumoured parade of the body through the city. Without the knowledge of the district authorities, the body was suddenly removed from the grave, against the relatives' wishes, and carried towards the city for parade. At 12-15, a frenzied crowd, about 10,000 strong, using lathis and stones, was met at Chakiwarra cross-roads on the outskirts of the city by a party of 50 police, 40 of whom were unarmed, and 50 men of the Royal Sussex Regiment, accompanied by the District Magistrate. The police were overwhelmed and the soldiers had to fire to stop the crowd and in order to save their own lives. The number of casualties was due to the soldiers being obliged to fire from the closest range and to the density of the mob. The minimum amount of force necessary was used in a situation that endangered the whole city. If the rioters had broken

[Sir Henry Craik.]

through the cordon, reinforcements from the unruly elements inside the city would have involved widespread looting and attacks on the Hindu population and general chaos. The casualties—and this is the latest figure I have—were 35 dead, 67 major and 38 minor injuries. Immediately arrangements were made for the removal of the casualties to the civil hospital, but their initial removal was hindered by crowds stoning the lorry drivers. Everything possible was done for the wounded. The body of Abdul Qaiyum was re-interred by a section of the crowd, in the original place, at 3 P.M. City life was returning to normal.

This message was supplemented by another telegram despatched and received today at about mid-day. This is also a telegram from the District Magistrate:

"The rioters had no intention of burying the body inside the City. The sole object of the parade was to inflame feeling against the Hindus. A roaring crowd stoned the car containing two Honorary Magistrates, a few minutes before encountering defensive arrangements. The defence organisation was the police in front, then one platoon of the military with one platoon as a rear-guard a hundred yards behind where a large hostile local crowd subsequently formed up. The front line of the military and the police and the District and City Magistrates were stoned at sight from in front and from the flanks simultaneously. The police made no stand and broke immediately back through the soldiers. Therefore, the rush of the crowd came right on to the soldiers and one rioter actually seized a soldier's rifle. The soldiers fired just in time to save themselves from being overwhelmed. The crowd was savage, violent and out for wholesale destruction."

This, again, is supplemented by certain information which has been obtained by the General Staff from the Local Staff Officers, which makes it clear that when the troops arrived on the scene, the mob was surging down a street called Chaudhuri, at the end of the tram-line on the South River road. Three magistrates tried to stop the crowd, but were stoned. The police broke and ran through the troops who had been called up at the double. The troops charged with the bayonet and the mob recoiled about fifty yards, but continued to throw stones at the police and the troops from alleys and houses. I understand there were no bayonet casualties, because the mob recoiled as the troops advanced. The troops then hoped that it was all over, but the mob continued to throw stones on the police and the troops from alleys and houses and gradually, the mob, which at this time was estimated at 10,000 or even more, formed up again opposite to the troops. After a momentary delay the mob came running forward again, shouting and throwing stones and one man was ordered to pick off the ring-leader as the last hope of stopping them. That was strictly in accordance with the military instructions for these occasions. One round only was fired for this purpose. This, however, failed to stop the mob who came on at the run, and the situation was then so serious that in self-defence and to avoid being overwhelmed the platoon opened fire. The mob then halted and the officer in command immediately gave orders to cease fire. A total of 47 rounds were fired by some thirty men. When the firing actually occurred, the mob were right on top of the troops, being only a few yards distant, which accounts for the heavy casualties. In those circumstances a bullet will go through perhaps three or four bodies. It was not possible for any one to give the usual warning because the noise and the din was so great that it could not have been heard. But I am informed that for some moments before the actual firing occurred, the troops were standing with their rifles at the "present", that is in the position for firing, so that the mob knew perfectly well that they would be

fired at if they again attacked the troops. The troops then assisted in the collection of the killed and the wounded and, while this was being done, they were stoned from the houses. During the crisis the officer commanding the battalion as well as the company commander were actually present and three or four magistrates, including the District Magistrate, were also present.

Now, Sir, I think that that message shows clearly the circumstances in which the firing had to be ordered. Honourable Members can picture to themselves this frenzied mob of over 10,000 people literally on top of the troops. It is all very well to say or rather to sneer as some Honourable Member did just now, 'brave troops'. Thirty men, even though armed with rifles could not have lasted a minute against a mob 10,000 strong of frenzied people, if they had not used their rifles in time. The troops had to fire in self-defence to save themselves. One point I wish to make clear is that the troops did not fire in the air as was stated in some newspapers. That is directly contrary to military instructions and would be contrary to military discipline.

