

2nd March 1921

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

FIRST SESSION
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1921



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1921

Rs. 9-8 or 15s. 9d.

CONTENTS

	Page
THURSDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1921	1-4
Opening Speech.	
Oaths.	
Election of Deputy President.	
Closing Speech.	
SATURDAY, 5TH FEBRUARY, 1921	5-6
Oath	
Election of Deputy President.	
Government Business for 15th February, 1921.	
WEDNESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1921	7-18
Oath	
H. E. the Viceroy's Speech.	
H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught's Speech.	
Speeches by the Presidents of the Council of State and Legislative Assembly	
H. E. the Viceroy's Closing Speech	
TUESDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1921	19-
Questions and Answers.	
Procedure as regards Questions.	
Legislative Assembly (Deputy President's Salary) Bill.	
Indian Tea Cess (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution re Martial Law Administration in the Punjab.	
THURSDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1921	103-108
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Precedence of Resolutions.	
Resolution re Military Expenditure of the Government of India.	
Resolution re Listed Posts in the Indian Civil Service.	
Resolution re Third Class Passengers.	
Resolution re Army in India.	
SATURDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1921	109-
Questions and Answers.	
The Indian Tea Cess (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indigo Cess (Amendment) Bill.	
The Import and Export of Goods (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolutions re the Washington Labour Conference.	

TUESDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1921 295-354

Oath
Questions and Answers.
Deputy President's Salary Bill.
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.
The Indigo Cess (Amendment) Bill.
The Import and Export of Goods (Amendment) Bill.
Committee on Public Accounts.
Standing Finance Committee.
Resolution re Press Legislations.

THURSDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1921 355-410

Questions and Answers.
Resolution re Female Education.
Resolution re Creation of an Indian Bar.
Resolution re Reports of Commissions and Committees.
Resolution re Raids in the N.-W. F. Province.
Nankana Sahib Tragedy.

TUESDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1921 411-506

~~Questions and Answers~~
Committee on Public Accounts and Standing Finance Committee.
Budget for 1921-22.
The Indian Finance Bill.
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
Bills passed by the Council of State.
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
The Calcutta University Bill.
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill.
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill.
The Hindu Transfers and Bequests (City of Madras) Bill.
Resolution re Legislation for Registration of Trade Unions.

WEDNESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1921 507-574

Questions and Answers.
Resolution re Raids in the North-West Frontier Province.
Resolution re Export of Cattle.
Resolution re Equality of Status of Two Chambers.
Resolution re 3 and 8½ per cent. Securities.
Resolution re Meetings of the Legislative Assembly.

SATURDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1921 575-650

Questions and Answers.
Resolution re Meetings of the Legislative Assembly.
Resolution re English Translation of Accounts and Statements of Income.
Resolution re Bihar and Orissa Executive Council.
Resolution re Inquiry into the Causes of Non-Co-Operation Movement.

MONDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1921 651—714

Oaths.

Questions and Answers.

Notice *re* Discussion on General Demands.

Resolution *re* Select Committee on Esher Committee's Report.

General Discussion on the Budget.

TUESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1921 715—794

Questions and Answers.

General Discussion on the Budget.

WEDNESDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1921 795--812

Oath.

Statement laid on the Table.

The Budget :

Discussion on Demands.

(Second Stage).

THURSDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1921 843—905

Questions and Answers.

The Budget :

Discussion on Demands.

(Second Stage).

APPENDIX i—lvii

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 2nd March, 1921.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock.
The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

FIRING ON CROWDS.

343. **Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala** : Will the Government be pleased to state if firing on crowds was ever resorted to in any part of India after the firing in the Punjab disturbances in 1919 ; and if so, when, where, under what circumstances, and with what result ?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell : There have unfortunately been occasions subsequent to the disturbances of 1919, in which it has been necessary to fire on crowds. The detailed information asked for is being collected and will be supplied to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

BULLS AND COWS OF THE ONGOLE BREED.

344. **Mr. M. Krishnaswamy Reddiyar** : (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of bulls and cows of the Ongole breed, exported from the Madras Presidency, between the years 1900 to 1914 and between 1914 to end of 1920 ?

(b) Do the Government propose to prohibit by legislation any further export of this breed of cattle ?

Mr. J. Hullah : (a) Figures are available only from June, 1917 to December, 1920. During that period 1,030 bulls and 1,147 cows were exported.

(b) It is hoped that Government will be able to make a statement on the subject to-day, in discussing a Resolution regarding the export of cattle.

RESTAURANT CARS.

345. **Mr. M. Krishnaswamy Reddiyar** : Do the Government propose to advise the Railway Administrations concerned to run restaurant cars for the convenience of the third class passengers on the lines of the South Indian Railway and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Companies ?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by my predecessor to a question asked by the Honourable Mr. Kamini Kumar Chanda on the 6th February, 1919. In that reply it was pointed out that, as a result of the experiment of running refreshment cars for Indians on the Bengal Nagpur, Bombay, Baroda and Central India, and East Indian Railways, it had been found that they were not sufficiently used to justify their continuance and had accordingly been withdrawn.

In the case of the North Western Railway, though the withdrawal of refreshment cars for Indian travellers was necessitated by conditions arising

out of the war, the experiences gained on that line were similar to those on the Railways above mentioned.

In view of the existing shortage of coaching stock, it is not considered that the present would be a suitable time for setting aside additional stock for such purposes.

STAFF SELECTION BOARD.

346. **Babu Khitish Chandra Neogy**: Will Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the functions of the Staff Selection Board;

(b) the names of members of the Board with their respective qualifications and previous appointments in consideration of which the selections may have been made especially in the case of those who had not been in continuous permanent Government service previously;

(c) the expenditure incurred by Government on account of the Board from the date of its creation under the following heads :—

(i) pay,

(ii) travelling allowance,

(iii) contingencies,

(iv) other charges;

(d) whether one of the members of the Board is also the Inspector of Office Procedure, and, if so, his total emoluments for holding the posts?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: A statement giving the information asked for is laid on the table—

(a) The principal function of the Staff Selection Board is to recruit the Staff for the Government of India Secretariat and certain attached offices. Further details will be found in the Government of India Resolution No. 2366 of the 15th September, 1920, which was published at page 1799 of the Gazette of India of September 18th, 1920.

(b) Sir J. H. DuBoulay, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., Chairman (since resigned).

He was previously Secretary to the Government of India in the Home Department.

The Honourable Mr J. A. Richey, C.I.E., Educational Commissioner with the Government of India (now Chairman).

He was previously Director of Public Instruction, Punjab.

Mr. R. J. Watson, Inspector of Office Procedure, Government of India.

He was previously Inspector of Judicial Offices, High Court of Calcutta.

Dr. Zia-ud-Din Ahmad, C.I.E., Principal, M. A. O. College, Aligarh (since resigned).

He was previously a member of the Calcutta University Commission.

Raja Narendra Nath, C.I.E. (since resigned).

He was previously a member of the Statutory Civil Service in the Punjab.

In addition to the above the following have been at various times co-opted as members by the Board :—

Mr. L. D. Swamikannu Pillai (to sit with the Board at Madras).

He had previously held various high appointments under the Government of Madras, the last being the Directorship of Agriculture.

Dr. N. A. F. Moos, D.Sc., (Edin.), L.C.E., F.R.S.E., F.C.S. (to sit with the Board at Bombay).

The Honourable Nawab Abdul Majid, C.I.E., Member of the Council of State (now serving on the Board).

The Honourable Member who has asked this question was invited to become a Member of the Board but he was unable to join.

(c) The figures up to the end of January, 1921 are as follows :—

	Rs. A. P.			
(i) Pay	10,164	3	1	(this item will in future years be substantially less).
(ii) Travelling allowance	4,910	12	0	
(iii) Contingencies	990	10	8	
(iv) Other charges	4,549	3	3	

The Board has received up to date Rs. 4,678-8-0 as examination fees.

(d) Yes. He receives Rs. 3,250 per mensem as Inspector of Office Procedure and no extra emoluments for serving on the Staff Selection Board.

STAFF SELECTION BOARD.

347. **Babu Khitish Chandra Neogy**: Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of candidates who were examined by the Staff Selection Board last year and the number of such examinees as are already in Government employ ;

(b) the number of expected vacancies during 1921 and 1922 to fill up which selection is being made by the Board ;

(c) the number of temporary hands who are already working in the Secretariat and attached offices stating separately the number of those recruited during the war and after ;

(d) whether the claims of those who were recruited during the war and have been working for some time will be specially considered by the Board in filling permanent vacancies that are likely to occur ;

(e) if the number under (b) is less than that under (c), the justification for holding the examination for outsiders now and also for the creation of the Staff Selection Board at this stage ;

(f) whether, in the case of men who are already working in some Department, the opinion of the head of the Department as to their efficiency is not held to be sufficient for their confirmation or promotion ; and if the reply be in the affirmative, the necessity for making such men sit for the examination ;

(g) whether any exemptions from examination have been granted in favour of the assistants and clerks of any office appointed since the creation of the Board, and, if so, the grounds on which such exemptions have been made?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell : A statement giving the information asked for is laid on the table :—

(a) The number of applications considered by the Board last year was approximately 1,900, and of these 1,171 were examined. 336 of the applicants were already employed in the Government of India Secretariat or attached offices.

(b) It has not been found possible to prepare an accurate forecast of the number of vacancies likely to arise in 1921, and still less of those likely to arise in 1922, since these depend on factors which cannot be foreseen. The approximate number of vacancies reported to the Board as actually existing up to date is 70.

The list of approved candidates to be prepared by the Board will also be available to Local Governments and Chambers of Commerce.

(c) The information will have to be collected from Departments and will involve some labour. It will, however, be collected and supplied to the Honourable Member.

(d) Yes.

(e) The justification for holding an examination for outsiders and for creating the Staff Selection Board now is the desire of the Government of India to improve the standard of the clerical staff and to recruit for their offices the best men available from all parts of India, and, at the same time, to ensure, as far as possible, that the main sections of the community are adequately represented. The old system failed in this object. The tendency in the past has been to recruit hurriedly for temporary vacancies, so that the men selected were in too many cases either persons living near the headquarters of Government or persons having relatives or friends in the offices who could give them early notice of the occurrence of vacancies. As work in a temporary capacity gives a reasonable claim to permanent employment, it is obviously undesirable to appoint local candidates in large numbers to temporary posts, as this gives them an advantage over candidates from more distant provinces who may in fact be better qualified, and tends unduly to restrict the sources of recruitment. The Staff Selection Board will enable departments to replace any temporary employes who are not fit for permanent employment by better qualified men selected from a wider field and a larger number of candidates.

(f) No. The Heads of Departments of the Government of India have neither the time nor the opportunity to obtain sufficient personal knowledge of the ability of each member of the clerical establishment in their Departments. Further, it is impossible to ensure uniformity of standard, when individual Departments recruit independently.

(g) No exemptions have been made in favour of the assistants and clerks of any office appointed since the creation of the Board, and the Board in dealing with Departments have emphasised the fact that no exemptions can be made.

RESOLUTION *RE* RAIDS IN THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE—(contd.)

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I am sure the introductory remarks which I made the other day relating to this* Resolution are fresh in the memory of the members who were present here and therefore I shall not repeat those remarks. I propose to resume the discussion from the very point at which I had left, *viz.*, the lawless and abominable character of the movement. This outlawry has been going on since many many years past and a detailed discussion is not called for because this frequency of raids in the North-West Frontier Province is a patent fact; hence it would be sufficient to advert to a few instances only. In 1913, the Yusuf Zai of Buner raided China village in the Peshawar district killing seven British subjects and Balagarhi, where they murdered two. The Ambahar Utman Khel kidnapped a Hindu from the canal quarters at Liam, raided Takht Bai, committed a theft with murder at Tangi, and raided Sukkar.

These raiders, daring and lawless as they are, some times extend the range of their depredations even to the Railway Stations. The Afghan raiders committed raids on the Jahangira Road and Khairabad Railway Stations in December 1913; at the former four railway servants were murdered and in the latter the Assistant Station Master was carried off. He was traced to Afghan territory.

Similarly, the Kohat district like that of Bannu suffered from kidnapping raids committed by residents of Khost.

In 1914, we find that the Naib Tahsildar of Idak was murdered by outlaws. On 29th November 1914, a large force of Zadrans, Tarus and Gulbaz suddenly descended on Miram Shah and looted and burnt parts of the Serai, with a loss of some 20 men. It is much more painful to notice that there are cases, and their number is not small, in which the local men were found to have harboured the perpetrators of the trans-frontier or conspired with them.

The year 1914 was a very tragic one. The murders of Major Dodd, C.I.E., Political Agent, Wana, Captain Brown, 2nd in Command, Southern Waziristan Militia, and Lieutenant Hickie, R. A., together with three men of the Frontier Constabulary, who lost their lives in the endeavour to arrest the murderer and assist the British officers, were the fruit of two separate conspiracies, unhappily successful, to procure Major Dodd's assassination by his *Malik Shahi* orderly. From this it is quite evident that sometimes servants and local men will participate in conspiracies of this type.

In 1915, the Mahsuds raided the British Districts throughout the summer and autumn, producing in Dera Ismail Khan a state of affairs without parallel, its northern half was almost ruined. The neighbouring District of Bannu also suffered severely at the hands of Mahsuds and Wazir raiders. The Mohmands made a series of raids into the Peshawar District, and their atrocious conduct culminated in a serious attack on Charsadda, when nearly the whole bazaar was burnt by the raiders. Here is another instance where some local men had more or less some hand in carrying out the diabolical programme.

On the 8th January last, a dāk runner and a sowar who was escorting him, were both murdered on the Chitral road by some *badmashees* who absconded with

*That this Assembly recommends to the Governor-General in Council that a Committee consisting of elected members of the Legislative Assembly be appointed to inquire into the internal and external causes of the raids in the North-West Frontier Province and to suggest as to what suitable and practical measures may be adopted to put an end to the raids.

[Dr. Nand Lal.]

the mail bags. In the same month the village of Amankot Danda was attacked by a large gang of Waziris who carried off nine men and one woman and drove off a herd of five hundred sheep and goats.

The same month a daring dacoity was committed in Mauza Karak, District Kohat, by a Lashkar of armed Afridis. The raiders committed many murders. They gave an open challenge to the Police and in broad daylight looted the bazaar and the houses. The moveable property of considerable value was taken away by them. These outlaws and enemy of humanity not only murdered a number of villagers, but also forcibly took away a number of persons with a dishonest intention to claim ransom. The relations of the kidnapped and abducted persons were left to weep and cry. It was reported to the authorities. Some families have been reduced to poverty owing to these depredations. We entertain a strong hope that the Government will take severe action to punish the culprits and compensate those who really suffered material loss and whose relations have fallen victims. This instance proves that there is not much of security of life and property in the North-West Frontier Province, and it is thus incumbent upon us to suggest that, in the interest of justice and humanity, prompt measures should be adopted to bring the raiders to book.

In the Southern Districts of the Province, it is said the raid affairs interfered with the normal working of the school, and in one instance the headmaster of a middle vernacular school in the Kohat District had to defend himself and his boarders in the Hostel against the attack of raiders. It can be said without fear of exaggeration that the lawlessness of the independent tribes is mainly responsible for the decline in attendance at primary schools, notably in the Districts of Kohat and Bannu which were practically exposed to raiding gangs. It can thus be said that the frequency of the raids in the Province has affected very materially the education of the children at some places in the Province.

This standing menace to the peace-loving and loyal subjects of His Majesty, I may be permitted to submit, takes away much of the prestige of the Government, and I deem it my paramount duty to bring it to the notice of the Government.

Now the recent tragedy at Kohat, the abduction of a lady and of British soldiers from Peshawar and a highly successful raid for arms and ammunition, again at Kohat, during the past year, and numerous raids by trans-frontier tribesmen of almost daily occurrence on the villages within our borders have all combined to give prominence to the question as to whether the present day frontier policy of the Government is suited to the changed circumstances of the border line, or it ought to be improved by putting an end to these aggressions. I am sorry to say that these frontier raids, as I have heard, appear to have extended to the Campbellpore District also. The atrocious conduct of these raiders, before whom the life of a human being has not much value or no value at all, has begun to terrify the minds of some people in the District above mentioned. If this is true then no time should be lost in taking effective measures to prevent recurrence of this outrageous and thieving expedition of the raiders.

I do not feel justified to go into the causes of these raids, nor do I propose to suggest effective remedies, because I do not want to prejudice the Committee of Inquiry which the Resolution under discussion commends to be constituted.

I should like that their inquiry may be independent and based on evidence to be taken by them in order to assist the Government with their useful suggestions. It will be their duty to make a sifting inquiry and deep investigation into the causes, both external and internal, which give rise to and foster these raids and outrages, and to suggest what effective measures may be adopted to eradicate these evils. I think I have said sufficient to lay a claim to your sympathy for the unfortunate people who are in standing fear to fall victim to the ravages, outrages and atrocities of these offenders against humanity, peace, and order.

In the end, while thanking the Honourable Assembly for a very patient hearing, I entertain a strong hope that they will give very favourable consideration to the Resolution which commends itself and they will kindly pass it unanimously.

The Honourable the President: The Resolution is :

‘ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a committee consisting of elected members of the Legislative Assembly be appointed to inquire into the internal and external causes of the raids in the North-West Frontier Province, and to suggest as to what suitable and practical measures may be adopted to put an end to the raids.’

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: Sir, I am sure the House will share my regret that we have not in this House the Foreign Secretary, who would probably have been better able to deal with this subject than I can pretend to do. At the same time, I feel that there are just a few facts and a few points of view which it is necessary for me to place at once before the House before they decide to express their opinions. Honourable Members will remember that I gave a detailed reply to a question which was put a few weeks ago by my friend Rai Jadu Nath Majumdar Bahadur, in the course of which I took care to state in some detail the steps which had already been taken in regard to this matter. So far as the Government of India are concerned, they will always welcome any suggestions which would end or materially reduce these frontier raids. We have heard a very harrowing description from Dr. Nand Lal of the raids that have taken place, and I am sure that every one of us, official and non-official, sympathises with the sufferers on the frontier. But I wish briefly to tell you now what steps have been taken by the Government in the last few years. If any Honourable Member would care to read the Administration Report for the years 1919 and 1920 relating to the border of the North-West Frontier Province, he will find in great detail all the steps that have been taken or are proposed to be taken in relation to this matter. I shall, therefore, briefly sum up, for the convenience of the House, the measures that have been taken during the last few years. The existing forces of police and the Frontier Constabulary have been largely increased and motor transport has been frequently used to increase their mobility. The number of Government rifles which has been issued to villagers has been largely increased in order to enable the villagers to protect themselves against trans-border raiders. Then the importance of reporting at once the advent of the raid gangs has been impressed upon the villagers, and a large amount of money has been spent in the collection of information ; and the whole system of intelligence has been overhauled.