I claim, Sir, that the fact that these thirty men only fired 47 rounds in all or an average of just over 1½ rounds per man shows that the firing was steady and controlled, and that the troops behaved with exemplary steadiness in a position of extreme danger and extreme difficulty.

Mr. A. K. Fazal Haq: I do not believe it.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, you would not believe it.

I admit, Sir, that the information at my disposal still leaves some loose ends to be cleared up especially in regard to what happened in the earlier stages of the day. We still have not a complete picture of the whole affair. That I do not for a moment deny. But on the information that is available, I can see no ground for holding that any officer or any agent of the Government failed in his duty or exceeded in the discharge of his duty. I can see no ground whatever either for this House or for the Government, on the information now available, reaching a decision that is likely to be interpreted as a censure on any one concerned in this unfortunate affair. Honourable Members will appreciate the point how intensely distasteful it is to Government officers to have to use force on a mob, how greatly they dislike that duty and how reluctantly they undertake such a duty, but that is doubly so perhaps with soldiers. Such a duty is even more distasteful to the soldiers who have actually to carry out the use of force than to the civil officers who have to ask them to do so. But the officers here were faced with a situation of the greatest gravity.

My Honourable friend the Mover mentioned the case of Ilam Din, the murderer of Rajpal, who was given a public funeral in Lahore and he said that the authorities in Karachi would have been wise to have followed the steps taken by the authorities in Lahore on that occasion. Now, Sir, I happen to know a good deal about that. I was then the Commissioner of the Lahore Division and I was in charge of the arrangements. There is not the slightest analogy between what happened at Lahore in Ilam Din's case and what happened in Karachi in the present instance. In Ilam Din's case, the body was brought from a distant station at night and it was handed over to the relatives in the presence of the Muslim public of Lahore. It is quite true that I consulted the Muslim leaders, that I took them into my confidence, made arrangements with them and got an undertaking

[Sir Henry Craik.]

from them which they faithfully observed. The body, in that case, was handed over to them some miles outside the city at a place where there were no houses. It was taken from there to the burial ground only about half a mile away in my presence. I was there the whole time. There was no question of taking the body in a procession through the city and the authorities would not have permitted anything like that, as it would inevitably have given rise to the bitterest communal tension. But we have a much closer analogy in the Delhi incident quoted by my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, and, in fact, the circumstances there were so like, indeed so almost exactly similar to, what happened in Karachi that I venture to tell the House exactly what happened in Delhi in November, 1927.

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

That too was a case of a fanatical murder, the victim in that case being the well-known Swami Shradhanand. The murderer was hanged in the Delhi Jail and the body was, by an arrangement,—mind you,—with certain leaders and with the written consent of his relatives, who gave a written undertaking to abide by the conditions, made over to them at the jail gate to take straight to the cemetery which is a very short way off across the road. A mob swept the relatives aside, broke through the police, captured the bier and using it as a battering-ram got through the Delhi Gate into the city. They swept aside the barrier of the police at that point and they poured into the Faiz Bazar towards the Juma Masjid, surrounded and mixed up with the police who kept up with them and tried to stop them but could not get in front of them. There was in fact a running fight for a comparatively short time through the bazars of Delhi between this fanatical crowd and the police keeping up with them. Eventually the police intercepted and stopped them and succeeded in breaking them up. But what happened in this short time? In the short time, of less than an hour I think, 62 Hindus were wounded, 2 were killed, 51 shops were looted, and over Rs. 10,000 worth of goods were stolen.

That is what might have happened on a far larger scale in Karachi if this mob had been allowed to go into the city, not—mind you—a small mob that forced its way through the police picket and past the troops who were not expecting them, but a huge mob of 10,000 which, by that time, if the troops had not stopped them, would have swept aside all opposition and would have been victorious and triumphant. They would have swept through the city of Karachi leaving a trail of blood and arson and loot behind them.