It will also interest the House to know that in no case has a ransom been paid by the Government for the return of a kidnapped person. I will just give you the figures—altogether, on the frontier, 463 persons were kidnapped and 813 were released without the payment of any ransom.

[Dr. T. B. Sapru.]

The problem, as I understand it, is a very complicated one and varies from point to point on the frontier, and it requires a considerable amount of local knowledge, both of the people and of the country.

The officers of Government have been doing the best that they possibly could to meet a very awkward situation, and I am sure that the House will recognise that the Government feel very keenly that their own subjects require every possible protection. At the same time, it is impossible—and I venture to hope that the House will agree with me—to accept this Resolution in the form in which it has been put before the House. There are just one or two important matters to which I would invite your attention. I do not wish to utter one word which may give rise in this House, or outside this House, to any feeling of alarm ; but, at the same time, it is necessary to point out that an important mission is carrying on at this moment important negotiations in Kabul. Besides, the House will also remember that there is a state of war existing in Waziristan at the present moment, and our policy towards Wano has yet to be finally determined. These are important matters which have got to be borne in mind by every member of this House before he commits himself to any particular position in regard to this Resolution, and I hope the House will realise that, if I am opposing this Resolution, it is not in the spirit of any wanton opposition to it, but because we think the situation is such that the appointment of a Committee at the present juncture, so far from helping the situation, would lead to complications on the frontier.

I would suggest to my Honourable friend who has moved this Resolution, and also to this House, a course which seems to me to be better, and which, I trust, will appear to be better to the House also. We are willing to have a Round Table Conference with the Honourable Mover and any other members of this House who may be interested in the subject, at which the Foreign Secretary and military experts will be only too glad to explain the situation and to accept any suggestions that may seem to be practicable from the Honourable Mover or any other member who may be present at that Round Table Conference.

We are also willing to re-investigate the matter either by the appointment of a committee, such as is suggested by the Honourable Mover or by any other means, at a later time, that is to say, when times are more propitious and the complications that exist on the frontier at the present moment have been removed or reduced. If these considerations did not stand in our way we should not have offered any opposition to this Resolution—we should have welcomed it—though at the same time we realise that the appointment of a committee, all the members of which might not possess a local knowledge of the country or a technical knowledge of the frontier problem, would not be the best thing to do. And it is for this reason that I suggest to the House that they should accept my suggestion, namely, that a Round Table Conference should be arranged at which we can discuss with greater freedom all the problems relating to this question and arrive at some satisfactory conclusion. But it would not be wise and it would not be expedient for the sake of those very people whose interests my Honourable friend the Mover has at heart, at the present moment to appoint a committee which may lead to many misconceptions and which may affect certain matters of great importance to the defence of this country.

*

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur: Sir, this subject is indeed a very complicated one, and as my Honourable friend Dr. Sapru has pointed out, it may lead to some misconceptions if my Honourable friend Dr. Nand Lal's course were followed. But, at the same time, I must say that Government with all their local or technical knowledge have not been able to establish peace on our frontier for the last 50 years, and if all their knowledge has not been sufficient to prevent the raids referred to, I cannot see how it will suffer by sharing the responsibility with some members of this House.

The Government have established peace all over the country—from north to south and east to west—but the North-West Frontier Province is the plague spot, which is still pointed out by everybody as the place where neither life nor property, nor honour is yet safe. And in this connection I believe it is the Hindus who have been suffering most. I was in the Punjab very early in my life and took the trouble of going all over the frontier districts. I know something of those people of those districts and how harassed they have been, and how the raiders have often been encouraged in those raids of theirs by the enormous bribes received from the hands of Government. It seems to me that they have been given too much indulgence in the past, sometimes, some of these people are enlisted in our own Army. Then they get to know all—or nearly all—of the secrets of the Army and they are allowed to return to their own country on leave where they probably give confidential information to their friends.

The entire area from which all these raids issue will not be more than 2,500 square miles and the population will not be more than 10 lakhs, and it is surprising that the Government with its enormous resources, which could cope with the German Emperor and the German Empire, is unable to stand up and fight these petty and savage raiders who have been committing their raids for the last 50 years without cessation.

That is what surprises me and therefore I say the Government will lose nothing by taking some Members of this House into their confidence. There may be some secret things, but I think the Members of this House are responsible enough—they have enough sense of responsibility—to enable them to keep them. So, if the Government has any confidence in any of the elected representatives of the people, I do not think they should be averse from taking them into their confidence and making them share with them their responsibility. I think it will be a very good thing for the Government itself to do so. Because up to this time, the policy has been initiated by the Government. If the Government accepts this Resolution, the responsibility will not be theirs alone and will be shared by the people, and then, after accepting this Resolution, and acting upon the advice of the committee appointed, if the Government is still unable to restore peace and order, it will have very good reason to say that they have done their best. Therefore I say, from whatever point of view we look at it, it is better that my Honourable friend in front of me should accept this Resolution on behalf of the Government and relieve the public mind by showing that Government is no longer going to tolerate all these raids upon the British subjects in the North-West Frontier Province; and that they are perfectly willing to take into confidence the elected members of this House. There are many things which I know of the frontier, but which I do not wish to say in public, and I think the Government ought to take into their confidence some of the representatives of the people in order to shape their future policy and see how things fare thereby.

The Honourable the President : Do I understand that the Honourable Mover of this Resolution wishes to ask leave to withdraw this Resolution ?

Dr. Nand Lal : No, Sir. I adhere to every word of the Resolution and I find it is a perfectly sound and good and properly worded Resolution, and I do not want to accept any amendment or any deduction therefrom.

The Honourable the President : The question put to the Honourable Member was not whether he was willing to accept an amendment of his Resolution, but whether, in view of the firm offer made to him by the Government, he would withdraw his Resolution and come to terms with them behind the scenes.

Dr. Nand Lal : I am sorry I cannot withdraw.

Mr. Mahmood S'Chamnad Sahib Bahadur : Sir, I beg to impress upon the Assembly the necessity of thoroughly investigating and finding out the real causes of these raids before applying the remedy. The present causes in my humble opinion are more external than internal. If a man is suffering from a boil I think there will not be much use in treating him internally. If real causes are not found out and suitable remedies are not applied, the money spent on the North-West Frontier will be a waste. There is no good in spending money in a wild goose chase. I believe the general unrest in the Moslem world has got much to do with the present raids. Therefore, when the cause for that unrest is removed, these raids must necessarily stop. I therefore request the Government to realise the necessity of finding out the real cause of these raids before proceeding further.

Khan Bahadur Zahir-ud-Din Ahmad : I am not in favour of this Resolution and my reason is this. The committee will be of no use—even if the committee be composed of Government members and not only of elected members. These are military subjects. The best men to judge them are military men, and in my opinion the trouble lies in the fact that we have not perhaps got a strong enough army. Now, instead of having these committees, I would rather ask my friend here not to appoint a committee, but to make the army stronger. If there were a stronger army on the frontier even the Japanese will not come to annoy us. The best course is that we should be guided by those experts, and how my elected friends will be able to help in this matter I do not know. The age of this Assembly is only one month, and Government experts have devoted their whole life to the matter. Now the Resolution would amount to this that a baby one month old will go to give lessons to his mother or grandmother. I am therefore for rejecting this Resolution and depending on the Government to do their best. Raids do occur. Evils do exist. But the remedy of the evil is, as I said, to have a strong police or a strong army and there is no other remedy.

Munshi Iswar Saran : Sir, the account that we heard from the Honourable Mover of this Resolution must have convinced, if anybody did need conviction, that the state of affairs round about the North-West Frontier Province is not very satisfactory, and that this Assembly would be wanting in its duty if it did not do all that it could legitimately do to remove the evils that have been described to us. But, Sir, I venture to think that the considerations which have been placed before this House by the Honourable the Law Member, speaking on behalf of the Government, do deserve our serious consideration. I submit we should do nothing at the present moment which

might lead to complications and which might in any way interfere with the negotiations that we are told are going on at the present moment and on a satisfactory settlement of which I venture to say a good deal will depend. I shall, therefore, earnestly ask the Members of this Honourable House to pause and to consider before they come to a decision on this point. In the speech that has been made on behalf of the Government, it has been distinctly said that the Government are willing to meet such of the Members as may be interested in this question in a Round Table Conference. I submit, Sir, that that would afford, in the circumstances which unfortunately exist at the present moment, the best remedy for arriving at a solution. What I submit is that, if we really take into account—and I hope no one will imagine that the statement made on behalf of the Government is not correct—the statement made on behalf of the Government, then it becomes perfectly obvious that no committee can with safety go into those parts and collect evidence there. A visit to the North-West Frontier at the present moment would be anything but safe. Speaking as a non-official member deeply interested in the personal safety of non-official Members themselves, I submit, Sir, that it will not be safe at the present moment for any Commission or Committee to venture into those wild regions. So, what have we left now? That this Committee should meet in Delhi or some other place far away from the scene. If that be so, Sir, then I submit that the offer which has been made on behalf of Government seems to be acceptable. Without for a moment agreeing with my friend, the new baby, a month old, I do maintain that it is the duty and the privilege of this Assembly to offer advice to the Government. It is well known that old people, for a variety of reasons, do require advice; some of their powers, to take the illustration used by my Honourable friend, get weak and it is therefore conceivable that the advice which may be given by younger people may be helpful. But, apart from that, I submit that this is certainly a question in which this Assembly is most vitally interested, and I shall only beg the Honourable Members present to take into consideration the statement that has been made as regards the negotiations that are going on at the present moment.

Therefore, Sir, I would like to know if I shall be in order if I make one suggestion as regards the way in which this Resolution might be amended. In that form it may perhaps be possible for the Government to accept it. If you will allow me, Sir, and if I am not out of order, I shall suggest the following form :—

‘That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee consisting of elected members of the Legislative Assembly be appointed to suggest as to what suitable and practical measures may be adopted to put an end to the raids which occur in the North-West Frontier Province.’

I submit that this will practically come to a Round Table Conference, and there will not be any substantial difference between my amendment and the course suggested by the Honourable Member who has spoken on behalf of Government. If that is so, then I shall press it upon the Assembly to accept the Resolution in this modified form.

Rai Bahadur Pandit J. L. Bhargava: Sir, I also agree with Mr. Iswar Saran in suggesting that the Assembly should adopt the suggestion which he has made.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: In ordinary circumstances, Sir, if this Resolution had been moved by the Honourable Member in this House, I have no doubt that the House would have at once accepted the Resolution, and I

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

venture to believe that even the Government would have had no hesitation in accepting the offered help of a committee consisting of the elected members of this Assembly. But from what has fallen from my Honourable friend Dr. Sapru, I am convinced—and I am sure that this Honourable House is convinced—that the circumstances are far from being normal, that the circumstances that are now existing on the Frontier are abnormal circumstances, that to meet these circumstances, Government has already launched on a policy, that negotiations are already going on with Afghanistan and on the Frontier, and that we would not be solving the difficulties, but would be adding to them, if at this moment we were to make the work of the Government more complicated by interfering with that policy by the appointment of a Committee. I think, as a responsible body, it would hardly be to our credit if we were at this serious moment to try to interfere with a policy which has been decided upon after due and deliberate consideration. I may say also, Sir, that I do not agree with the views of my Honourable friend Mr. Iswar Saran inasmuch as he has moved an amendment to Dr. Nand Lal's Resolution. I think we ought to accept the offer made by the Honourable the Law Member to meet at a Round Table Conference with His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the military authorities, and have a free and full discussion on the subject, and even go further and ask any questions we like for our satisfaction with regard to getting knowledge of all that is taking place on the Frontier and in regard to the Government's policy. That seems to me to be a practical suggestion, and I do not think we shall be acquitting ourselves as a responsible body if, in our zeal for having a voice in everything that is happening, we try to interfere with a policy which aims at the settling of the whole trouble, especially when a step like this on our part threatens to create further complications and to increase the difficulty of the Government of India, and consequently our own. I do not think as a responsible body we shall be acting properly in the interests of those whom we represent here if at this time, over-zealous about our rights, we insist on the appointment of this committee. I shall ask the Honourable House to take into consideration the arguments I have advanced and reject the Resolution of my Honourable friend Dr. Nand Lal, and accept the offer made by my Honourable friend Dr. Sapru.

Lieutenant-Colonel D. Herbert: I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

The Honourable the President: I call upon Dr. Nand Lal to reply.

Dr. Nand Lal: First of all, Sir, I feel bound to thank the Honourable the Law Member for his sincere expression of opinion to the effect that the Government sympathises with the Resolution. But my Honourable friend has set forth certain reasons asking that this Resolution may not be adopted. In reply to those reasons, I may very respectfully tell the Honourable Member that he is wrong, and his fear, or Government's fear, seems to be misplaced. What do I ask for? What does this Resolution urge? It is this, that a committee may be constituted. Will the constitution of a committee upset the arrangements of the Government? Will it? Not at all. The constitution of a committee will not interfere with the negotiations which are going on with the rulers of Afghanistan or Kabul. This committee, if it is constituted, will hold its sittings and make inquiry into all these troubles. And who will be summoned to give evidence? Those who are living and have suffered. Can you get accurate, correct, independent, real and right account of those sufferings from Government officials who form their own opinion at Simla or in Delhi?

The people who have suffered are the fit persons who can throw light on the question. It is they who can give an accurate account of the troubles and the causes thereof. We shall put questions to them, as for instance, 'What are the causes, why do these raiders come here?' What remedy can you suggest? They are the proper people who can suggest the remedy,—the people who reside there and who know about local affairs. We may sit round a table and waste our time, or spend our time, working in a modest way. But it will not be of any avail at all. Therefore, it seems very necessary that a committee should be constituted. One of my learned friends has anticipated the fear for the safety of those members who will go to the North-West Frontier for the inquiry. He in a way admits that the state of affairs there is horrible. Are we to meet this trouble in the way suggested by the Government? Not at all. Therefore, the suggestion, which has been though very honestly made, I should say, is not feasible at all. It does not meet the present situation. Another gentleman has shared the same view. He has said that it seems proper that the suggestion offered by the Honourable the Law Member should be accepted and this Resolution, which as a matter of fact, is the voice of the public, may be dropped altogether, or may be rejected.

What will be the opinion of the people? What view will be held by the people of the Frontier? They will say that all their troubles have been placed before this House, which is a representative House, that their cries have not been given a proper response, and that the response which is suggested by the Government is not adequate. Therefore this response, I may respectfully submit, should not be appreciated at all. To be brief and not desirous of taking up more time of the Assembly, I submit that this Resolution may be accepted without any modification.

One Honourable gentleman asked for a modification, that a conference with Government officials and discussion would be sufficient. But on what data? Perhaps he meant to say that there should be no inquiry. How can suggestions be made without making an inquiry? There must be some data on which those suggestions can be based. Can anybody offer suggestions without having a knowledge of the trouble? So far as the suggested amendment goes, it has got no force at all. A regular Resolution has been placed before the House, and if the Government accepts it, its hands will be strengthened, and the suggestions which will be offered by the Committee will be placed before it, and if the Government acts up to them and even then fails, then the Government will have a very good answer, 'We have accepted the suggestions. We have acted up to them, but there is no good result.' Then there will be no cry, because there will be no help for it. I hope that the Honourable the Law Member will take these things into consideration. I am sure the House is with me, and will give its support to the Resolution in the interests of humanity, order, peace and good government. Therefore I need not amplify the arguments any longer, I need not dilate on the subject too much. I think the Resolution commends itself to the House, and I am hopeful that the whole House will see that it is passed unanimously.

The Honourable the President: The question is that the following Resolution be accepted:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee consisting of elected members of the Legislative Assembly be appointed to inquire into the internal and external causes of the raids in the North-West Frontier Province, and to suggest as to what suitable and practical measures may be adopted to put an end to the raids.'

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION *RE* EXPORT OF CATTLE.

Dr. Nand Lal: Mr. President, the Resolution which I have to move
12 P.M. runs as follows :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to prohibit, by legislation, the export of cows, bullocks and buffaloes from British India to any foreign country.'

This is a very important Resolution and speaks for itself. As you know, India is an agricultural country. Practically, the wealth of India formerly used to be counted in cattle. The people of India, in the main, were dependent on the milk, ghee, and curd supply as a principal part of their food. There are a number of causes which have reduced the supply of milk, as for instance, cow-killing, an abominable act, want of sufficient and timely rains, export of cattle, want of fodder on account of the want of pasture land. The export of cattle, as I have said, is one of the causes which has tended to reduce the supply of milk and other cognate articles which are prepared from it. Physicians and medical men will tell you that milk contains those properties which go to sustain the human life. There is a regular struggle within ourselves between the germs of various maladies and the resisting force which we naturally possess. If the forces which have to resist the various germs of maladies and diseases have not got sufficient resisting power, then the forces of maladies and diseases will gain the upper hand, and the human body will begin to deteriorate. Therefore, the shortness in the supply of milk has affected our physique. We deteriorate in our physique, and therefore a good many troubles arise. To meet this difficulty, we have to put an end to all the causes which have created this poverty of physique. One of them is the export of cattle, and this Resolution is intended to meet that.