That was the situation, as I have said, which the officers at Karachi had to deal with. And I ask the House to reflect most carefully whether on those facts, as I have told them, facts which were clearly not known to all the Members of the House, we are entitled to pass any motion conveying censure on any officer who acted with the objects I have explained in the face of so terrible and so sudden an emergency.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): I must confess, Sir, that the speech of the Honourable the Home Member was one which missed the real point. I equally regret,—I will not say deplore,—the

speech of Sardar Sant Singh, because he really went off the point altogether. The question before the House is, first, whether the civil authorities in Karachi did not mismanage this business. In my judgment, I venture to say that in relating the story which the Home Member related just now, having the past experience which was so eloquently described and which has no bearing on the issue before the House today

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It has every bearing.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Pardon me; it has absolutely no bearing on the issue now. And if it has any bearing you stand condemned, and I shall prove that to the satisfaction of the House. You had that experience of Delhi, you had that experience of the Punjab. I want to know from the Home Member, what did the civil authorities in Karachi do? I will read the newspaper report as to what happened on the 2nd March, and I may be contradicted if I am wrong:

"The tension, however, was so great that on the 2nd March the Additional District Magistrate of Karachi thought it necessary to serve a notice on about a dozen people and some newspapers asking them to refrain from delivering speeches or publishing news relating to Abdul Qasim."

Not only had you the experience of the Punjab and Delhi, but, on the 2nd March, the District Magistrate was fully cognisant of the high feeling that was running with regard to this question. The next day it was officially notified that the execution had been postponed. Then we come to the 4th March, and what happened on the 4th March:

"Several persons were hurt in a minor clash outside the jail gates when a demonstration was carried out by sympathisers of the condemned man. A large number of Moslems marched to the jail and collected near the gates where they held a demonstration and demanded to see Abdul Qasim."

This is what happened on the 4th. The Honourable the Home Member seems to think that the matter is very simple and plain because he has said that it is very irksome to the civil officer and doubly so to the military officer to open fire and, therefore, he has satisfied the House. But that is not the point. With your experience which you so eloquently described, with the events happening on the 2nd and 4th March, any man with any common sense must have seen that when execution is going to take place, what was to be expected?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Trouble.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What did you do? You failed in your duty.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: How do you say that? What do you know of that?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I know more than you do from the facts so far available.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member should address the Chair.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I am sorry that the Honourable the Home Member is really nothing but complacent and facile. He has got only one idea in his head and he refuses to see any other point of view. Has he no sense to follow what I am saying? What I am saying is this: You had this evidence on the 2nd, you had this evidence on the 4th. And what I am putting before the House and the Government is this. With your past experience, what measures did you take to prevent the collection of 20 thousand people? Do you understand my point or do you still fail to see it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I fail to see anything in that.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If you do not, I cannot help it. Now, Sir, what happens? Where was this man buried? The report says this:

"At 5-50 the body was sent to the cemetery two miles outside the city."

This was a statement read out officially in the other House and I am reading from that. The body was sent to the cemetery two miles outside the city. Was the crowd there waiting for the body? No. How did the crowd get there and when? And what measures did you adopt to prevent the crowd getting there? None. Sir, it is said that prevention is better than cure, and the gravamen of my charge against Government is that you have not given one single word of explanation as to what preventive measures were taken before the 20 thousand people went out of the city two miles to the cemetery and collected there. I am not justifying. I am not holding a brief for Abdul Quaium; I want the Members of this House to understand that I am standing for this that citizens have got their rights. Governments have their rights and Governments have their powers. I am not saying that you were not justified in executing Abdul Quaium; you were perfectly right. The law must be carried out: but surely it is the duty of any civilised Government, it is the duty of any competent and capable authority, knowing the events of the 2nd March and the 4th March and the previous history, knowing that there was enormous excitement which was uncontrollable—would you not expect any competent authority in Karachi to so arrange that not more than a hundred people could collect together and have you not done that in the past?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: How can you do it?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Surely you could have stopped every route: even when the King comes every route is stopped: but the Honourable
 5 P.M. the Home Member says no route should be stopped, but they should be butchered when they get there. Is that what you want? You create the situation. You allow the situation to develop: you know if you have any common sense and if you have got the meanest intelligence, that if you do not prevent this and if you allow twenty thousand people to collect near a dead body where religious feelings are excited: you know perfectly well that there can be only one consequence and no other consequence. The Home Member himself said that he would never have allowed that body in Lahore to be taken through the city. Why did he prevent it? For the same reason. Why did he not prevent the crowd getting within two miles outside the city? He has not answered that. There is no explanation; and I demand in the name of humanity. I demand in the

name of civilised government, I demand in the name of justice that you should appoint an independent commission and inquire into this matter. Do you want us to respect the Government? Do you want us to have confidence in you? Then, why do you refuse this inquiry? I want to know what your civil authority did.

The next point is this, and that is the only point with which the Honourable the Home Member has dealt. I certainly am unable at present to say that the force that was used was necessary. I am certainly not one of those men who is going to say that a British officer would use force and open fire upon a helpless mob wantonly; but supposing the order is given, he has to carry out the order. Who was the person who gave the order I do not know

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Military Officer Commanding

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If the Military Officer Commanding gave the order, I admit it makes my position more difficult because I refuse to accuse the military officer of wantonly opening fire upon the crowd; but it may be that with the best of intentions he may have been hasty. The intention is all very well: you may have no intention of doing anything wrong; but there may be an error of judgment and that I would like to know: I am not in a position to say. I, therefore, say—I do not want to take up more of the time of the House—but I do ask the Government that you will be making the greatest mistake if you refuse an independent and an impartial commission to inquire into this matter, and it will be a matter of guidance to you in the future: we all wish to avoid and bury things of this kind happening; but is it in our power? and I say, appoint a commission and in future you might acquire wisdom from this commission, if you have not acquired wisdom yet.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Dossal (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammedan Rural): Mr. President, following my friend, Mr. Jinnah, I wish to make it quite clear as to what the true issue before the House is. The true issue before the House has got nothing to do with the rights or wrongs of the criminal who was hanged. That is not the issue. I regret very much that any such issue should ever cloud the true issue which is before the House today. I also join with my friend, Mr. Jinnah, in the appeal that he has made and which he has pressed with all the earnestness at his command, that a matter of this kind, where lives have been lost, and children have died and men have been injured, is not one in which this House can merely accept the bare statement of an assurance that everything was done rightly and that nothing requires investigation. I am one of those who believe and believe very earnestly that a matter of this kind can never be decided and can never be asked to be decided on purely *priori* grounds and it is all the more surprising to me that on the telegrams and the other information which has been read out, a responsible Member of the Government should get up and should want to assure the House or think that he is justified, unless he is of the opinion that no wrong can ever be done by any agent of this Government so long as he is in power: that is entirely an erroneous attitude and I have not the smallest doubt that when the Honourable the Home Member reflects he will certainly not adopt that attitude at the end of this discussion. My sympathy undoubtedly, as the sympathy of every man here, goes out to those who have suffered, for undoubtedly those who have suffered are innocent. The question undoubtedly is one of

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

investigating how what occurred did occur, or perhaps to put the words of my friend a little more strongly, would not prevention have been better than shooting? Because those were the two alternatives—either prevention or shooting; and between the two, certainly this House, or anybody who represents the least idea of humanity or efficient administration, is entitled to have it investigated whether or not this was a preventable injury. The fact remains, in addition to the facts which my learned friend, Mr. Jinnah, has stated, that a motion was actually given for an adjournment of this House on the eve of the anticipated execution of this man: it was disallowed on public grounds. I have no quarrel with that decision; but the fact also remains that, therefore, it was not a matter entirely concerning the local magistracy or the local civil authorities. It is a matter which was well within the knowledge,—on which actually an opinion had been pronounced, having been so sought, I presume,—of His Excellency the Viceroy, in order that that matter may not be discussed. It was, therefore, fully well-known that events must take necessarily a wrong turn, perhaps a bad turn, perhaps a most undesirable turn, unless there was a certain amount of pre-vision and caution were taken in this matter. I have not heard a single word in the statement that has been read out here of any precaution of any kind. If precaution had been taken, the graveyard might have been properly guarded in order that the body might not have been exhumed: what did they do to have that graveyard guarded?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The graveyard was guarded by the police.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Yes, guarded in a manner which has resulted in what has resulted: they call that guarding. If it is guarding, I call it gross negligence