Perhaps, you would like to know how many cattle are exported. They are exported in thousands and thousands. The literature, upon which I could lay my hand, has strengthened me to say that, in 1913-14, cattle, excepting sheep and goats, exported to the British Empire alone, amounted to 28,582. In 1914-15 it amounted to 16,589. In 1915-16 it amounted to 14,213. In 1916-17 it amounted to 14,568. In 1917-18, 9,005. Unfortunately in 1918-19 it rose to the figure 44,438. So far as the other foreign places are concerned, the export amounted, in 1913-14, to 1,327 and to 1,119 in 1914-15; a very small number indeed in 1915-16 and a similarly small number in 1916-17. It was 972 in 1917-18 and a very small number in 1918-19. The total number of cattle exported to both kinds of places amounts to 1,30,654. It cannot be denied that the export of these cattle causes a great decrease in the supply of milk which sustains the lives of Indians, as they are used to that sort of food. It may not be a staple food, but all the same it is a major factor of that food, *viz.*, one of the most essential ingredients. Now how can we get rid of this evil? One of the remedies, which this Resolution suggests to this Honourable House, is that the export of cattle may be stopped by legislation. Some sort of amendment has been suggested and I may say at once that it is much more than an amendment. That amendment takes away the life out of this Resolution. If that amendment is carried out, then this Resolution will be reduced to a mere skeleton. This Resolution will then become nugatory. Most probably this Honourable House may like to ask why. The answer is obvious enough. The determination of the

point, whether a particular breed is good or bad, is sure to be left to some sort of human agency. It will then become a kind of tossing affair. It will rest with the officer who has to give an adjudication upon the point. A law should be framed in such a manner that there should be no ambiguity in it. There is fear not only of ambiguity, but also there is the fear of a gambling spirit. Therefore this amendment which has been proposed has got no force in it at all. When I thought of this Resolution, one idea occurred to my mind, and that was the question of time limitation. This idea had hardly occupied my mind for a minute or two when the second idea cropped up which was that the time limitation also is an idle one. Law is made to remove the present trouble. Now the present complaint is that this export causes a regular drain and it should consequently be stopped. If it were not required and there were a change in the circumstances it would be obvious. Therefore no time limitation seems to be necessary. I therefore move this Resolution as it stands, with the strongest possible hope that you will pass it unanimously, and I am sure even the Government will have no hesitation in giving its support to it.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanyam : Sir, the amendment which I intend moving is as follows. After the words 'export of' put in 'such class or breed of'. The sentence will then read 'the export of such class or breed of cows, bullocks and buffaloes' etc., and then at the end add the words 'as may be notified by the Local Government'.

The Resolution is designed to prohibit altogether the export of three sets of animals. My amendment is intended, if the principle of the Resolution is accepted by the House, to restrict the force of the Resolution. It holds that the prohibition of the export would produce injurious result to labour in any country and in this country with its large area, if you endorse the principle that these three sets of animals should not be exported and that they should remain here, work here and die here, I think it will have far reaching effects. Now the first people who will be affected, injuriously affected by this prohibition, would be the small class of peasants and farmers of moderate position in life, who add to their agricultural incomes and to their agricultural activities by the export of these animals. Those Honourable Members who may have some acquaintance with agricultural conditions in the country would see at once that there are not many large cattle farms in this country and that cattle farming is not taken to as in other countries on a large scale. It is only the small men, as I said the farmers, who have taken to breeding and make some income out of it. If you prohibit the export of produce of these men it means that you take away a certain portion of their income. I do not think this class of people are represented here in this Assembly, but many of us have something to do in some form or another with agricultural life, and we ought to be able to say at once whether this will or will not affect injuriously the income of that class of people. Now there is another larger question, the number of cattle in the country. I am told on good authority that the number is very large and that the pasture available is not enough to keep this large number of animals in good condition. Now the question of pasture is a very important one. If you have a large number of cattle and the pasture available is not sufficient to support them, then the cattle are sure to be under-fed. If you have cattle which are not kept or which it is not possible to keep in good condition, then the question arises whether this state of affairs should be continued or some remedy ought not to be found for lessening this large number of under-fed cattle. In considering

[Mr. C. S. Subrahmanyam.]

that question the export of cattle is one of the means by which the number of under-fed cattle can be lessened. Now we have not been told by the Honourable Mover whether the cattle that are exported are of the right type, that is of the useful, serviceable type. If they are of the useful and serviceable type and if they are exported, then it means relieving the country from the necessity of finding fodder for these animals.

It adds some money to the owner of the cattle and it relieves the country of the necessity of finding fodder for these cattle. Therefore, on that ground, and until we are assured that the pasture available in the country is enough to meet the requirements of the existing number of cattle, I think this House should not endorse this wholesale prohibition of the export of cattle. Well, there may be something at the back of the minds of those who support this proposition, namely, that the export of cattle should be altogether prohibited, but, as far as we can understand, the main reason given by the Honourable Mover in support of this Resolution is that the milk supply of the country is diminished by the export of cattle. Well, the milk supply might be diminished if good milking cows and shebuffaloes, *i.e.*, milking buffaloes, are exported, but whether the milk supply would be diminished—I do not mean any offence—by stopping the export of bullocks and buffaloes, is another matter, which I must leave to the Honourable Mover to explain. But, before we ask this House to take a definite step on a matter like this, it is necessary that he should furnish us, or point to us, the sources of information as to the quality of the cows that are exported. If valuable milk cows and good cattle are exported to the detriment, to the lessening of the available stock of cows in the country, then, I think, he will have a good case. Any one who passes on a road will see that there are a large number of under-fed, half-starved bullocks in the country. Well, if, as I believe, the exported cattle are of the inferior type, their export would be an advantage. Well, that view is a rather hard view to take. All my Honourable Colleagues here have at the back of their minds that the export of these cattle is more or less for the purposes of food, and they think with their natural instinct of charity that the prohibition of the export of these cattle would be an act of charity towards those animals that they should not be exported to a country where they would be slaughtered, but that they should remain in this country to die a lingering death. The question is a difficult question between these two forms of death, namely, to allow the animals to die a lingering death or to despatch them quickly. On that question it is very difficult to persuade a Hindu audience to take the other summary idea of charity. Well, I would ask the House not to take that question into consideration, but to decide it on the ground that you ought not to interfere with the profits of any section of the community unless you are called upon to do so by some imperative necessity. We here should not be damaging the interests of persons who take to the rather precarious business of rearing cattle. Well, on that main ground I would ask the House not to accept the Resolution in that form; but if, as has been alleged in some places, for instance, that in Nellore where there is one of the recognised types of bulls and cows reared by farmers in small and large numbers and where there is an agitation that a large number of cattle had been exported to the Malay Peninsula, to the Straits Settlements and to other countries, and thereby the stock available in that district was depleted and there was a fear that the type would become extinct, in such a case Government might interfere and

see that a particular type of breed does not become extinct. That relates to the question which was asked this morning and answered about the Ongole type. There is the Amritmahal type and other types in other places. My amendment, I submit, will at least prevent the depletion of any particular class of cattle which it is an advantage to retain in the country. It also prevents the taking away of the profits or the lessening of the value of the property of people who are engaged in the business of cattle rearing or of the generality of people who may have unserviceable cattle which they want to dispose of. There are the larger questions about the supply of fodder and whether this country can maintain all the cattle that are growing up in the country. Cattle breed very quickly, probably in three years the number would be doubled and our fodder resources will not double in that same ratio. All these things should be taken into account, and not only the sentimental ground that cattle which are taken away to other countries are slaughtered for food, and so on. I request my Honourable Colleague not to give any weight to these considerations, but to look at the question as a hard business proposition.

The Honourable the President: The question is that in the Resolution after the words 'export of,' the words "such class or breed of" be inserted, and at the end the words "as may be notified by the Local Government" be added.

Mr. E. L. Price: Sir, I rise to support what I consider a very sensible amendment. I am not a Padget, M. P., who professes to know all about India and its affairs in six weeks. I have been in the country about 16 years and I do know something about my own district, and what I have not very rapidly discovered is this, that the attitude of the agriculturist and the attitude of the townsman towards the cattle question are entirely different. It must be recognised, I think, as a fact, that the supply of milk is the result of two factors, the factor of the number of neat cattle in proportion to the factor of fodder supply. Well, in Sindh, unfortunately, we are everlastingly short of fodder; the price of grass is Rs. 45 a thousand lbs. Now the agriculturist dealing with cattle is dealing in a business-like way with a business proposition. If he has got cattle of any sort, milch or draught, that are worth feeding, he feeds them to the best of his ability; and if he cannot feed them, he will sell them to the butcher or to any one else. The townsman, however, seems to take another and a quite different view. As often as not, you find animals that are well worth feeding in a town under-fed, and then, somewhere in the suburbs, you find a *pinjrapole* where old and useless cattle, whose lives are a burden to them and absolutely useless to the community, are gorged, literally gorged, on fodder that ought to be given to the younger and more useful animals. I say, Sir, that there is a radical difference between the attitude of the agriculturist in the country and the attitude of the townsman towards this cattle and milk question, and it is simply because the agriculturist deals with the thing in a rational, business-like way, because it is to him a business, whereas the man in the town seems to me to let some weird notion of sentiment run away with him and cause incalculable loss to the community, since the fodder that ought to feed the milch cattle is given to old and useless animals whose end would be a mercy to themselves and a relief to the locality of a great drain on its fodder resources.

I, therefore, do support this amendment.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma : Sir, the Government fully realise the great importance which the country attaches to the question of its cattle-wealth, and I am glad that my friend the Honourable Dr. Nand Lal has brought forward this Resolution in the Assembly, for the simple reason that I hope that its discussion to-day will remove some of the misunderstandings, misconceptions and ignorance that prevail generally on this subject. It will have served a very useful purpose if only people can see really what the facts are and that the Government are working in the true interests of the country and on right lines.

The Honourable Member's principal point was that the physique of the people is deteriorating on account of the insufficient milk supply due to the export of cattle from the country, and that consequently we ought to prohibit by legislation the export of cows and cow buffaloes. He did not say so, but he is evidently under the impression that, in respect of male buffaloes and bullocks, the agriculturist is suffering on account of their export inasmuch as the remaining stock is insufficient for the needs of the country. I take it that is his meaning, although he has not said so.

Dr. Nand Lal : It is so.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma : Well, on these two grounds he asks the Assembly to accept his Resolution, that we should recommend to the Governor General in Council the absolute prohibition for the time being of all exports. I should not have been surprised if he had brought this Resolution in ignorance of the figures that he has quoted this morning to the House, because then there would have been some justification for the alarm he might have felt that there was a very great depletion of stocks in this country by reason of these exports. But I was somewhat surprised to find that he considers that an average export of about 13 or 14,000 per annum from the whole of India to foreign countries, including in the term 'foreign countries' all countries outside India and Burma, such as Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Mauritius, Java, etc., where there is a large resident Indian population, that the total export to all these countries put together is roughly, 14,000 as against 140 million cattle, bovine cattle, in this country,—that is a percentage of somewhere near '0001. He thinks that this large number is responsible for the deficiency of the milk supply. And this cannot be the whole number, because part of it must be bullocks and bulls and male buffaloes. Well, I think the figures he has quoted are ample refutation of his argument that there is any serious drain of the cattle which are necessary for the proper nourishment and for the proper agriculture of this country. I shall have to deal with this subject at somewhat greater length on another Resolution which another Honourable Member is going to bring forward in connection with the slaughter of cows, so I shall not weary the House with a very long explanation of the subject to-day, but shall content myself with merely stating that we have no reason for alarm inasmuch as the cows and cow buffaloes which in 1910-11 were computed to be 47·7 millions have risen in 1920 to 50·4 millions, that is, an increase of two millions and odd. The population meanwhile may have increased or is expected to have increased roughly from 243 to 253 millions. The proportion of cows and cow buffaloes, therefore, to the population is somewhat more favourable now than it was in 1910-1911. I do not for one moment ask this House to consider that the milk supply of the country is absolutely adequate, or that it does not require

improvement. What we want in India is not so much numbers and quantity as quality—in this as well as in other matters. Honourable Members must within the last few days have read the figures of the cattle statistics relating to other countries, and compared them with those of India. We find that if it were only a question of numbers, we are very much better off than many other countries in the world. But, Sir, it is a sad tale when we compare the milking capacity of our cows generally with what obtains in other countries or with the best cattle even here. I will only mention one fact for the purpose of showing that the Government is duly impressed with the importance of the subject—that at the price of two annas per seer, the milk supply of this country was computed to be worth roughly 140 crores,—that is, estimating at the rate of 1 seer per cow and 2 seers per buffalo cow; whereas we can safely put it at three or four times and even much higher if we only look to the improvement of the breeds, as we have done successfully in Pusa and in other places, and as we have attempted to do throughout the country. That is to say, we can increase the value of the milk supply of this country from about 300 crores, at the higher prices now prevailing to 1,200 crores or more. So it is not by the increase in the number of cows or by bringing from outside this country a few hundreds or a few thousands that we shall be able to meet the situation. Paucity of numbers is not at the real bottom of our troubles, but it is the absolutely miserable way in which these cows are fed and in which the breeding qualities of cattle are looked after that are responsible for our position. Then, again, it is from the districts and provinces where the cattle are bred in large numbers that these exports are largely taken. It is from Madras that we find a vast majority of these exports go. Out of those 13 or 14 thousand average export per year, I may say that roughly 10 thousand go from Madras to Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, etc., where there is a large resident Indian population. It is in those provinces where there is a surplus available that we find any exports. Of course, the same thing cannot be said of Bombay and we are looking into the matter. In 1907 and 1908 and again in 1914, we looked into this matter and we referred it to the Board of Agriculture. On every occasion that we have considered this question, our expert advisers have told us that the true remedy lay in improving the quality and not in prohibiting export. There has been one very good result. The price of cattle has risen as the result of the competition of the foreign buyers and the agricultural wealth of the country has been added to in that way. But we are not oblivious of the fact that evils may have arisen and we have attempted to ascertain from the exporting provinces whether they can tell us if their stocks of good breeds have been unduly depleted. The Madras Government have intimated to us that it would be desirable, in the interests of that province, that the Ongole bulls and cows might, for the time being at any rate, be prevented from going abroad. And the Government of India have resolved—I may inform the House—to prevent, by notification under the Export and Import Act possibly, the export of Ongole cattle, because here it has been ascertained on definite inquiry by a responsible Government that during the last few years the province has been unduly depleted of stocks of a very fine breed, and that that breed deserved protection. We have addressed the Bombay Presidency also on the subject. We have not had a very definite statement yet as to the breeds of cattle, if any, which have to be protected. We were told that a limitation might be put upon the numbers to be exported; and if the Bombay Government find that our assistance is necessary and were to approach the Government of India with specific recommendations, the

[Mr. B. N. Sarma.]

Government of India would be only too glad to accept the recommendation, if possible.

I will not weary Honourable Members with figures very much, but they may take it from me that the average export from India to countries which can be really said to be foreign, such as Belgium and so on, is only about 700 per annum; the average export figures were 17,303 from 1913-14 to 1917-18 and became reduced to 13,507 in the quinquennium ending 1919-20. There is no reason, therefore, for any apprehension that the export of cattle is going on on an alarming scale. Honourable Members will see that there is absolutely no case whatsoever made out for the general prohibition that is sought. In this connection I may also state that the normal exports of ghee from India to other countries during the last 7 or 8 years has been nearly the same, with slight fluctuations. This also shows clearly that the milk supply could not have been diminishing during the last few years.

Then, with regard to bullocks and buffaloes for cultivation purposes, there is still less of a case for the Honourable Member to proceed upon. He will find that in 1912-13 there were about 51·5 millions the same approximately as the number of cows and cow buffaloes, etc.; and in 1919-20, 54·4 millions, that is, there has been an increase of nearly 3 millions as against an increase from 255 millions to 264 millions in acreage. That means that there are more cattle now for the cultivation of land than there were in 1912-13, if there be any accuracy in these figures. There is thus no cause absolutely for any alarm whatsoever under this head.

This much is however clear: that it was the famine of 1918-19 which was widespread throughout India that did produce great cattle mortality as well as human mortality and reduced the previous figures slightly. It is that cause really which has alarmed the people to such an extent; but when we compare a period of years, there is absolutely no ground for any alarm whatsoever. The question is being gone into, and as I have already said every possible step is being taken to prevent any undue depletion of stocks. The Government are carefully watching and will carefully watch the decrease in cattle, especially in the Punjab, the United Provinces, particularly Agra, and part of Bombay. An investigation has to be made there, and agriculture is now a Transferred Subject. Representatives of the people in the local Councils will be in a position to express their wishes in a concrete form such as can be acted upon by any Government; and I think therefore the Honourable Member was ill-advised in asking for such a general prohibition as is suggested in the Resolution that he has brought forward.

With regard to the amendment of the Honourable Mr. Subramanyam, I am in deep sympathy with the object he has at heart, and I appreciate fully the very sensible remarks which he has made in explaining the difficulties in our way. If only we can surmount the difficulties as presented by the fodder problem and the infectious disease problem, the process of reproduction would be so rapid that the increase would be absolutely unnecessary for the needs of the people, and it would be ridiculous, wrong, uneconomical and suicidal to think at any time of prohibition of exports from this country. We have a reputation to build up, and it should be our earnest endeavour to make the Indian cattle famous throughout the world; that must be our ambition. We must see that the best breeds of our cattle go forth to foreign countries to bring plenty and contentment to the

people of other lands, just as we should benefit by the best cattle from other countries being brought in here. That should be the line of our policy, and not a narrow, suicidal policy of trying to live for ourselves and within ourselves, which we can never do satisfactorily.

It is therefore necessary, in the economic interests of this country, that this House should determine at the very outset that there should be no such policy as prohibition of exports in general terms. With regard to the amendment that I was speaking about, there is this difficulty : the Local Governments cannot be given full power as is suggested, because it would be difficult to differentiate in the ports between cattle of one province and those of another. Take the case of the Bombay Presidency which has two ports, Bombay and Karachi; a number of cattle may come from the Punjab into Karachi; the Punjab Government may not care to prohibit their export, but the Local Government of Bombay may be in favour of some prohibition. Similarly, taking the case of Bengal, the Bengal Legislative Council may be in favour of some prohibition; but Calcutta is also the port for Bihar and Orissa; it is also a port for Assam, and parts of other provinces also. In some of these provinces the increases are large, and therefore this matter cannot be left entirely to the Local Governments. That is the reason why I find great difficulty in accepting the amendment that has been suggested by my Honourable friend. If any particular Local Government find our assistance necessary, present to us the facts of the case and ask for protection of any breed of cattle which is peculiar to that province and which can be differentiated, and ask for the imposition of limitations and restrictions, the Government of India would be only too glad to comply with such a request. I therefore strongly oppose the original Resolution, and regret that I cannot accept the amendment that has been suggested by Mr. Subrahmanyam. I would like, if possible, that the other amendment be moved, so that I may be able to explain my position completely.

Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala : Sir, I would appeal to my Honourable friend, Dr. Nand Lal, to withdraw his Resolution, as I have given notice of my intention to introduce a Bill in this Assembly, not totally prohibiting the export of cattle, but restricting export and also restricting the destruction of cattle, and I have drafted a very short Bill with a few sections

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : I rise to a point of order, Sir. That Bill is not before this House now.

The Honourable the President : No, but the Honourable Member may give his intention of bringing in such a Bill as a reason for persuading another member to take a certain course with regard to his own Resolution.

Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala : Now, in that proposed Bill I say that it might be declared unlawful to slaughter, kill or otherwise destroy any milch or agricultural cattle for purposes of food, bones or hide. I have in a previous section defined milch cattle as meaning cows and buffaloes which are capable of calving and bulls which are fit for breeding purposes, and agricultural cattle as meaning cattle such as are generally used in India for purposes of agriculture including their young ones; so that I exclude from this definition all such cattle as are useless. I have further said that a certificate of a qualified medical man should be conclusive proof of the matters certified, so that when I bring up my Bill every Honourable Member of this House will have an opportunity of discussing the matter thoroughly. I submit that

[Lala G. L. Agarwala.]

at the present stage it is not necessary for my learned friend Dr. Nand Lal to be afraid of any serious injury being done to the cattle population of this country, and I would appeal to him again to wait and see when the Bill comes forward, and it would be time enough for him then and for other Honourable Members of this House to make their amendments and suggestions with regard to the particular sections and provisions of my Bill.

The Honourable the President : The original question was that :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to prohibit, by legislation, the export of cows, bullocks and buffaloes from British India to any foreign country.’

Since which an amendment has been moved, namely :

‘ That after the words ‘ export of ’ the words ‘ such class or breed of ’ be inserted and at the end the words ‘ as may be notified ’ by the Local Government be added.’

The question is that the amendment be made.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju : Sir, the amendment which I propose to place for the consideration of this Assembly is that for the words from ‘ cows, bullocks ’ to the end of the Resolution, the following be substituted : ‘ good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country till the Government is satisfied that India has enough and to spare.’ From the observations of the Honourable the Revenue Member, I take it that Government are already disposed to take into consideration the depletion of any important breeds from any part of the country. So far, from the observations of the Honourable the Revenue Member, I gather that the Nellore breed is being depleted. I may state that they are nearly exhausted on account of export to Java for the last five years, and during the last two years to the Straits Settlements, and we must congratulate the Government of Java for taking precautions to secure good breeds wherever they can be had and supplying them to the agriculturists at the expense of the Government. If our Government also followed the same policy it would have enough of good breeds in this country. We have had enough of sympathy expressed, but I find there is not much of practical action directed in that course, because I do not find any large number of cattle imported, good breeds or otherwise, into our country ; though small quantities are exported from our country. The estimates of the Government as to the number exported must be taken with some discount, because reliable figures are not obtainable in all parts of the country. So far as actual figures are, in the year 1912-13, we find that in British territory there are about 95 million and odd, and now the Honourable the Revenue Member says we have got about 140 million. Giving a margin for 20 million for inaccuracies due to guess work, because in most zemindari tracts it is the irresponsible karnams who report the matter, it will be seen that the figure given by Government is not quite accurate. However, I earnestly draw the attention of the Assembly that good breeds of cattle should be prevented from being exported from British India if we have not got enough of them in this country. There is no use in saying that we should not export at all, because every country which produces good breed exports it and realises large profits. In Canada, they are making nearly 60 crores by exporting animals and animal produce, whereas we are realising money by sending living animals, including cattle, sheep, goats, etc., to the extent of

only Rs. 22½ lakhs. From such a large country as India can we not export animals and animal produce of a larger value? What we generally export is bones from this country to the extent of some lakhs, which ought to be kept back for manurial purposes in our own country. But taking all in all, I would respectfully urge on the attention of Government that they should take sufficient precautions to secure that good breeds are kept in the country in sufficient number and also adopt other precautionary measures to improve these breeds. Therefore my suggestion is that the Government of India themselves should take this matter in hand, because some difficulty has been pointed out about the Local Governments being given such power, and stop the export of good breeds of cattle, wherever possible, and adopt the necessary precautionary measures wherever they are necessary to secure this object. With these few words, Sir, I commend my amendment to the acceptance of this Assembly.

The Honourable the President : The question is :

‘ That for the words from ‘ cows, bullocks, etc., ’ to the end of the Resolution, the following be substituted : ‘ good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country till the Government is satisfied that India has enough and to spare ’.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma : Sir, I do not think I need enter into any controversy with the Honourable Member as to the correctness of his statement that the Government are not doing what they ought to have done. I take exception to that remark because the Government are doing all that is possible for them to do. If Government did not do enough in the past, it was because popular interest could not be roused, and now that it is roused, they are entertaining greater hopes that the object would be speedily achieved.

I regret that although I appreciate the spirit in which the amendment has been moved, Government are not in a position to accept it, as it stands, because it suggests the prohibition of good breeds of cattle primarily and then a limitation. But if it meets the Honourable Member, I would suggest to him that he might move his amendment in an acceptable form, and if he is prepared to accept my suggestion, Government will have no objection to accepting his amendment. The form I suggest is, that the following be inserted instead ‘ prohibit the export of good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country when the Government is satisfied that the stocks of such breeds are being unduly depleted ’.

If this will suit the Honourable Member, Government will be prepared to accept it.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju : Sir, I accept that amendment.

The Honourable the President : It will be in order if a member of Government who is a Member of the Assembly moves the amendment.

Mr. J. Hullah : May I put the whole Resolution, Sir, as re-drafted ?

The Honourable the President : The amendment of Mr. Venkatapatiraju is already before the House. I suggest that the Honourable Member should move an amendment to the amendment, *viz.*, to omit the words ‘ good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country till the Government is satisfied that India has enough and to spare ’ and insert in their place ‘ when the Government is satisfied that the stocks of such breeds are being unduly depleted ’.

The Honourable the President : The question is that that amendment be made in the amendment before the House.

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable the President : The question is that for the words in the amendment proposed, *viz.*, 'good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country till the Government is satisfied that India has enough and to spare,' the following words 'when the Government is satisfied that the stocks of such breeds are being unduly depleted' be substituted.

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable the President : The question now is that the Resolution, as amended, and which runs as follows be accepted :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to prohibit by legislation the export of good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country when the Government is satisfied that the stocks of such breeds are being unduly depleted.'

Rai Bahadur Pandit J. L. Bhargava : Sir, the cow question possesses an importance all its own for us Indians in general, and Hindus in particular. No question political, religious or economic, exercises the Indian mind so much as this mixed question of vital importance does.

The population in India is agricultural, in the main. To a Hindu, economic instinct, utility, gratitude or something mysterious, true or untrue have crystallised the consideration for the cow into a religious sanctity. On many occasions in the year at particular festivals the Hindus worship and respect the cow from time immemorial. Their scriptures are replete with traditions and stories which seek to depict cow as the treasure of all blessings. No orthodox Hindu would die without gifting away a cow. Call it prejudice, call it passion, call it the height of religion, but this is an undoubted fact that in the Hindu mind nothing is so deep-rooted as the sanctity for the cow.

I am fully confident that the Government is conversant with the strength of this feeling in the matter, and I trust that the subject shall receive the consideration it so richly deserves.

The present Resolution, however, does not touch the broad question of cow protection in its various details. It embodies a very moderate demand and presents the milch cattle question from an economic standpoint which affects all sections of the Indian community equally.

The price of cows, bullocks and buffaloes has risen to such an alarming extent, that a peasant has to yawn several times before he can feel that he can replace his cattle or provide himself with them.

In countries other than India where agricultural operations are carried on with horses or improved machinery, the bullocks may not be very useful, but here in India the bullock is as indispensable for cultivation as the human hand.

These cattle are the wealth, the support and the mainstay of the agriculturists in general.

The question of milk supply in India, where milk forms the chief and indispensable factor of human consumption, is one of exceptional significance. Within the memory of living men milk was not considered to be a saleable commodity in the villages. The acceptance of any price for it was regarded very derogatory ; but now on account of the export of milch cattle and other

causes, which occasion a decrease in their number and quality, the supply of good milk at reasonable prices in towns and villages presents difficulties which baffle solution.

To vegetarians in India the price of ghi also is a matter of supreme concern. From 2½ seers per rupee to 6 chhitaks per rupee in the lifetime of one generation is a fluctuation which would stagger the imagination of many. In fact, milk and ghi constitute the staple food of all Indians alike, and export of the milch cattle from an economic point of view is fraught with the most serious consequences.

The state of impoverished India can be bettered to an appreciable degree by the prohibition of the export of such cattle from India. I come from a part of the country which was once famous for its bullocks and cows. The Haryana, as it is called, was the home of bullocks and cows whose endurance and milk yielding capacities were the talk of the whole country and milk and ghi were found in great abundance.

It was difficult to find a home without a milch cattle. But of recent years the export of cattle from Haryana has been very great, and I have seen with my own eyes people looking with eyes full of concern and dismay at the moving railway wagons carrying away their milch cattle outside their part of the country, and attributing the rise in the price of milk and ghi to the export of such cattle.

It is the primary duty of every Government, four-fifths of whose subjects follow agriculture as their sole occupation, to conserve, develop and protect agricultural cattle: one of the effective modes of improving the material condition of the masses is to bring about an increase in the number and improve the quality of agricultural cattle. The military and non-military classes of India subsist on milk and milk products. It is absolutely necessary, for the maintenance of physical vigour and stamina among the people, that no efforts be spared which tend to increase the number of milch cattle. I therefore think that the prohibition of export of cows, bullocks and buffaloes is highly desirable in the interests of agriculture, and for the supply of milk and ghi so necessary for human consumption in India.

I am confident that considering the subject from a purely economic standpoint, this Assembly will whole-heartedly urge on the attention of the Government the desirability of accepting the Resolution.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I move that the question be now put.

The Honourable the President: The question is that the following Resolution be accepted:—

‘This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to prohibit by legislation the export of good breeds of cattle from British India to any foreign country when the Government is satisfied that the stocks of such breeds are being unduly depleted.’

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION *RE* EQUALITY OF STATUS OF TWO CHAMBERS.

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur: The Resolution, which I am going to move, runs as follows:

‘This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to place the Members of both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature on an equal footing in respect of allowances and honorary titles to be borne by them during their term of office.’

[Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur.]

Though self-determination is our goal, it is not without considerable hesitation, belonging, as I do, to this House, that I am going to move a Resolution, concerning our own status before ourselves.

It may savour of jealousy as well as of selfishness and it is liable to be misunderstood and misinterpreted. Many among us in this House have ungrudgingly given their services to the State for years without allowances or honorary designations, and are ready to undergo any sacrifice when the occasion demands it. Neither are we jealous of the other House. Our complaint is not against them, but against those who have without rhyme or reason made an invidious distinction and branded us with a label of inferiority.

Though liable to be misunderstood, I have, with due deliberation, fully conscious of the responsible position, which a Member of the All-India Assembly occupies both in the eyes of the Government and the country, brought forward this Resolution, and faced the situation, delicate and unpleasant though it may be personally to me, in order to give the Government an opportunity of correcting a mistake which it has unwittingly committed, and of strengthening itself, by strengthening the hands of co-operators who, from a strong sense of duty towards their country, elected at a critical moment to stand by the British Indian Government which, though not yet responsible to the people, is yet the best Government India, with her environments, can have for the present, and which we are determined to make responsible to the people in the course of the next ten years by following the straight path of co-operation and not by the tortuous one of non-co-operation.

If any Member had any misgiving in this matter, it must have been removed by the friendly attitude of the Government Members in this House towards the aspirations of the people as voiced by their representatives.

Our grievance is, that an invidious distinction has been made without the slightest justification.

Members of the Viceregal Council used to get certain allowances and were designated 'Honourable' both inside and outside the House. Both the Council of State, as it now stands, and the Legislative Assembly are its successors; but the former has been allowed to retain the old rate of allowance, and the designation 'Honourable' while allowances have been reduced and the 'Honourable' taken away in the case of the Legislative Assembly.

Two beautiful birds perched on the same tree,—one to enjoy delicious fruits and the other to be a mere looker-on !

The effect has been to proclaim to the world that we are an inferior body and to lower our prestige, and prestige plays an important part in human affairs and everybody knows, it plays a very important part in this country. It has marred our usefulness in the cause of good government of this country.

* It has been said that the Council of State is a Council of Elders, the Supreme Legislative Authority on all crucial questions, as also the revising authority upon all Indian Legislation.

This reminds me of the well-known description of a crab, which was described as a red fish which walks backwards. The crab is
1 P.M. not red, it is not a fish, and it does not walk backwards.

The Council of State is not a Council of Elders, a young man of 25 is eligible to it, it is not the Supreme Legislative nor the Revising Authority. The two Houses taken together may be the Supreme Legislative Authority. They have both old and young men among them, so have we. If they can revise our Bills, we can revise theirs.

Then, if we have some young men among us, they all carry wise heads over young shoulders. Most of them are graduates in science, arts and law and are elderly in the true sense of the word, for *Mannu*, the oldest Law giver of the world, has declared :

*'Na tena briddho bhavati yenasya palitam sirah,
Yo bai yunapyadhana stam deva sthoviram biduh.'*

i.e., no one becomes old by grey hairs. The gods know him to be old, who, although young, is learned.

So we are really the Council of Elders, the Witenagemote, the Council of Wise men.

Have we not eminent men among us. I don't think it proper to mention names, but look at our list and theirs, and we shall not compare unfavourably, nay, may compare favourably. In joint sittings we enjoy equal rights.

In the matter of the Budget, we wield some powers, they none. So I for my life do not understand the reason or object of this brand of inferiority.

I know in the year 1918, long before the era of non-co-operation, there was some proposal for the change of the designation of Members of the Provincial and Imperial Councils.

In page 151 of the Report, I find the following :

'The great increase which will result from our proposals in the number of Provincial Legislative Councils, makes it desirable that they should no longer enjoy the designation 'Honourable' which we desire to reserve for the Members of the new bodies (i.e., the Privy Council and the Council of State) whose institution we propose in the next chapter.

On reading the next chapter, I find the following, in page 176 :

'For reasons similar to those which we have given in the case of Provincial Legislative Councils, we recommend, that the Members of the Indian Legislative Assembly should not be designated 'Honourable', but should be entitled to affix the letters 'M. L. A.' to their names.'

Of the two proposed Councils, the Council of State and the Privy Council, the latter has not yet come into existence. The Council of State is quite a different body from what it was proposed to be. The Legislative Assembly is the successor of the old Viceregal Council with more elective element and larger powers. The objection on the ground of number is not reasonable. The Empire would not have gone to pieces, if some 140 odd Members of this Assembly, which legislates for all India, were designated 'Honourable' during their terms of office, nor I believe that any catastrophe would have overtaken it, if some seven to eight hundred odd M. L. Cs. were similarly designated, for, is not India a continent and are we not about 21 crores in British India? But I am not speaking now for Provincial Members, though I know how they have saved the situation at a critical moment and proved a tower of strength to the British Government in its sincere desire to confer responsible government on India. It has been said in some quarters, with what truth I know not, that honours and titles are the silken chains which bind the intelligensia of this country to the Government; if that is really so, a wise Government ought to utilise it to the fullest legitimate extent, instead of taking away

[Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur.]

honours enjoyed from the year 1861, and then justifying it by the analogies of the Houses of British and Colonial Parliaments. Surely the British Parliament was in existence between 1861 and the present year of grace 1921. Coming to the Council of State, I find that the Council of State, as contemplated in the report, has not even the semblance of resemblance to the present Council of State. It was to consist of 50 Members, of whom only 15 were to be elected by the various Legislative Councils and six by some special constituencies, and the rest to consist of officials 21 and nominated members 4. It was, as I have said, to be a supreme legislative and revising authority and was also to have joint deliberation with the Council of Princes—but not with us—*vide* page 198. That was the reason assigned for which the designation 'Honourable' was to be given to its Members. The reason of law ceasing, the law itself ceases. The reasons for which the designation 'Honourable' was to be given to M. C. S. do no longer exist and so the designation 'Honourable' should also cease. If it is claimed on their behalf on the ground of their being successors to the former Viceregal Council, the reason applies more forcibly to the Members of this House. It is true, the payment of a higher amount of land revenue, etc., has been prescribed for the Council, but, at the same time, there are provisions by which one may not own a single acre of land, may not pay any tax and yet be eligible to the Council. Our Members have been recruited from the ranks of Baronets, Knights, Hereditary Nawabs, Rajahs, Merchant-Princes, European and Indian lawyers, *ex-High Court Judges*, *ex-Council Members*, University Graduates and Members of former Ruling Houses, land-holders, most of whom are eligible to both the Houses.

Officials of equal ranks, not entitled to the designation of 'Honourable' by virtue of their offices, become 'Honourable' when nominated to the other House, but remain, I should say, 'unhonoured' when they are with us. Is our touch the reverse of that of a touchstone? Officials sometimes must suffer in silence, and I am not speaking here on behalf of our official Members, they themselves may not be sorry, but we are sorry for them, as they must feel sorry for us. The analogy of the House of Lords and of the House of Commons does not hold good.

The House of Lords consists of Peers who hold their seats by hereditary rights, by creation of the sovereign, by virtue of office—Law Lords and English Bishops and Archbishops, by election for life—Irish Peers, by election for durations of Parliament—Scottish Peers. They get no allowances—no delicious fruits for them.

The Council of State is as much the House of Lords, as we are the House of Commons. We have yet to make the Government responsible to us and we have yet to get £400 or more a year.

Neither the analogy of the self-governing Colonies holds good, for the simple reason they are self-governing, while we are not; they make their own status, while ours is made by our earthly providence, and also because the Members of all Indian Legislatures have all along enjoyed the title 'Honourable'. India is a continent and some of our districts have more population than Colonial Provinces. The population of Canada will be less than 1 crore, less than that of a division of Bengal. The total population of Australia is considerably less than that of a single district of Bengal, say Mymensingh, whose population again is equal to that of the whole of the Union of South Africa. So the analogy of Colonial members does not hold good. Sometimes a single

or a couple of members represent a district of 10 to 15 lakhs of people. Let me also point out, that the Upper House in Canada, which is called the Senate, is an entirely nominated House and the speaker and the members have the same allowances as in the House of Commons with no extra allowances. Similarly, there is no difference of allowances so far as I remember of the members of the Senate and the House of representatives in Australia. Members of the Upper House of New Zealand get at the rate of £200 per annum, while those of the Lower House at the rate of £300. Then, why go to distant lands, when we had a practice obtaining here from 1861.