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Criminal negligence.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: They should have anticipated trouble. I am not here to judge. One might say that perhaps the wiser course might have been not to deliver the body at all. That perhaps would have been a wise course. Because, I know it is not in every jail,—I have been in one myself,—it is not in every case that a dead body is handed over to the relatives. There are instances in which the authorities have felt it their duty and their right in the cause of public peace to dispose of the body in the manner in which they thought best. It has been done in other instances and where disasters of this kind have been averted by caution. In this case the civil authorities had been warned long before, and they did nothing to prevent the disaster. Not a single word has been said as to what the District Magistrate or other civil authorities did, not a single word has been stated, from what I heard from the Honourable the Home Member, as to why the military authorities fired in self-defence, which almost gives me an idea as if there was absolutely no warning of any kind. Evidently the facts are such that one would certainly expect them to state clearly and precisely as to what necessitated them to take the action they did, namely, self-defence by armed men with bullets and bayonets at their command. I would, therefore, appeal again, in order to end this discussion, the Honourable the Home Member is not infallible,—he is not personally responsible, but only those under him about whose acts or neglects he does not fully

know,—there is no need to defend things of this kind in the spirit that everything must be right and must have been right,—but I still appeal to him in the name at all events of all those who speak in terms of humanity, that where life and liberty are in danger, or, more so, when they are lost, that an impartial inquiry should be made, and, without that, no public will ever be satisfied.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Sir, I find from the discussion that has gone on till now that there is a good deal of misunderstanding in the minds of Honourable Members. In the first place, we have to see whether this crowd wanted to go into the city or not. Sir, according to my information, the crowd did not want to go to the city, but they wanted to go to the Chakiwada Idgah, which is hardly a hundred miles away from the place where the firing actually took place. For the information of the House, I shall just read this telegram:

"On Tuesday, the 19th instant, about noon, military fired without any notice or warning upon funeral procession Ghazi Abdul Qayoom consisting several thousand persons, including old men, women and children, without justification, when procession had nearly reached destination *via* Chakiwada Idgah for funeral prayers. Forty persons been killed, 80 others been seriously injured."

So this shows, Sir, that the crowd did not want to go to the city at all, but many people wanted to go to the Idgah to say their last prayers to the dead according to the Muslim custom.

Another thing that I find is this. Whenever such a thing takes place, the question of Hindu property being looted or a Muslim being murdered is always trotted out on the floor of this House. Sir, I have been in Karachi for a very long time, and can the Government show me a single untoward event that has happened in the Karachi city during the last six months after the murder was committed by Abdul Qayoom? None has happened, and here I may congratulate my Karachi friends, both Hindus and Muslims, on the fact that within the last 15 or 20 years, though many things have happened in many parts of the country, nothing has happened in Karachi to embitter feelings between the two communities. (Hear, hear.) I know of many instances in which, when some mischief-makers wanted to create trouble, responsible members of both the communities came forward and averted very awkward situations by timely intervention by peacefully settling disputes between the communities. What is the justification for the Government to say that the crowd in this instance wanted to go to the city and loot the Hindus or commit arson? Can they quote a single instance within the last 20 or 30 years in which the members of one community have attempted to loot the shops of another community in the Karachi city? Again, this telegram says:

"Forty persons been killed about 80 others been seriously injured."

Then, at a public meeting, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"This meeting most respectfully urges immediate impartial inquiry into conduct officers concerned being convinced that loss of life was entirely avoidable unjustifiable and due extreme incompetence on part of officers concerned."

[Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

It will thus be obvious, Sir, that the public of Karachi do want an impartial investigation to be made, and I do hope that Government will pay heed to this request. In support of what I just said, I may say that the Hindus and Muslims in the Karachi city always live in amity and concord. Not only that, from today's papers Honourable Members will find that Mr. Tikamdas Wadomal, the Mayor of the City of Karachi and President of the Hindu Association, has made a public appeal to render what little help they can to the injured people and their relatives. (Hear, hear.) This clearly shows that there is no communal feeling in the Karachi city; on the other hand, both the communities are living as friends. Therefore, I hope that this small request to hold an impartial inquiry will be acceded to. If Government do not accept this small request which has been so ably supported both by my friends, Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, we shall have no other course but to censure the Government.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have no intention at all to create any bitterness on this question. Let me assure the House that I feel the most about this unfortunate incident that has taken place in Karachi. Everybody would feel and sympathise with those who have been killed, but the question at issue before the House is whether the Government should be censured or not. I must say, at the very outset, that I do not hold any brief either for the Government or for anybody else, but I must say that in the interests of law and order it is necessary that a man should give his own fair opinion. Sir, I do not command that emphasis and that dignity that my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, possesses, to put my views before the House. If the House is of opinion that beyond the statement that has been made by the Honourable the Home Member there is necessity for an enquiry to be made, I personally would not be against it. But I submit that all the facts have not been placed before you, and I am going to place a few facts before the House which would convince it that the situation, such as had happened, was not a spontaneous situation. It had a background, and I must say at once that we Hindus in Sind are not on inimical terms with the Sindhi Muhammadans. Sir, it is the outer element that is responsible for this, and I am going to give you a few facts.

An Honourable Member: Foreigners?

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: I mean Muhammadans from outside if it pleases you, but I was calling it the outer element. I may say this that we the Hindus there are so sorry over this that we have joined the Sindhi Muhammadans in collecting a fund for the relief of the injured, and I might also inform the House that all the Hindu doctors have taken upon themselves to help the unfortunate injured. (Cheers.) But the point at issue is this, what was the situation and was it necessary for the Government to take the measures that they have taken or not? To begin with, let me say that this case of Nathuram started in Hyderabad and not in Karachi. In Hyderabad, when that case was going on, there was no uproar or anything else from the Muhammadan side or the Hindu side. It went on smoothly. The case came in appeal. Nathuram was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous

imprisonment. But the Hindus made no demonstration over it to show that the man was wrongly convicted, not even a single man came forward, no funds were collected and nothing was done for helping the man. He took his own appeal to the High Court and on that unfortunate day he went and sat there in the Court as an appellant. This Abdul Qaiyum, I may tell you to indicate that the Sindhi Muhammadans of the place are not responsible—this Abdul Qaiyum happens to belong to the Hazara district outside Sind. This Abdul Qaiyum came there, had the help of certain persons who were also from outside. . . .

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. How are all these relevant?

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: It is relevant to show you the background, because the Mover of this motion said that Muhammadans had no annoyance with the Hindus. Let me say that it is not so. When you consider the facts, and, within the time at my disposal, I shall place a few of them

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Might I interrupt the Honourable Member? I think I have made it very clear that the position we take up in this House is this, that the Government did not take satisfactory preventive measures—that is No. 1, and No. 2 is that when this firing was opened we are not convinced that it was necessary and that the minimum amount of force was used. These are the only grounds on which we are supporting this motion.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: I have understood you, it was not necessary to repeat that.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair is not prepared to say that any reference to what happened previously is not in order, but at the same time the Honourable Member will realise that the real question is not the execution of the man.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: I say it is only relevant for the purpose of throwing light on the question, and I would give only a few facts and I am not going to be long on that. If the House wanted to discuss this question fully, there should have been a resolution to that effect and on that resolution everybody would have had an opportunity of putting forward his case. But now when you are going to censure the Government you must have a few facts before you to do that. This Abdul Qaiyum in the open Court, in the presence of two European Judges actually stabbed the man.

An Honourable Member: That is not the issue.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Hear me; do not disturb me. Subsequently an outside barrister was engaged to defend Abdul Qaiyum and his defence was that under the Shariat, in the eye of God and the Prophet, Abdul Qaiyum was a martyr and that he would not be considered to have committed any offence. This incensed the Muslims there, and you must know, in Karachi there are fifty thousand Makrans belonging to the frontier and

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

twenty thousand Punjabis from the Hazara district, the North-West Frontier Province and other places. They collected funds for the defence, but the Sindhi Muhammadans of Karachi did not join in that. My friends from Karachi would bear me out. Those outside people went on inciting the masses and the situation was very critical. The situation being critical, now let us see what the Government have done and what was the conduct of those fanatics. It is asked why the Government did not take care to see that all these twenty thousand did not meet at the burial ground. The thing is like this. The execution took place at 4 o'clock, and at 5 o'clock there were certain people—the relatives of the deceased who had already been sent for. Those relatives never said that they were going to take the dead body in a procession in the bazar or in the city. They only wanted that it should be given a burial. Then those people were taken two miles away because otherwise they would have gone to the city side and there would have been a conflagration, as immediately the outside limit finishes, begins the 'Chakiwara' and 'Lyari' quarters where 70,000 Muhammadans reside. And what was the intention? The intention was that they must pass those men, and after passing those men they had to go in a procession to the old town where there were Hindu respectable people and rich . . .

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: You are misleading.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: You know that in Cawnpore and Kohat and other places, when the mob went into the city, what happened. There was arson, houses being burnt down, property looted and murders committed. And why should not Government check it? Let us see whether the Government checked it or not. The point is these men took the corpse two miles away from the city and there were the deceased's relatives present. The corpse was buried in the ground with all the rites appertaining to a Muslim burial. The question is, how did these other people come, how within an hour or so did they collect twenty thousand men? They came from the town, from every nook and corner and there was a critical situation. It is all very well to say that when the Governor comes there is proper police arrangement in the streets and so on. But I may say then it is organized for a long time and that the police get long time notices about it. But here when the people rushed there, look at the defiance they exhibited. Would any member say that at that particular time Government should have said 'No, take the corpse away and we are not going to interfere. Let it be taken into the town and let anything happen'? Then we would have all ourselves blamed the Government. Then comes the information that at that time the police that were there were overpowered. That is the information that we have got. The police having been overpowered, they sent for the military and that the military were also about to be overpowered is not disputed. Therefore, they had to fire at that time. Therefore, the point is on the facts before you, the facts as they are, and the background I have shown you and the tension that was there, what would have happened if the corpse had been allowed to be brought into the City? There was a strong communal tension. Why for the matter of that at Sukker and in Larkana such things happened, there had been great damage and people had been killed in these riots. Would the House allow the authorities to take proper precautions as they have done at that critical moment or should they have allowed the corpse to be removed to the town, with the prospect of so much loss and damage? Therefore, I submit that

in my humble opinion, the Government have done what they had to do and if still people are not satisfied, there could be a resolution to that effect and then the whole thing will be considered but to say at this time that Government should not have done what they have done is absolutely wrong.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President; it is gratifying to find that on the whole the discussion on this very serious matter has taken place in a fairly calm atmosphere. I am not going to take more than five minutes, and, during those five minutes, I desire to place two or three points before the House Member. In the first place, in any part of the world if an occurrence of this kind had taken place, where 35 to 40 people had been shot, I venture to suggest that no Government would refuse an inquiry. Sir, it is possible that every precaution was taken. It is possible that the military acted in self-defence. It is also possible that the civil authorities performed their duties absolutely satisfactorily; but the fact remains that today we know that 80 to 40 people have been killed. We have not got all the facts before us. The House Member has admitted that he has not been able to place all the facts before us. Therefore, the only thing to do is to have a proper inquiry.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Wait till you get the facts.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: We are here to discuss the facts. We are the Legislature. The Government is not the only party in this question. When an adjournment motion is moved, this side of the House is also a party to the question. This side of the House desires that an inquiry should be made into this question, and I strongly affirm that in any part of the world if an occurrence of this sort had taken place when the Legislature was in Session, the Government would immediately agree to an inquiry. I give credit to Government and their officers for having acted absolutely justifiably throughout, but that does not mean that I have not my own suspicions in the matter, which have not been by any means cleared up. I would not have given expression to those suspicions just now, had I not been interrupted. The point is, that it is admitted, that on a serious occasion like this there were only 80 troops present. That has not been denied.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Three companies of British troops were present. Only 80 men fired.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In defence of three companies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Not at that particular spot. At other danger spots?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: 80 men fired in defence of three companies?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: How many troops were out?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Three companies.

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: What would that mean? How many troops would that be.

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): About 300 or 400 men.