I may also point out, that even the Reforms Report did not make any proposal for the reduction of allowances.

I may be told, that if we are given allowances at higher rates, a similar demand will be made by Members of the Provincial Councils. Even if that is made, and allowed, the entire expenditure will come to only a few lakhs, a mere drop in the ocean of the Indian Finance, which, in spite of its treacherous sands, is being so skilfully navigated by a veteran mariner. In our own case, the entire cost will not be more than 50 or 60 thousand rupees a year. Generous as the Government has been to its own officers all round in the matter of pay, pension, leave allowances, and perhaps rightly so, it is hard to imagine why it should adopt a cheese-paring policy to all-India Legislators, who, in many cases, have to undergo considerable sacrifice in coming here, and whose hearty co-operation is essential in the interest of the Empire. Non-officials wear no charms on their persons to make themselves proof against high prices; and to reduce their allowances, after taking away the 'Honourable' from them, is to add injury to insult.

I know there are many who take their stand on the High Eminence of Noumenon and look down upon wealth, honour and everything of this phenomenal world as so many unrealities, *vanitas vanitatum*. If such there be, minstrel raptures may swell for them, but this House is not for them. For such high-souled *Mahatmas*, a snowy Himalayan cave is the fittest abode. If you are really above all these things, do away with all honours and allowances all round and we won't object, but pray, do not make any invidious distinction which does not blow any body any good.

We do not attach more importance to wealth or honour than they deserve; but they are welcome as long as they are honourably gained. Let it be not said of us, as it might be said of the Pharisees: The heart yearneth, but the mouth speaketh not.

No body in this House will be translated to *Valhalla* by being designated 'Honourable' for three years or for the matter of that for 'five years', but we all feel that we are having a brand of inferiority on us. It will mar our usefulness. It will weaken Government itself. Why an economical Government should hold election for every three years in our case and every five years in their case. Then, why for five and not for six years, two complete periods of this House.

If my Resolution is given effect to, some 140 odd Members, All-India Legislators, will also be designated Honourable along with the sixty Members of the other House and get a few rupees more.

I hope the Empire will survive this shock.

I have shown that reason, sentiment, expediency, precedent, public interest, are all in the favour of my Resolution, and I hope every one will look

[Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur.]

upon this matter not from a narrow personal aspect, but from the broad one of the honour, dignity and usefulness of this House.

Individually we are all passing figures, but this Assembly; which is the symbol of a Free United Indian Nation, the consummation so devoutly wished for, the crowning glory of the British rule in India, which, through good report and evil report, is steadily pursuing its course towards 'freedom,' worshipped as a duty by the British people themselves,—this Assembly, I say, is to live even after our exit from here for the good of this great and ancient land and we should always keep in mind its honour, dignity and usefulness, for, self-determination is our goal.

The Honourable the President: The following Resolution has been moved:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to place the Members of both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature on an equal footing in respect of allowances and honorary titles to be borne by them during their term of office.'

Babu K. C. Neogy: Sir, the House must have observed that the terms of this Resolution are comprehensive enough to include the case of the reduction of the status of the Members of the other House to the level of our own. But, I am afraid, my learned and Honourable friend, the Mover, has left no doubt in our minds that the real objective of his Resolution is the title 'Honourable' and the addition of a few rupees to our allowance. I venture to submit that in our proceedings to-day we should make it clear that this reading of the Resolution is far from our true intentions. In these days of democracy, this House would be an anachronism to cast wistful glances at the titles of honour borne by others. To my mind, there could be no higher distinction for ourselves than to be known as the Commons of India. Sir, I am anxious to be assured that nothing will be done to-day which will in any way affect whatever democratic or popular character this House may possess. And, I may point out one practical danger to this House. If you make Membership of this Assembly to carry with it the right to be called 'Honourable', you make this House a little too attractive to a particular section of our people who, though perhaps improving the picturesqueness of this House, would not improve its democratic character—I won't say usefulness. I should think this a real danger which should be borne in mind.

Sir, turning to the question of allowances, if we think that the invidious distinction sought to be made between the two Houses should be set aside, we shall have an opportunity of achieving our end, when we come to vote on the demands a few days hence, by reducing the allowance enjoyed by the Members of the other House to the level of our own. This will certainly be one way of effecting equality. If, however, it be felt that our allowance is not adequate, quite apart from the question of equality of rates, let us say so at once and in the plainest terms. And, then, there will arise considerations which should weigh with us before we decide to utilise our new powers to our own immediate advantage in these days of financial embarrassment of Government.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanyam: Sir, the amendment, I have suggested, is one which Mr. Norton himself has put down in the following amendment. I believe, he has not had an opportunity of speaking on it yet. And, I would ask you, Sir, if I may speak on mine.

I recommend,

'That the words 'and honorary titles to be borne by them' be omitted.'

The only thing implied by 'honorary titles to be borne by them' is the prefix 'Honourable', which the Members of the Council of State get for the period of their existence as Members of the Council of State. It is not quite a decent thing to ask Government to publish our names in the Gazette with the word 'Honourable' before each. For, I presume, that one thinks and is Honourable himself whether the Government prefix the title or not. Therefore, it struck me that the words in the Resolution about the honorary titles, was not quite proper, and that the word 'Honourable' need not be made much of. Whereas the other portion of the Resolution is more substantial and one on which we might leave the Assembly to form its own opinion. I think I will stop here. I will say in advance 'ditto' to what my Honourable friend, Mr. Norton, may say on this matter.

Mr. P. E. Percival: Sir, I rise to oppose the Resolution and the amendment also. I oppose the Resolution on the ground that it is below the dignity of this House to pass a Resolution of the nature proposed. There are a certain number of enemies of this Assembly; and they will take advantage of the position, and blame the House for the fact, that in the first Resolution that we pass in this Assembly dealing with finance, we propose an increase of our own allowances. There is another objection which I have to urge against the proposal, and it is this. The suggestion is that we should be put on a level with the Honourable Members of the Council of State. Well, there is no knowing, if this Resolution is passed and accepted by the Government, but that in another fortnight the Council of State may pass a Resolution to the effect that their allowances should be increased to Rs. 30; and then we should be no better off in regard to equality than we are at present. With respect to money matters I submit, that we should leave it to other authorities to decide that question. No doubt, we are very deserving people, but we should leave it to others to say so, and not say so ourselves. I object, therefore, to the first part of the Resolution, on the ground that it is below our dignity, and that it may fail to attain its object.

As regards the second part of the Resolution, however, the objection is still stronger. As Honourable Members are aware, the reasons for the distinction were laid down in the Joint Report, and no serious objection was taken at the time. Now, after the elections are over, the Honourable Mover says 'we will now change that and become 'Honourable'.' I submit, this is not playing fair with the Council of State. Another point is this, that the Council of State have certain advantages, for instance that of dignity, while we have the advantage of discussing the Budget and so forth. Now the Honourable Member proposes to take away from the Council of State the advantage that they possess, while being careful to retain for us the advantage that we possess. That will place us in a more advantageous position than the Council of State.

Sir, if I may adapt a well-known phrase, there is such a thing as being too proud to accept a title. I think, however, that that is not a view which should be approved in this Assembly. The Honourable Member may of course say that he is not too proud to accept the title of 'Honourable', but that he does not wish to accept the title of 'M. L. A.' Well, Sir, that title is not such a very humble one after all. If the Honourable Member will refer to the *Statesman's Year Book*, he will find that the Prime Ministers of Victoria and New South Wales have no titles, such as K.C.M.G., C.M.G.,

[Mr. P. E. Percival.]

or anything of that sort. The only letters after their names are the letters 'M. L. A.'. Well, Sir, what is good enough for a Prime Minister, should be good enough for us also.

But there is a more serious objection to the proposal of the Honourable Member which he has possibly overlooked, and it is this. He draws a line and says that all gentlemen above that line should be Honourable and those below should not; and that we should be placed just above that line. But the difficulty is how you are going to prevent that line from falling down? The immediate result of this Resolution will be that similar Resolutions will be passed in the Provincial Legislative Councils. Consequently there will be another 600 Honourable Members from those Legislative Councils. Sir, while pursuing the shadow of the title of Honourable, we shall lose the real distinction that we possess, namely, that of M.L.A. as compared with their distinction of M. L. C.

I suggest, therefore, that we should take no steps to cheapen titles; and also that we should not covet a distinction which rightly belongs to the Honourable Members of the Council of State.

Mr. E. L. Price: Sir, I want to give notice that under Procedure Rule 32, (2) I desire a division to be taken on this subject, because I feel very strongly against the idea of this House asking for anything for itself, either in the way of *honorificabilitudinitatibus* or *paisa*, and I want to have a sure means of putting it on record that I voted against the Resolution.

Mr. Eardley Norton: Mr. President, I think if the vote of this Assembly could have been taken immediately after the speech of my Honourable and learned friend, there is but little doubt that there would have been a unanimous vote that he should get his Rs. 20 a day, at any rate for one day for the speech he has made. I am not afraid, Sir, of any deterrent suggestion of being a greedy man. For, I admit, I am a hungry man. I shall await with interest the reasons to be advanced by the Government for making what I agree in considering an invidious distinction between the Members of the other House and ourselves. I shall be surprised if I am told that the Government have based this distinction on the ground that the Members of the other House are endowed with 'mature knowledge, with experience of the world and the consequent sobriety of judgment' and have adopted this as the ground for giving them Rs. 5 a day more than myself and my colleagues here. If they justify the line of demarcation and distinction on this ground, I think that the Members of the other House might well complain that they and their accomplishments have been undervalued and would be well entitled to ask for more than Rs. 5 a day for the divergence. The earlier part of the Resolution requests that we and the Members of the Council of State should be placed financially on level terms. I am not disturbed by the higher status of the Honourable gentlemen in the Council of State. I bear them no envy. I do not wish to judge them. My position is simple. I am hungry and under-paid. I am under-paid and, therefore, I cannot live on Rs. 15 a day. I doubt whether Honourable gentlemen elsewhere can live on their Rs. 20 a day. I have come up here to find amongst other things that my petrol bill runs away with much of my daily allowance, and only the day-before-yesterday I was faced with a laundry bill for Rs. 13-8-0 which left me the slender balance of Rs. 1-8-0 for all the necessities of life for 24 hours. All I can say is this, that if it continues like this and I am

left alone to struggle with adversity I shall be obliged to resign this Honourable Assembly. The only possible solution to the problem of our exiguous allowance is that we shall be compelled to practise the strictest economy in our domestic habits and to go to bed, say for one day in the week, and for that day to amuse ourselves with Bovril and Sanatogen in order to readjust our financial balances. If we are to meet and survive the expense of attendance in this House, there ought to be a substantial increase in the largesse which we receive from the somewhat ungenerous Government.

But there is another part of the question besides the question of Rs. 15 a day to which I do not think my Honourable and learned friend made any allusion, though I think it a very serious matter of distinction, and of unjustifiable distinction, between the Members of the other House and ourselves. We receive two first class tickets, while every Member of the other House has the right to get a whole compartment to himself. I venture to bring to the notice of Government how harshly this works with us. In the first place, we are debarred from bringing our wives with us, I mean of course our own wives, and I have been witness to many tearful farewells exchanged on various Railway platforms when the wives of learned Members travelling up to the north were informed that their husbands were departing on affairs of urgent public importance, while in their heart of hearts the wives believed that their husbands were going away on matters of urgent private affairs. I think, Sir, that this official introduction of discord into the harmony of family life ought to be stayed and that we should be relieved, amongst other inconveniences, from the suspicion—the not unnatural suspicion—which follows upon the enforced desertion of our better-halves for a time. Surely, the distinction between a first class reserved compartment and two first class tickets cannot be supported upon any ground of physical conformation between ourselves and the Members of the Council of State; for, whilst I agree that the other House is the weightier House weighed in pounds avoirdupois, I am unable to agree that they are entitled to more room in a railway carriage than persons of slighter build. It may be, for instance, perfectly true that laterally I am not as powerful or imposing as my Honourable and esteemed friend in the other House, the Honourable Mr. Ahmedthamby Maricair. But, Sir, longitudinally I occupy more space and I can only say, that if we are expected to study, learn and assimilate the rules of procedure in this House, we ought to be permitted at least the possibility of doing this at our ease in the silence of a first class compartment reserved to ourselves, undisturbed by racy and thirty subalterns. In fact, two first class tickets are of no use, because we cannot occupy two lower berths at the same time, and we cannot occupy them alternatively. If we do, we should be certain to create great and possibly unpleasant disturbance among the other occupants of the carriage.

Sir, I will not enter into these harassing details at greater length though my Honourable and learned friend, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, reminds me that even though a Member of the other House has the privilege of getting a first class compartment to himself, he has to pay an extra fare for his wife. If that be so, all I can say is, that this is a most inhuman order.

On this portion of the Resolution I am rather suspicious of the motives of Government. I am not sure whether they intend by this discrimination between ourselves and our friends elsewhere to introduce a sort of internecine warfare of jealousy between the Members of the two Houses, so as to make sure that the other House shall never pass a Bill which has been passed in this House and which the Government dislike. I am also not by any means satisfied that

[Mr. Eardley Norton.]

they do not desire to introduce into these two Councils something of the unfortunate anti-Brahmin split in Madras, of setting class against class, of underfed against the over-fed. If that be the reason why Government have made this distinction between the Members of the two Houses, I feel sure that they possess the candour and the courage which will propel them towards plenary confession. I do not, in the least, mind being charged with hankering after money. That is the normal condition of the profession into which I was born and have ever remained. I see nothing despicable or undignified in admitting that I want more edible delicacies and more clean linen than I can pay for and it is part of my profession that I should have the advantage of putting my hand into somebody else's pocket. Unlike the Honourable Member for Finance who charms this House with his clear and lucid expositions on various intricate matters (which I do not understand) who occasionally puts his hand by way of oratorical flourish into his own pocket, I have been taught from my earliest youth as a lawyer to put my hands into the pocket of my neighbour. To me, it is immaterial whether that neighbour be a client or the Government the trustees of my client. I therefore feel no sense of shame in asking, that as our appetites are practically the same as those of the Members of the other House, as we dress alike, perform similar dental ablutions every night before going to bed and every morning alike, say our early prayers; I feel no sense of shame in asking why these gentlemen, for similar duties similarly performed, should receive Rs. 5 a head more than I do.

I come now to a very different and much more important portion of the Resolution to which my Honourable friend behind has moved an amendment: the question of prefixing 'Honourable' to our innocent names. It is obvious that the intention of the Honourable Mover is to deprive the Member of the other House of a handle which may possibly adorn them but which is unsuited to our more plebeian wants. Eighteen years ago, I was elected, quite by accident, to the Madras Legislative Council, as quite by accident I have been elected to this Assembly. For four years I struggled against the incubus of 'Honourable,' an incubus much more easy to acquire than to discard. Only the day before yesterday, I received a letter from a Madras Hindu gentleman, asking me to marry his daughter, I mean of course to provide him with the funds necessary for marrying his daughter to some one else. The superscription on the letter was 'The Honourable Elderly Norton.' I felt at once that he must have mistaken me for a Member of the other House, because I see in the speech made to us by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, that he has described the other House as being 'a body of elder statesmen.' Anything older than myself I find it difficult to conceive, and I can only say, if there are Honourable Members of the other House who take priority to me in years, they must be veritable Methuselahs unfit in this more degenerate age for the satisfactory discharge of the duties entrusted to them under Royal sanction. Let me give a practical reason to my learned friend against the adoption of the title which he has referred to. I found, that its retention doubled my hotel bills, enhanced my subscription to the Dufferin Fund and compelled me to give twelve pairs of gloves to my lady friends instead of as before only four. From that last custom, my Honourable friend, the Mover, is by the customs of the caste immune. But the ladies of his family will speedily invent for him other and perhaps more costly forms of extravagant torture. I strongly resent the suggestion that we should transform ourselves into Honourables. I have watched with amusement the great temptation, to which many Members succumb

of having their portmanteaux painted with the word 'Honourable' in very big letters and the word 'Mr.' in undecipherable characters thus simulating positions which they were not entitled to occupy. I do suggest that we ought to be content with the honours we already own. We, a democratic House, should rest satisfied with the fact that our representation is more chromatic and widespread than that of the sister institution. We are proud that our legislative activities embrace professions which are unknown in the other House and we should be content with the knowledge that we possess at one end of the chain the only Baronet in Delhi and at its other end a practising Artist in Pastry. We have heard the Honourable Baronet. We all hope that the Honourable manipulator of diaphanous puffs will—after consultation with the Commissioner of Delhi—exhibit to our friendly and gustatory welcome the products of his culinary skill. I will only in conclusion say this that if the Honourable Mover forces upon us a penal distinction we dislike which will not benefit us and what we have done nothing to deserve I for one will turn in earnest supplication to the noble Lord to whom the Resolution, if passed, is to be submitted and pray him in the words of our Litany 'from all the pest and punishment and pain good Lord Deliver us.'

Munshi Iswar Saran: Sir, I submit that this Resolution which has been discussed in a most amiable spirit should be considered from the serious point of view. There are not a few who are ever ready to criticise this Assembly, its Members and their doings, and, I submit, Sir, it will give them just cause for very strong and severe criticism if, at the very first opportunity, Members of this Assembly vote an increase of five rupees to themselves. I ask in all seriousness, is it in keeping with our dignity that we should vote for ourselves an extra five rupees for every day that we have to stay here? I submit, with confidence, that the only answer that this Assembly will give is, 'No, we shall not vote five rupees more for ourselves.' As regards the term 'Honourable,' I am surprised, that the Honourable Mover should attach any importance to it. In season and out of season we rail,—whether with reason or without reason, I shall not pause to consider—those people who have titles and still more, those who hanker after them, and I say, with all emphasis, that the position and status of the Members of this Assembly will depend not on the title of 'Honourable' that may be affixed to their names, but upon the useful, honest, independent and self-sacrificing work that they may be able to do. I shall, therefore, with all respect, beseech the House not to make the fatal blunder of accepting this Resolution, though it may be proposed in a most humorous and a most engaging manner.