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: That is my point. As has been already explained, the authorities had ample notice that there was going to be trouble and I place the greatest importance upon the notice of the motion for adjournment of this House moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, which was disallowed. I am not betraying any secret when I tell this House that I tried to dissuade my Honourable friend from moving that adjournment on that occasion, but Mr. Gauba told me distinctly that he anticipated a riot in Karachi, when the execution did take place, and that he wanted, if he could to prevent that riot by having a discussion in this House before the execution. Well, Sir, if Mr. Gauba, from the Punjab, knew enough about this question to anticipate a riot when the execution took place, and, acting on his information, he moved an adjournment of this House, how much more must the authorities in Karachi themselves have known of the gravity of the position.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): May I interrupt my Honourable friend? Am I to understand that the trouble was within the full knowledge of the responsible Muhammadans in Sind?

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: Suppose feelings were excited

Mr. M. S. Aney: I do not want to draw any inference.

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: We are talking of the facts. The facts are that feelings were very much excited. The fact that a riot actually did take place

Mr. M. S. Aney: With the knowledge of the responsible Muhammadans in Sind? Is that a fact or not, and what did they do to stop it, apart from the Government, and I am asking you this question as you are standing in defence of this motion?

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: I really fail to understand this excitement.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is a bad argument that you are making.

Sir Gowanji Jehangir: I maintain that there was sufficient notice that we were in troubled waters.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I point out to Mr. Aney for his satisfaction that, as far as I know, I entirely repudiate that any responsible Muhammadans had anything to do with it, much less to encourage such a thing as this.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I inquire with what object they waited upon the Home Member?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Mr. President, I refuse to give in any more. Mr. President, I have a grave suspicion that the three hundred troops were not sufficient at a time like this. I have had some little experience of these matters. I have also been in the midst of riots—riots that have lasted much longer than two or three hours, that have lasted days, and I know that very often it has been difficult to get a sufficient number of troops out in time; and, therefore, Mr. President, I do believe, that there was ground for suspicion that the troops in the City of Karachi were not sufficient; but there is one moral to be drawn from this discussion,—a moral which I desire Government to take note of. On previous occasions, I have heard respectable citizens of important cities protesting against the orders of Government stopping processions going through the city when feelings were excited. Here, today, what do we find? We find some of the most respected men in India asking Government why they have not taken steps to stop a procession even being formed. Is not there a moral to be drawn from these remarks? Why, Sir, here are these men pleading for peace, pleading that these processions should have been stopped, should have been absolutely nipped in the bud. Now, Sir, surely Government have got a justification for instituting an inquiry. Why not do it? Surely, there are facts which Government are not aware of. Why not have an inquiry once and for all on an occasion like this and lay down the policy? I would appeal to Government that this is just the psychological moment when they should step in and agree to an inquiry—an inquiry the personnel of which they themselves will have the power of deciding, an inquiry which will lead ultimately to the advantage of Government and of the public, and an inquiry, mind you, demanded for reasons which the Government ought themselves to support by men of the standing of Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Bhulabhai Desai. (Applause.)

Several Honourable Members: The question be now put.

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

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Gauba.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, I do not wish to reply.

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

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

(At this stage, the Honourable Sir Henry Craik rose.)

The Honourable Member has no right of reply. The Mover has not replied.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Even so, Sir, I think under the rules I have got the right to reply with the permission of the Chair.

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

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided:

(During the Division.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. I notice one Honourable Member is smoking inside the Chamber. That is not allowed. (Voices: "Shame, shame.")

AYES—67.

Aasen, Mr. Samuel.
Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Baqui, Mr. M. A.
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Bhutto, Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh.
Chhattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Esoak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Faal-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib
Shaikh.
Fazlul Haq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Gauba, Mr. K. L.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Ghunnawi, Mr. A. H.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
Hidayatullah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogendra Singh, Sardar.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir
Sayad Muhammad.
Modi, Mr. H. P.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtaza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Doss.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Rajan Baksh Shah, Khan Bahadur
Makhdom Syed.
Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
Raja, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Simha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Simha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Soni, Mr. Surya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U.
Umar Ali Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.

NOES—52.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
 Bhoré, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. B. D.
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
 Drake, Mr. D. H. O.
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya
 Ananda.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Monteath, Mr. J.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Mukerjee, Mr. N. R.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Owen, Mr. L.
 Parma Nand, Bhai.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Richards, Mr. W. J. O.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Scott, Mr. W. L.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar.
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir
 Nripendra.
 Sloan, Mr. T.
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 22nd March, 1935.