But, before I sit down, Sir, I only wish to make one submission and it is this—that the speeches that have been made to-day make perfectly clear what the Members of this House think of the other House, and, I submit, that there will be a strong movement in the country which will lead to results which the Members of the other House will not consider to be pleasant. In conclusion, I wish to urge on each and every Member of this House to look at this question from a serious point of view and not to vote for it in a light-hearted fashion. I beg to assure you, with all the earnestness at my command, that if we accept this Resolution, we expose ourselves to criticism which, I think, will be quite just. I, therefore, say 'Reject this Resolution', not on the ground of its being unsound but on the ground of its being inexpedient and of its being derogatory to our position. We should clamour for the rights of the people and not for Rs. 5 and the title of 'Honourable' for ourselves.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, I rise to support this Resolution. The Honourable Members who have opposed it, I venture to think, have done so from a certain misconception of facts. The Honourable Mover of the Resolution is not asking for an increase in emoluments or to any new honour. He is protesting against the reduction in emoluments and the disappearance of an honour which the predecessors of this Assembly had a right to enjoy. The question is not what we are to get, but the question is whether we should submit to a reduction in emoluments and honour by an act of Government without reference to this House. Honourable Members will remember that the Members of the late Imperial Council were allowed Rs. 20 a day and Members of the Provincial Councils, so far as my recollection goes, were and are still allowed Rs. 10 a day. When this Assembly came into being, we received a circular that the Members of this Assembly will receive only Rs. 15 a day. The Members of the late Imperial Council were entitled to be addressed as Honourable Members. It was stated in a communiqué from the Government of India, which was published in the newspapers, that the Members of this Assembly were not to be addressed as 'Honourable'. It is against this distinction, Sir, that this Assembly raises a protest. What have we done that we, the representatives of the late Imperial Council, should be deprived of the emoluments to which the Members of that Council were entitled. The only reason that I can suggest is, that the Government has got no funds after spending 5 crores of rupees, as the Honourable Finance Member told us yesterday, upon the increase of salaries of all their officials, high and low. Nothing is left whatever for paying the representatives of the people in this Assembly and it will cost the Government a very large sum of Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000, which might necessitate a very onerous loan, which might strain to the uttermost the credit of the British Government in this country! That seems to be the only reason why this cheese-paring policy was pursued by the Government and why it has been since persisted in. I should have expected that when Members of the Legislative Assembly began to meet and complain in private that they have not been fairly treated it would have been, I think, a handsome acknowledgment if a communiqué was issued in which the Members of this Assembly were restored to their former dignity and emoluments. But nothing of the kind has been done and I feel that even now it is not too late for some Honourable Member on the side of the Government to assure this House that the emoluments and honour that belonged to the late Imperial Council will be restored. I feel, Sir, that this is the question with which we are confronted here. Some Honourable Members who addressed the House just now seem to think that we are fighting for our own selfish ends. I wish to make it perfectly clear that we are doing nothing of the kind. We are only being moved by the spirit of the late lamented Imperial Council and the Members of this Assembly as its successors have to keep alive its memory, position and power. They with lesser rights and no greater responsibility were far more handsomely treated than we who are here to introduce and to bring into operation the reformed order. Then, Sir, it has been said, and said with a certain degree of truth by my friend, Mr. Eardley Norton, that we are the Members of a democratic body and should not ask for the title of 'Honourable'. I entirely agree, but the question is not whether we are asking for the title of 'Honourable'. The question is, that we are complaining of its forfeiture and, Sir, you will admit that the more distinctions you make between the Members of the Council of State and this House the more numerous will be the occasions for differences of opinion on material issues between the two Houses. It was

of course said in the original report which ushered in these reforms, that the Council of State was to be a revising Chamber. Now, we all know, that the Council of State is not a revising Chamber. It is a Council with somewhat co-ordinated and equal powers with the Members of this House, at any rate so far as Resolutions and Bills are concerned. Added to this, the Members of this House possesses a power over the budget, which, under the Reforms Act, members of the other House do not possess at all. In the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, it was said, that following the example of the Colonial Governments, Members of the Council of State will be called 'Honourables' and Members of this House will be entitled to append to their names the three letters which are only too familiar to us. Now, Sir, the Colonial form of Government has not been vouchsafed to this country. If we want to follow the analogy of the Colonial form of Government, surely we cannot suffer from their disabilities without possessing their corresponding rights and whatever may be the distinction which the Colonial legislature adopted as regards emoluments and titles to be conferred upon the Members of the two Houses, it was of their own creation. If we had passed a Resolution in this House, then the case might have been different, and, Sir, if the question had been referred either to a Joint Committee of the two Houses or to this House, there would have been no difference of opinion. We are complaining of a discrimination made in favour of the Council of State and against ourselves, and against that we are protesting here and we will protest even if we are called upon to divide the House.

(Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas rose to address the Assembly.)

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I ask for the closure unless the Government wants to reply?

The Honourable the President: No Member of the Government has risen as yet to reply.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: My feeling on the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, my feeling on hearing all the speeches that have been made in support of the Resolution, and I hope this feeling will be shared by many of my colleagues, if not by all in this Chamber, is this: When we cease to be Members of this Assembly and when we reflect on the work of importance that we shall have been instrumental in doing in this Assembly, probably there will not be any other hour which we shall regret as having wasted as this hour. I venture to submit, Sir, that the whole discussion on this Resolution is not merely a waste of time but, as was pointed out, is such as does not do credit to the sense of honour, I may say, of this Assembly. I do not understand why Honourable Members are anxious to have 'Honourable' prefixed to their names by this method of bringing in a Resolution and getting it passed by those who are concerned in getting the prefix attached to their names. As was pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Percival, when the Montagu-Chelmsford Report was first published in 1918, it was clearly stated in that Report, that when the new Assembly is established, and when the new provincial councils are established, the ordinary title 'Honourable Member' would be dropped and the words 'M. L. A.' and 'M. L. C.' as the case may be, would be attached to the names of Members. I want to ask my Honourable friend who has moved this Resolution, I want to ask all those who have supported him, whether, in the course of these three years that have elapsed since that statement was published in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, there has

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

been any agitation in the country either by the Congress or outside the Congress or by any political body, or has it been pointed out by any individual, that this suggestion made in the Report should not be accepted by the country.

The country does not want, those whom we represent here do not want, that we should all have the prefix 'Honourable' attached to our names. Is it fair, is it dignified, that we only, because we cannot resist the temptation of having the prefix attached to our names, should come here and, while we are expected to spend every minute that is at our disposal to work for the good of the country which we claim to represent here, should waste our time by asking for the attachment of that prefix to our names? I say, Sir, that if by this method we succeed in getting the 'Honourable' prefixed to our names, that the honour that is within us and which will be justly due to us by the work that we shall do here will have disappeared.

I submit, Sir, that so far as the five rupees are concerned, I believe that the Government are to a certain extent responsible for sowing the seed of discord between us and the Members of the Council of State. I think no distinction ought really to have been made in that direction. But, at the same time, after giving a good deal of thought to this question, I do feel that we ought not to ask for five rupees more a day. I agree that probably fifteen rupees a day is not enough for our requirements, but I submit, that even rupees twenty a day will not be enough for our requirements. Are we, therefore, going to ask for more?

Mr. Eardley Norton : Yes.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : I do not think we are. I do not think fifteen rupees a day are enough for us. I do not think twenty rupees a day will be enough for us. I do not think twenty rupees a day are enough for Members of the Council of State.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Why not ten rupees?

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : But, if a certain sum is fixed, why not adhere to it? I submit, that there is a good deal of force in the argument that has been brought forward that it would be better if Honourable Members of both Houses should get an equal amount per day. There is a good deal of force in that, but I do not think that it is the fault of the Members of the Council of State that they are getting more. I do not think that they could have had any hand in getting the Government to give them a little more, and in pointing that out, I want to make it clear that we do not look upon the other House, the Council of State, as a rival House, but as a House with the Members of which we, the representatives of the people, are going to work in concord and harmony. I do feel, Sir, that the Government did make a mistake in making this distinction between the two Houses, so far as the five rupees are concerned, but, at the same time, I want to emphasize this fact that I do not want to ask for more for this reason—and I think Honourable Members will agree with me—that while it is not material that they should get five rupees more per day, it is material in the interests of the country that they should not deprive the people of this country to the extent of about Rs. 60,000 or Rs. 70,000 per year. None of us here, Sir, would wish that we should be instrumental in depriving the taxpayer of this country of Rs. 60,000 to Rs. 70,000 per year which would be the amount if five rupees a day more were given to us. That is the calculation which

I have carefully made and it has weighed a great deal with me in coming to the conclusion that we ought not to ask for more.

I submit, therefore, Sir, that the Members of the Assembly will see their way to reject the Resolution and will proceed with the more important work that is lying in front of them.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I now move, Sir, that the question be put.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Five Minutes to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Five Minutes to Three of the Clock. The Honourable the President in the Chair.

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: Sir, I must preface my remarks by pointing out that the question of titles is not one which primarily concerns the Government of India. The conferment of titles is the prerogative of the Crown; that prerogative has been delegated in this country to His Excellency the Viceroy; and, therefore, the grant of titles rests solely with His Excellency the Viceroy, and not with the Government. At the same time, I should like to explain the reasons for this distinction to which objection has been taken, because I should regret it very much if any Honourable Member should suppose that there is anything invidious or derogatory to the Members of this Assembly in the fact that the Members of the Council of State have the title of 'Honourable', and they have not. I should regret it still more if it were thought by any Honourable Member here that there was any underlying sinister motive. The distinction is based entirely on the differences in the functions and the position in the constitution of the two Chambers. This House is the popular House, the democratic House, and its powers are wider than those of the Council of State. The Council of State, on the other hand, is essentially a Revising Chamber, and it is because it is a Revising Chamber, that in accordance with the Dominion precedents the title of 'Honourable' has been conferred upon the Members of that Chamber. Now, Sir, it has been denied that the Council of State is a Revising Chamber. Well, if the Council of State is not a Revising Chamber, I think any Honourable Member will find it exceedingly difficult to say what its functions are. Perhaps a reference to another constitution will make the point clear. Take the case of the South African Federation: There you have two Chambers. One Chamber is the popular, the democratic Chamber and the Chamber with the larger powers. The other is the smaller Chamber, and the constitution makes provision, when there is a difference of opinion between the two Chambers, for a joint sitting. The position, therefore, is closely analogous to that which obtains here in the relations between this Assembly and the Council of State. Therefore if it is admitted that the second Chamber in the South African Federation is a Revising Chamber—and I am not aware that any constitutional authority would dispute the point—then it must be admitted that the Council of State is a Revising Chamber. The fact is of course, that whether a Chamber is a Revising Chamber or not depends solely upon the question of what its powers are. If the powers of the two Chambers are absolutely co-ordinate, then, of course, neither is a Revising Chamber. But if one Chamber is the popular and democratic Chamber, with the larger powers, the other Chamber is in relation to that Chamber of a Revising Chamber and that is the position of the Council of State. This House is the popular, the democratic House; it has the co-ordinate powers, it controls the purse and

[Mr. S. P. O'Donnell.]

in any joint sitting it must have a predominant voice; and, therefore, in relation to this House the Council of State is a Revising Chamber.

Sir, I have said that it is entirely in accordance with the Dominion precedent, that the Members of the Second Chamber should bear the title of 'Honourable'. That point again has been challenged but not, I think, on grounds that will bear scrutiny. In none of the popular Houses in the Dominions is the title of 'Honourable' borne by the Members thereof. It would be considered inconsistent with the democratic character of those Houses, that their Members should bear the title of 'Honourable'. On the other hand, the general practice of the Dominions is, that Members of the Second or Revising Chamber do bear this title. I admit, there are exceptions. The title is not borne by the Members of the Senate of Australia. On the other hand, it is borne by Members of the Senate of Canada, and by the Members of all the Legislative Councils which are of course Second or Revising Chambers in the Dominions. It has been said by the Honourable Member who moved the Resolution, that these Second Chambers in the Dominions are nominated bodies. It is true, that the Senate of Canada is a nominated body; but the Honourable Member can satisfy himself, by a reference to any standard authority, that there are a number of Second Chambers in the Dominions which are entirely elected.

Then we have been told that Dominion precedents are beside the point, because these matters are settled by the Dominions themselves. That is entirely incorrect. Questions of titles are not settled by the Legislatures in the Dominions: they are settled by the Crown, just as in this country they are settled by His Excellency the Viceroy exercising the prerogative of the Crown.

Sir, the Dominions are among the most democratic communities on the face of the globe. At any rate, if there are more democratic communities, I think, they have yet to be discovered. And if the peoples of the Dominions do not feel, that there is anything invidious or derogatory in the fact, that only Members of the Second or Revising Chamber bear the title of 'Honourable', then, I do not think, any Member of this Assembly should think there is anything invidious or derogatory in the fact that Members of the Council of State bear this title while the Members of this Assembly do not.

Sir, another argument that has been advanced is, that this Indian Legislature is the successor of the old Indian Legislative Council. In a sense, of course, that is true: but the Indian Legislative Council has not been succeeded by a single Chamber. It has been succeeded by a bi-cameral Legislature, and, as I have said, it is entirely in consonance with constitutional precedents that the Members of the Revising Chamber should bear this title.

I hope that what I have said will satisfy Honourable Members that there is no sinister motive underlying the distinction, and that the distinction is in fact based upon sound constitutional precedents.

I turn now to the question of allowances. The differences in the allowances are based at bottom on the distinction to which I have referred.

3 P.M.

At the same time, I admit, that in some respects, they stand on a different footing. Let us take first the question of the daily allowances. If the daily allowances were levelled up—and I think it will be agreed that it would be rather difficult to level them down only two months after they have been

granted—if they were levelled up, the cost would not be Rs. 5,000 as the Honourable Member said, but Rs. 50,000.

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur: I said Rs. 5,000 by mistake. I meant Rs. 50,000.

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: I wished to point out that mistake. The position was correctly stated by Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas. The cost would be much nearer the neighbourhood of Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000. Also, so far as I could gather, there is a difference of opinion among Honourable Members on the subject of these allowances. At the same time this is a matter on which the Government will be guided by the House. The Government is quite prepared to leave this matter to the decision of the House. If the House wishes that the allowance should be raised from Rs. 15 to Rs. 20, then the Government will accept the decision.

Then, there is the question of railway carriages and reserved compartments. I think it will be realised by all Honourable Members that it is quite impossible for the Railways to provide reserved compartments for all Honourable Members. There are something like 150 or more of them and all these reserved compartments will be wanted practically at the same time; and if they were reserved for Members of the Legislature coming up to Delhi, I am afraid, the rest of the travelling public would be put to considerable inconvenience. At the same time, Government will be prepared to re-examine this whole matter of railway accommodation a year hence, and I hope, that this assurance will satisfy Honourable Members on that point.

Dr. Sir D. P. Sarbadhikari: Sir, I share the regret that it should have been at all necessary to bring up this Resolution and, I am inclined to agree, that there has been an avoidable waste of time. I am not sure, however, whether my Honourable friend—(though we are not legally Honourable, we are called 'Honourable' even by Members on the Government benches)—I am not sure, however, that the Honourable Member who complained of that waste of time did not very materially contribute to that waste. While complaining of the waste in a somewhat high falutin fashion, to which we have been accustomed, he was giving the very reasons for a dispassionate consideration of the Resolution. He admitted, and more than admitted, he almost complained, that there was a regrettable distinction which he would much rather should not have come into existence. If that is at the back of the minds of people, what harm is there in giving it voice? Does that Honourable Member or any other Member of this House,—and this expression that has the sanction of Government Members—think that for the sum of Rs. 2,700, that is Rs. 5 a day, for five or six months in the year for three years, any Member here from a Baronet to another to whom Mr. Eardley Norton unfortunately referred to—he being an equal was entitled to greater consideration than was shown to him—does any Honourable Member . . .

Mr. Eardley Norton: May I make a personal explanation, Sir. I did not intend to cast, and I did not cast the slightest reflection on the Honourable Member. I said, on the other hand, that he was justly elected.

Dr. Sir D. P. Sarbadhikari: Does any Honourable gentleman imagine that for Rs. 2,700 in three years any of us here would be voting for what may be considered as a gain in one's own favour? A false issue has been raised—I am not sure if an unfair, an unconsciously unfair issue has been raised against Members voting for what is called their own allowance. Are they called upon to do that here to-day? Are

[Dr. Sir D. P. Sarbadhikari.]

they doing that? Or, is it for all time that they are bringing up this consideration? I and Mr. Jamnadas may to-morrow cease to be Members of this Assembly; but those whom all are interested in seeing here ought not to have a complaint which every one of us has felt, whether they be inclined to give expression to it or not, very many of us are here at considerable sacrifice of convenience; considerations of health demands upon their time, family considerations, business considerations have not been allowed to stand in the way of people who thought it was their duty to throw themselves into the breach at a critical time and to come and serve their country. After the adjournment, that venerable and esteemed friend of ours, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, had an accident followed by a fainting fit, we are all sorry—I am sure the House will be in deep sympathy with him. A man of that age and position comes here, and comes here for Rs. 2,700 extra in three years voted for by himself. Is that a notion to be tolerated for one single moment?

I refuse to be party to such an accusation against my colleagues. There are those who feel that this distinction is unmerited. I do not think, that Mr. O'Donnell need have taken those seriously who were attributing sinister motives to Government. Members of the Government fattening on an ill-gotten five crores of rupees and wanting to shield the bankrupt Government from liability for another fifty thousand—that was a weird picture which was not, I suppose, meant to be taken serious notice of. But people do feel that divided as the Imperial Council may have been into two Chambers, no occasion arose, no justification has been put forward for the distinction that has come about. Why? I shall not pursue the constitutional aspect of the question because that seems to me for present purposes to be a regrettable side issue. It is admitted on the part of the Government that these two Chambers form the Legislature and that they between themselves fill the place of the former Council. Why, then, this distinction, though costs have gone up? The Provincial Councils cannot complain because they had their schedule before. What has happened to make these people revise their scale of livelihood, either in Simla or in Delhi? None. Then, Sir, about the question of the title of 'Honourable'. I do not see eye to eye with those who would prefer to take and keep the cash and let the credit go. I am sure, Mr. Eardley Norton, by the way that he described and depicted himself, was not speaking for himself; he was speaking only as an advocate for those whose case he had taken up, because that graphic picture will not apply to him. He of all people after having put his capacious palm into less capacious pockets for a number of years can well afford to pay his laundress Rs. 13, not a week, but a day, as I am sure he does. That is not the point, Sir. The question is, that there is, this gratuitous distinction and this distinction has not been justified. It cannot be. Government has been good enough to say that it will leave it to the good sense of the Members of this Assembly to say what they feel on the matter of allowances. Well, the division, which Mr. Price has asked for, would prove his scrupulousness. I for myself shall not hesitate to vote the way that I think I ought to, and I shall not be afraid of facing my voters after that. I shall be able to go to them with a clear conscience that what we are voting for was not a mere Rs. 5 per day, to enable those who for our own individual selves but also may later want to come here and who might be kept back on account of this distinction. We want to pave the way of those people, and if in the meantime the present Members of the Assembly get benefited, why not? My Honourable friend,

Mr. Neogy, I am told, put forward a reason which appeared to me somewhat quaint. He in effect says that lesser lights would not have a chance of coming here if the title of 'Honourable' was affixed to a Member's name, because those who would have assisted them, zemindars and other people with an eye to the main chance, would not help in keeping up the democratic character of the Assembly . . .

Babu K. C. Neogy : I did not say so.

Dr. Sir D. P. Sarbadhikari : I did not take him seriously there. As for this Resolution having been initiated and supported by the Members themselves that again is a proposition that I cannot assent to ; because immediately after the notification on the subject it was issued, I saw strong and vigorous protests in the papers, and the Resolution here is a reflex of that protest.

It is unfortunate that we should have the appearance of having to speak for ourselves. But, if appearances are likely to be against us, I do not think, that mock heroics should stand in the way of giving expression to our views. It is a delicate question. It is not a question of labour and wages ; it is not a question of compensation ; it is a question of practicability of things ; and every one has felt that hard as matters are already, they ought not to be made harder. From that point of view and from the larger point of view which I have tried to put before you, I think, the Members of the Assembly should approach this question. If unfortunately they have the appearance of being a party to voting for themselves, with larger powers of finance in their hands, that should deter them from doing what they think is right.

Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha : Sir, I have listened very carefully to the reply of Mr. O'Donnell on behalf of the Government of India. It is, because I am satisfied that his reply is unsatisfactory and inconclusive that I make no apology for prolonging this debate. So far as I have been able to gather the sense of this House, it is either indifferent to or not very desirous of having that clause in the Resolution which tries to retain the title of 'Honourable.' If I may venture to advise the Honourable Mover, I shall ask him to drop that part of his Resolution. But, so far as the other parts of the Resolution are concerned, I think, they require very careful consideration at the hands of the House. I fear, some of my friends here, notably Munshi Iswar Saran, have struck a false note and made it a question of Rs. 15 *versus* Rs. 20. To begin with, the Resolution, as drafted, contains no such words at all. All that it asks for is an equalisation of the status of the Members of both branches of the Legislature. Munshi Iswar Saran also administered a gentle rebuke when he said that this important question should not be discussed in a spirit of amiability, geniality, urbanity or perhaps levity, but should be discussed in a very serious spirit.

I shall approach this question, if I may say so, in a very serious spirit, and I venture to ask whether it was right for the Government, in the first place, to have made these admittedly invidious distinctions between the Members of the two Houses without consulting a single Member of this House; without giving us an opportunity to have our say or to bring before this House our suggestions on the question, and now to say 'it is too late now to ask us to do this and to do that.' That, I submit, Sir, is not a fair way of dealing with the Honourable Members of this House. Viewed in this light, the question, to my mind, is of great importance and the Government, I submit most respectfully, had no right to take action in the matter and make these admittedly invidious distinctions without giving us a chance to have our say in the matter. Then,

[Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha.]

Mr. O'Donnell says: 'We have made these rules now; we cannot level down the allowances of the Members of the other House and at the same time if we level up, it means Rs. 60,000 more'. I notice, Sir, there has been a good deal of discussion about the reduction of the pay of Ministers in the Provincial Councils and the official Members have always replied to non-official Members, 'Well, after all, it is a question of Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000 that you are trying to reduce; it is a very small amount after all compared with the large amount of expenditure that is to be incurred. What is the good of asking for a reduction of Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000 out of Minister's pay?' When it comes to that, then, Rs. 50,000 is a very small amount. But, when the proposal is brought forward here and when it suits Government, it becomes a large amount. I do not think that argument is really very convincing. I think personally, this question affecting the position of the Members of this Assembly is one which should be settled by placing them on a footing of equality with the Councillors even if it necessitate an expenditure of Rs. 60,000 or more. But, quite apart from that, I do not see why the Government were not disposed to level down the allowance of the Members of the two Houses. What we say is this. Make it Rs. 5, Rs. 10, Rs. 15 or Rs. 20, or whatever the amount may be, make it the same amount for Members of both the Houses, and I think it is putting a wrong construction to say, that it is really a question of voting more money for ourselves. Therefore, what I say is, that the reply of Mr. O'Donnell is not satisfactory and the Assembly should vote for the Resolution and the Government should consider the best way in which they can, as soon as possible, give effect to the Resolution.

Again, about the railway accommodation, we are told that we are 150 strong and how could the railways provide reserved accommodation for so many? But, surely, if that be so, why give any special facilities to the Members of the other House? Is it because they are of the character of a Revising Chamber that it is necessary that each of them should have accommodation of a whole reserved compartment? I think, the whole thing is indefensible. I do not attribute any sinister motive to Government, and I shall never do so, I hope; but I think that without characterising it, the fact remains that the distinction made is grossly invidious. The Assembly should consider on the merits whether it is right for the Government, in the first place, to have made these distinctions and now to turn round and say: 'We cannot consider the question now, we shall take one year's time to consider the whole matter,' and so on. That, I think, is a wrong way of disposing of the matter. I, therefore, hope that with the omission of the clause about the retention of 'Honourable', on which I don't want to say anything, since much has already been said, the Honourable Mover will stick to the Resolution as it stands and that the Assembly will vote for it.

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey: I move that the motion be now put, Sir, and if you think proper, would suggest, that it be put in two parts, namely, that relating to the question of title and that relating to the question of emoluments.

The Honourable the President: The question to be put at present is the amendment moved by Rao Bahadur Subrahmanyam. The original question was, that the following be adopted:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to place the Members of both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature on an equal footing in respect of allowances and honorary titles to be borne by them during their term of office.'

Since which an amendment has been moved to omit the words 'and honorary titles to be borne by them'. The question is, that that amendment be made.

The Assembly divided.

AYES—47.

Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
Bryant, Mr. J. F.
Burdon, Mr. E.
Carter, Sir Frank.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Cotelingam, Mr. J. P.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
Currimbhoy, Mr. Rahimtoola.
Dalal, Sardar Bomanji Ardeshir.
Dentith, Mr. A. W.
Dwarkanadas, Mr. J.
Fell, Sir Godfrey.
Garu Jayanti, Mr. R. P.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
Girdhardas, Mr. N.
Hailey, The Honourable Mr. W. M.
Herbert, Lt.-Col. D.
Holland, The Honourable Sir Thomas.
Hullah, Mr. J.
Hutchinson, Mr. H. N.
Innes, Mr. C. A.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.

Keith, Mr. W. J.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Maw, Mr. W. N.
McCarthy, Mr. F.
Mudaliar, Mr. S.
Mukherjea, Babu J. N.
Neogy, Babu K. C.
Norton, Mr. Eardley.
O'Donnell, Mr. S. P.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Pickford, Mr. A. D.
Price, Mr. E. L.
Rangachariar, Rao Bahadur T.
Rao, Mr. C. Krishnaswamy.
Renouf, Mr. W. C.
Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Sapru, The Honourable Dr. T. B.
Sharp, Mr. H.
Subrahmanyam, Rao Bahadur C. S.
Valia Raja, Mr. R. V.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Waghorn, Colonel W. D.
Watson, Sir L. P.

NOES—50.

Abdulla, Mr. Saiyed Muhammad.
Afsar-ul-Mulk Akram Hussain, Prince.
Ahmed, Khan Bahadur Zahir-ud-Din.
Ahmed, Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din.
Amjad Ali, Mr.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
Bagde, Mr. Kesho Ganesb.
Barua, Srijiut Debi Charan.
Bhargava, Rai Bahadur Pandit Jawahar Lal.
Bishambhar Nath, Rai Bahadur.
Chatterjee, Mr. J. C.
Faizaz Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.
Ghose, Babu S. C.
Gidney, Lt.-Col. H. A. J.
Gour, Dr. H. S.
Habibulla, Khan Bahadur Muhammad.
Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lieut. Nawab Muhammad.
Ikramulla Khan, Khan Sahib Mirza Muhammad.
Jafri, Mr. Syed Haider Karrar.
Lakhshi Narayan Lal, Rai.
Latthe, Mr. Anna Babaji.
Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.
Mahmood S'Channad, Mr.

Majid, Sheikh Abdul.
Majumdar Bahadur, Rai J. N.
Man Singh, Bhai.
Mitter, Rai Bahadur N. C.
Misra, Mr. P. L.
Muhammad Hussain, Mr. T.
Nabi Hadi, Syed.
Nand Lal, Dr.
Nag, Rai Bahadur Girish Chandra.
Nayar, Mr. K. M.
Pyari Lal, Mr.
Reddiyar, Mr. M. K.
Sarbadhikari, Dr. Sir D. P.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Sen, Rai Bahadur Nishikanta.
Sen, Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra.
Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhuri.
Shahani, Mr. S. C.
Singh, Babu B. P.
Sinha, Mr. Sachchidananda.
Sircar, Mr. N. C.
Subzposh, Mr. S. M. Zahid Ali.
Tulshan, Rai Sheo Prasad Bahadur.
Ujagar Singh, Baba Bedi.
Wajid Hussain, Khan Bahadur Chaudhuri.
Wajiduddin, Haji.

The Honourable the President: Ayes 47, Noes 50.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, before this House passes its final verdict on this question, I would like to put one or two considerations before it. Whatever the Members of this Assembly may think, it is not yet a fully democratic body, although we all hope that in the course of time and very soon

Dr. H. S. Gour: I rise to a point of order, Sir. I understood you to say that we were in the midst of voting. I ask, Sir, that the question be now put.

The Honourable the President: Order, order. We are not in the midst of voting. We have just decided part of the question before the House, but the main question is still before the House.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: This House, although it is not a fully democratic body to-day, hopes one day to be a fully democratic body. Therefore, when the Members vote on this question, they should not only consider what their personal view is, but what will be the view of those who will succeed them hereafter. As a democrat, I believe; that the prefix of the title 'Honourable' gives us a distinction which is not democratic and which makes us cease to belong to a class to which we wish to belong.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I rise to a point of order. The amendment has been negatived. Is the Honourable Member now entitled to speak on the amendment?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I am speaking on the whole Resolution.

The Honourable the President: Order, order. The Resolution as on the paper is now before the House intact. It contains the words which the Honourable Member, Mr. Joshi, is discussing.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: No democrat would really like to have the prefix 'Honourable' attached to his name. As soon as he gets that prefix he ceases to belong to the great democratic party, the mass of the Indian people. It creates a distinction which a real democrat always hates. I would, therefore, like this House to consider this question very seriously before they vote upon it. Let them, if they care for a title, get it by some other means. But let them not commit their future generations in this Assembly. As regards the question of allowances, I entirely agree with the Honourable Member from Bihar. The Government really had no business to make a distinction between the allowances of Honourable Members in the Council of State and the Members of this Assembly. If the Members of the Council are elders, and are supposed to come from a richer class of people—and they do come as a matter of fact from a richer class of people—they ought not to have been given any allowance at all on the analogy of the House of Lords. But if any allowances are to be given, I do not know on what principle the distinction was made.

If the distinction was made on the ground that they are a superior body, then, I can understand it. But we have been told by Mr. O'Donnell that he did not believe that body to be a superior body, and that, as a matter of fact, this Assembly is the superior body in power. I therefore do not understand at all why this distinction as regards the allowances should have been made. But, unfortunately, we are now in a fix. We must either throw away the whole Resolution or accept the title of 'Honourable'. If that alternative is given to me, I would rather throw out the proposition rather than accept the title of 'Honourable'.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju : Sir, the whole trouble has been brought about by the attitude of the Government. Mr. O'Donnell has very well pointed out that the title of 'Honourable' is one to be conferred by the Viceroy, and that we, as representing the democratic section, ought not to care to accept the title of 'Honourable', and I agree with Mr. Joshi on that point. Mr. O'Donnell has not pursued the comparison of India with the Dominions further, because, if he pursued it further, he would find that in no other country, Colony, or Dominion, monarchy or republic, nowhere else where there are two Houses, whether they are called Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly or Senate and House of Representatives, the allowances paid are unequal. There is absolutely no distinction throughout the world. It is only by the Bureaucratic Government that this distinction has been made. To make sure of my facts, I have taken the figures from 10 countries outside and 10 countries inside the British Empire and all of them indicate the same result. I may mention, that in the United States, the Members of the Senate, as well as the Members of the House of Representatives, are paid equally 7,500 dollars per annum besides travelling allowance. In Belgium, the Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate are paid £384 per annum. In the Republic of Bolivia, both are paid alike. In Bulgaria also, the same is the case. I would mention now some of the more important countries. In France, Senators and Deputies are paid £600 a year. In Italy, all the Deputies receive an equal allowance. In Japan, both are paid equally (2,000 yen). In Mexico, (7,000 dollars), in Norway, in Rumania, in Sweden, and everywhere, it is so. With reference to the British Empire, leaving out England where a salary (of £400) is paid to Members of the Parliament, in Canada the allowance for both the Members of the Senate as well as of the House of Commons is 2,500 dollars for the session with travelling allowance. So also in Newfoundland where the Upper House receives a little less. In New South Wales, both are paid equally. In Victoria, both are paid £300 per annum. In Queensland, Members of both Houses are paid £300 only. In South Australia, they are paid £200 only. In Western Australia, they are paid £300. In Tasmania, they are paid equally. In New Zealand, the Members of the Upper House get less and Members of the House of Representatives get more.

Therefore, in order to save the situation, I earnestly appeal to Government, as they want to follow the Dominions, to say that they make no distinction whatsoever between the Council of State and this Assembly, so that they may not ask us to vote for ourselves, and to be graceful enough to place us on an equal footing with the Members of the other House, by accepting the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : This Resolution naturally divides itself into two parts, one relating to the question of title, and one relating to emoluments.

Now, the origin of the title 'Honourable' in the case of Members of the old Legislative Council comes down from a time when a very few non-officials of exceptionally high rank were associated with the Governor General in Council in the making of laws. They were not called Members of the Legislative Council, but they were 'Additional Members of the Governor-General's Council' for the purpose of making laws, and received the same title that had been given originally to Members of the Executive Council. This was continued under the Morley-Minto Scheme but it seems to me that it is

[Sir William Vincent.]

unreasonable to assume that the present Assembly here, a democratic body with much greater powers and of an entirely different character from the original Council, is, or can be called the successor of that body, and I should have thought, that this Assembly would act wisely, on this point of title, in resolving not to attempt to make any claim to it. Personally speaking, I have had it for some years, and I can assure those who want to have it, that it is of very little value as Mr. Norton said, more an incumbrance than anything else. In the course of my official experience I have known many cases in which officials and non-officials have suggested indirectly that they were very suitable subjects for the King to honour. But I have never, I think, before to-day, heard a direct demand for an honour from those who seek this distinction, a distinction, which is solely within the gift of the Governor General under the prerogative powers delegated to him by the King. I think, the Honourable Members should hesitate before they take up such a position, which is somewhat undignified, and, in my opinion, not in accordance with the character of this Assembly.

I may also mention another point. When the proposal to withdraw the titles was first published in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, there was no kind of suggestion from any quarter though the Report is two years old, that the recommendations met with any disapproval in any quarter, and the Government, not unnaturally supposed that there was a general acquiescence in the view that the new democratic body did not want to be burdened with this honorific title.

Turning to this question of the daily allowance, there, I think, the Honourable Members are on much stronger ground. But the real question to my mind is whether the amounts are adequate or not, that is adequate in order to enable all those who seek to attend here, to do so without suffering pecuniary loss owing to the cost of living here, and if, in the opinion of the non-official Members, the daily allowance is not adequate, the Government is quite prepared to raise it at once to any figure that may be reasonable and that this Assembly may think suitable. I hope, however, that when this question of emoluments is being voted, the officials, at any rate, those who belong to the Government of India, will not vote, so that Government may get the plain opinion of the provincial officials and of the non-official Members of this Assembly whether the sums they now receive are adequate or not. If they are not adequate, we shall be quite ready to alter them, but for practical reasons, I think, it would be very difficult in the present year, and I am quite sure, the Members of this Assembly will see with me on this point, to reduce the allowances of the Council of State and to withdraw in the middle of the year concessions already given.

Finally, Sir, I want to refer very shortly to another point. In the course of this debate I heard one or two remarks regarding the Council of State which seemed to me intended to depreciate the value of that body. I happen to be a Member of it, but I am not speaking in its favour on that account, because it is common knowledge that an official in my position can speak in either House; I much regret, however, that any such note should have been struck in this Assembly. If there is one thing necessary for the success of reforms, it is as was said by Mr. Dwarkadas, that the two Chambers should work harmoniously and when I myself, who am a Member of the Council of State and have to meet in debate the non-official Members of it, hear it suggested that it is, in some

way, an inferior body, that it is not a body of elder statesmen, that the Members are not men of weight,—I think the capacity of many Members of the Council must have been forgotten and that the Members of the Assembly must regret that any of them should have suggested anything of this kind. Further when I think of one who has just passed away, who, until a few days ago, was a Member of the Council of State, a man with whom, I say frankly, few if any Members of this Assembly could compare themselves intellectually for one moment, then I feel the more that there is no justification for such a suggestion, and in any case I again express my great regret that anything should have been said which depreciates the status and position of the Council of State.

Sir Frank Carter : Sir, I cannot support the Resolution as it stands. I entirely agree with Sir William Vincent as regards the title of 'Honourable'. It is only an honorary title and nothing more. We compare ourselves to the House of Commons. Members of the House of Commons are not 'Honourables'. They only put M. P. after their names. I do not want the title 'Honourable' I have been an 'Honourable' for three years and I cannot get rid of it and every letter I get is addressed to me 'Honourable', and I am tired of it. I hope every Member of this House will vote against it. But, as regards pay and emoluments, I think, it is making a very invidious distinction between the Members of the Assembly and those of the Council of State. There is no logic in it. It is presumably intended to be a subsistence allowance. Are we to suppose that the Members of the Council of State eat more than we do. This has already been referred to. Then, the Honourable Sir William Vincent said, that he will kindly settle our pay. Well, I think we can safely leave the matter in his hands. As regards the question of travelling, I should prefer that we have the same facilities as the Council of State Members have. I can tell you, that I was on a Government job for about a year and I gave my time and money to Government and I asked for a compartment to take me down to the sea-port when I was leaving India and I was told, I could not have it. What was the result? I travelled with six men in my carriage the whole time, day and night. It is said, that the railways cannot provide the carriages. Well, that may be. I do not think any of us will object to two in one carriage. What I would, therefore, suggest is, that we should have a special train to take us up and down. We had one to bring us up on account of the Duke's visit and not on account of our coming up here to the Assembly. I think that is all I have got to say and I wanted to tell the House what a member does feel about it.

Mr. Eardley Norton : Sir, I should like very shortly to state my present position. The last amendment has placed me in a very awkward dilemma, because I am now called upon to vote on the Resolution which contains the suggestion that we should be 'Honourable'. I admit, that in these circumstances the fear of present famine gives way to my future apprehension of being called something to which I am clearly not entitled. I, therefore, feel that my only security is to vote against the Resolution in its entirety. I have a horrible sensation that if this is passed with the concluding words attached to it, I shall find myself, *nolens volens*, at once relegated to the situation which 16 years ago proved such an embarrassment to my younger life. I certainly am resolute in my view that if, as is the case, Honourable Members could stand up in the House and say that this is a really democratic institution, it would be very difficult to reconcile it with this consistent clamouring for something which is not democratic. Personally I should vote against this Resolution and

[Mr. Eardley Norton.]

personally I object to the concluding words in this particular Resolution, because I do not desire to be peacocking round the universe as the unacknowledged son of some fictitious Peer.

Khan Bahadur Zahir-ud-Din Ahmed : Sir, I will not detain the House for long. None of my friends, Sir, has been able to give any explanation as to why Members of this House should not be called 'Honourable.' Before I came in here, a Dacca friend gave me an explanation. He said, that the non-co-operators have not come into the Assembly and that is the reason perhaps why the title 'Honourable' has been taken away. I was satisfied with the explanation and I ask my friends here to be satisfied with it. I do not myself want to be called 'Honourable' and perhaps a large number of my friends will also not like to be called 'Honourable'. Another thing, I do not like either to be called 'M. L. A.'. The friend of mine, to whom I have referred, explained that those letters meant 'Member of a Lunatic Asylum,' and he said, moreover, that perhaps when I go back that will be the place to which I will go.

With these few words, I condemn both the word 'Honourable' and the words 'M. L. A.' I am satisfied with my plain name and hope, that my friends will be satisfied with theirs also.

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur : Sir, the discussion, that my Resolution has given rise to in this House, is very pleasant and at the same time rather edifying.

My Honourable friend, Mr. O'Donnell—not Mr. McDonnell this time, but Mr. O'Donnell—has told us that the Crown is the fountain source of all honours. Some 43 years ago, I read the very same thing in my Blackstone that the Crown is the fountain source of all honours, and in my old age I need not be told the same thing. We all know, that titles are conferred by the Viceroy as the representative of the Sovereign and not by the Government. Therefore, my Honourable friend thinks it is quite within the powers of the Governor General or the Viceroy to take away the title 'Honourable' from the Members of this Council.

Now, my Resolution, as all Members will see, is not that we must have the title 'Honourable' or that we must have a few rupees more. My Resolution is framed in altogether a different strain, and that is, that we must not brook any difference. It does not matter if you take away the 'Honourable' from the Members of both Houses. Take away all allowances from both Houses. We would not complain. My complaint is that no distinction should be made between the two Houses. The two Houses are the successors of the original Legislative Council. It is wrong to suppose, as Mr. O'Donnell has said, that the Council of State is a revising body. I think, that a mistake is not corrected by repeating it. I have already said, that if they are, we too are a revising body. Take the case of the Criminal Procedure Code amendment. Has not the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill been initiated in the Council of State and are we not going to revise it? Therefore, we are also a revising body.

Then, I have already shown that this so-called Council of Elders is not really a Council of Elders. Although we have young men amongst us, they are very wise. For instance, my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, although he is young, is wise, though sometimes he considers himself wiser than all of us, and thinks, that everybody else in this House is wasting his time; but when he himself takes half an hour in order to repeat what others have

said, he does not think that he is wasting anybody else's time. In the plenitude of his wisdom he thinks that this Resolution has been what is called most unfortunate, or unworthy or something of the kind of any Member of this House and that all this time should not have been wasted. But, in the end, he concludes by saying, 'Yes, we ought to have got something more, five rupees a day more.' He is not at all concerned with the title 'Honourable,' but he thinks he ought to have got five rupees more. I do not say we ought to have more money or that we ought to have the title 'Honourable.' That is not my position.

The Government have made a muddle of the whole thing by making a distinction it ought not to have made. Somebody has said we are all democrats. I am a democrat myself.

'Rank is but the guinea's stamp,
A man's a man for a'that.'

I believe that all men are brothers. I believe that, and try to act up to it, and that is why I would not allow any distinction between myself and a Member of the other House. If my friend, Mr. Joshi, is a democrat, he ought to protest against any distinction between the two Houses. In America and France, two of the most democratic countries, there is no 'Honourable.' The President is 'Mr.' or 'Monsieur'—nothing more. If we want to do away with distinctions, let us do away with all distinctions. I for one will not submit to any such invidious distinction as is going to be made between this House and the other without rhyme or reason, without any justification, simply because the Government wish it or for the matter of that the Viceroy wishes it.

I was under the impression that the Government has changed its angle of vision, but the Government's angle of vision I now find to be sometimes obtuse, sometimes acute, but never right along with ours. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, who carries a wise head on his young shoulders, said, that for two or three years past this matter has been before the country, and no one has protested against it. The Congress never raised any protest against it, he says, as if a protest from the Congress would have carried the least weight with Government. The Government is perhaps not bound to listen to anything that the Congress has to say. The Congress has said many things and neither my friend nor Government has listened to them. If my Honourable friend is such a friend of the Congress, he ought not to be in this House, for the Congress says, that nobody ought to come here.

The Honourable the President: Order, order.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: May I make a personal explanation? I never for one moment said that the Government ought to be guided by the opinion of the Congress. I said even a democratic body like the Congress did not raise any protest against the statement that was made in the Report that in future the title of 'Honourable' will not be given to the Members of this Council. I never said anything more than that.

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur: As no protest has been made for three years, according to my friend, it ought to be barred by the law of limitation. The law of limitation is going to be amended, and my friend may avail himself of the opportunity. I find that his argument has been echoed by my very old and distinguished and Honourable friend, Sir William Vincent, for whom I have learnt to entertain a great regard from the year 1896,—when I used to appear before him at Khulna.

[Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur.]

But, I submit, Sir, that the law of limitation does not stand in my way. I have been a Government pleader myself for many years and I have always protested against it; but I have been instructed, I used to be instructed by my Legal Remembrancer to take the period at three years. I do not think that this Resolution of mine ought to be held barred by limitation. This is the best opportunity that the country has got to speak its mind. My friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, says, that the country does not want it. Does he represent the entire country? Do the rest of the Members represent no body? Though he is very wise I think he should be more careful in future when he always speaks on behalf of the whole country; because every one of us here represents a portion of the country at least. As regards what my learned and Honourable friend, Mr. Norton, has said, I shall say very little except this, that my Honourable friend, like many successful Members of the profession to which both he and I have the honour to belong, has reached the stage of *nirvana*, and from a *nirvanic* point of view he looks upon all human wishes and aspirations. He himself said sometime ago, that he was 69 years of age; I am not yet 69. He may also think, that he has already attained such a high eminence and an honourable position that he need not have the title of 'Honourable', etc. It does not matter to him. Those people who rise very high in the sky can afford to look down on everything and cannot see any distinctions. Perhaps many of you have gone up to the heights of Simla or Darjeeling and from there if one looked down on the plains, he found everything on the same level. Therefore, I think that from his high position of professional success he thinks that all these titles are so many playthings to play with and not worth having. But, at the same time, he wants his Rs. 5. I think, he is not serious even there. I believe, there is not a single Member of this House, including my Honourable friend, Munshi Iswar Saran, who has his eyes always towards the Press, and is always awfully afraid of the Press and is always thinking what will the Press or others say, and not whether a thing is right or wrong, who thinks that for him or for anybody else, high or low, that this Resolution has been moved. This Resolution has been moved in the interests of the Government itself and of the country. There is not now and then a little stupidity on the Government side, I should say this is the case in this matter; unless a thing is thrust into its head it would not understand even its own interest. The position has come to this: the Government itself has cut the ground from under its own feet by non-co-operating with those who have thrown themselves on the side of the Government at a very critical moment of its life. We know that this House will stand even after we are gone. We are all passing figures; we do not, none of us, care whether we be 'Honourables' or not, whether we get a few more rupees or not; but we all care for the honour and dignity of this House. If this House is to do its work, its useful work for this country, I think every one should throw away personal considerations; that little sense of personal delicacy ought not to prevail with anybody, and everybody ought to vote in favour of this Resolution which is not for any individual, this or that, but for the honour, dignity and prestige of this House which is to work in the interest of this country.

The Honourable the President: I think it would be consulting the convenience of this House if I use Standing Order No. 68 to enable Members to vote separately upon the two issues presented by the Resolution. It might appear that the Assembly had already

4 P.M.

decided on the words proposed to be omitted in the amendment. All that the vote on that amendment did, however, was to instruct me, when the final question was put from the Chair, to put those words as well as any other words in the Resolution. I, therefore, propose to put the Resolution in the form of two Resolutions, instead of one.

The question is, that the following Resolution be accepted :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to place the Members of both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature on an equal footing in respect of allowances'.

The motion was adopted.

Munshi Iswar Saran : I claim a division, Sir.

The Honourable the President : I put the question again :

'That the Resolution down to the words 'in respect of allowances' be adopted'.

The motion was adopted.

Munshi Iswar Saran : I claim a division, Sir.

The Honourable the President : Will those who desire a division kindly rise in their places ?

(Only 2 Members rose in their places.)

The Honourable the President : The division is frivolously claimed. Now I put the second part of the Resolution. The question is, that the following Resolution be accepted.

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to place the Members of both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature on an equal footing in respect of honorary titles to be borne by them during their term of office'.

The Assembly divided.

AYES—50.

Abdulla, Mr. S. M.
Agarwala, Lala G. L.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Ahmed, Mr. Zahir-ud-Din.
Amjad Ali, Mr.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. Mukundaraja.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.
Barua, Srijiut Debi Charan.
Bhargava, Mr. J.
Bishambhar Nath, Mr.
Chatterji, Mr. J. C.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Faiyaz Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Gajjan Singh, Mr.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.
Gidney, Lt.-Col. H. A. J.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
Gour, Dr. H. S.
Ibrahim Ali Khan, Nawab Muhammad.
Ikramullah Khan, Mr. Mirza Md.
Jafri, Mr. S. H. K.
Keith, Mr. W. J.
Lakshmi Narayan Lal, Mr.
Latthe, Mr. A. B.

Mahadeo Prasad, Mr.
Mahmood S'Chamnad, Mr.
Mahomed Hussain, Mr. T.
Majid, Sheikh Abdul.
Majumdar, Mr. J. N.
Man Singh, Bhai.
Mitter, Mr. N. C.
Nabi Hadi, Mr.
Nand Lal, Dr.
Nayar, Mr. Kavalappera Muppil.
Neogy, Babu K. C.
Pyari Lal, Mr.
Reddiyar, Mr. M. K.
Sarbadhikari, Sir Deva Prasad.
Sen, Mr. Nishikanta.
Sen, Mr. Sarat Chandra.
Shahani, Mr. S. C.
Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhuri.
Singh, Mr. B. P.
Sinha, Mr. S.
Sircar, Mr. N. C.
Subzposh, Mr. S. M. Zahid Ali.
Ujagar Singh, Baba Bedi.
Wajid Hussain, Mr.
Wajihuddin, Haji.

NOES—41.

Afsar-ul-Mulk, Akram Hussin, Prince.
 Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
 Bryant, Mr. J. F.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Carter, Sir Frank.
 Cotelingam, Mr. J. P.
 Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
 Currimbhoy, Mr. R.
 Dentith, Mr. A. W.
 Dwarkadas, Mr. J.
 Fell, Sir Godfrey.
 Garu, Jayanti, Mr. R. P.
 Girdhardas, Mr. N.
 Hailey, The Honourable Mr. W. M.
 Herbert, Lt.-Col. D.
 Holland, The Honourable Sir Thomas.
 Hullah, Mr. J.
 Hutchinson, Mr. H. N.
 Innes, Mr. C. A.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.
 Lindsay, Mr. Darcey.
 Maw, Mr. W. N.
 McCarty, Mr. Frans.
 Mukherjee, Babu J. N.
 Norton, Mr. Eardley.
 O'Donnell, Mr. S. P.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Pickford, Mr. A. D.
 Price, Mr. E. L.
 Rama Varma Valia Raja.
 Rangachariar, Mr. T.
 Rao, Mr. C. Krishnaswamy.
 Renouf, Mr. W. C.
 Samarth, Mr. N. M.
 Sapru, The Honourable Dr. T. B.
 Sharp, Mr. H.
 Subrahmanyam, Mr. C. S.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Waghorn, Colonel W. D.

The Honourable the President : Ayes 50, Noes 41.

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION *RE* INCREASING THE RATE OF INTEREST PAYABLE ON 3 AND 3½ PER CENT SECURITIES.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : Sir, I congratulate myself that I have caught this Assembly in a very liberal mood to-day and I know I can appeal to the sense of liberality and to the sense of justice of this Assembly in support of the Resolution which I move and which runs as follows :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken to increase the rate of interest payable on 3 and 3½ per cent. securities to 6 per cent. or to take such other measures as will secure the restoration of the pre-war market rates of those securities.'

I know I am in charge of a very difficult subject and I also know that times are not propitious. I know that an appeal will be made to the sense of responsibility of this Assembly which has acquired new powers.

At the same time, Sir, I am impressed with the justice of the cause I am placing before the Assembly, so that I have ventured much against my own inclination in a financial critical time like this to bring up such a subject for consideration. I will place a few facts before this Assembly and it is hardly necessary for me to dilate at length on this subject as many of the Honourable Members of this Assembly will have read the very able and careful speech delivered in the other Chamber by the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy on this subject although he presented it in a different form. The history of these 3 and 3½ per cent. securities is perhaps not well known to all the Members of this Assembly. By the courtesy of the able Financial Secretary whom we have, I was placed in possession of the history of these securities. Originally the Government had to borrow at 5 per cent.

and when their credit began to assume proportions they were able to convert the 5 per cent. securities into 4 per cent. securities. Many of the 5 per cent. holders willingly consented to convert them into 4 per cent. securities, and again when they acquired further credit after the Mutiny they floated these 3½ per cent. securities. Most of the 4 per cent. holders took the 3½ per cent. securities. And again, if you take the people who took these securities or converted them into the new Government securities, you will find that their case deserves a very careful and anxious consideration at our hands. You know the provisions of law which require co-operative credit societies and the bye-laws of Insurance Companies and rules of practice in courts which require as regards the investment of certain funds to be made only in Government securities and we know also the rules of conduct relating to the conduct of public servants which unfortunately compel them to invest in Government securities. We know also the rules of the department which require officers who have to give security for their appointment; when they pay down in cash they had to purchase Government paper oftentimes at a premium of—I remember the days when 3½ per cent. securities used to sell at a premium of 5 or 6. Now, Sir, most of these people, Government servants especially, had to invest in Government securities. And that was the only fortune which they could leave to their widows and children. Those of us who were wise in our generation—and I count myself as one—I did not believe in them invested in land and houses. My investments are now worth ten times what I paid for them. But these unfortunate people who by rules and law were compelled to invest, to believe in Government and in Government securities, who were forced as it were to invest in Government securities are in this pitiable position. What is their position to-day? They get 3½ rupees interest. Speaking of the interest itself, 3½ rupees of 1880 and 1890 do not fetch the same commodities which they used to fetch in those days. Many of them have to rely only on the returns on these investments for their livelihood. But look at the depreciation in value—in capital value. Many of them had to pay—I hold a letter in my hand, but as I promised to be very short with my Resolution, I do not propose to read any of the papers in my hand—there is a pitiable letter which I got to-day from a man employed in Rangoon, who was employed as cashier or treasurer under Government at some place and had to deposit Rs. 10,000 and he actually paid Rs. 10,500 because Government paper sold then at 105, this was in 1892. The man retired last year and he wanted his Rs. 10,000 and under some rules of the department he was told he could only get the paper and as he is forced to part with it he is forced to go to the market. Nominal prices at 55. No body to buy. And, as to 3 per cent. securities, no body cares for it. There are not even quotations in the various stock and share lists which we see for these 3 per cent. securities. Is it right on the part of Government to allow this state of things to continue? Well, Sir, I quite see that the holders of these securities have no legal claim on the Government. But we have to remember the history of these loans, and the history of how this depreciation has come into vogue. As it was admitted in the able speech delivered yesterday by the Honourable the Finance Member, it is mostly due to the action of Government in issuing new loans at higher rates of interest. And one other feature regarding these 3 per cent. and 3½ per cent. securities we have to remember. Whereas these later loans are redeemable, those loans are non-redeemable. That is to say, Government are not bound

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

at any time to pay back the price and redeem it. If at any rate there was such a guarantee, that 10 years hence, 12 years hence, or 15 years hence, the Government were going to take back those papers at their face value, prices would not have gone down in the way in which they have gone down. Making a rough calculation, I find that the holders of these securities lose nearly 50 crores. I have got the figures here. Out of 276·8 crores rupee loans which are outstanding, 119 crores are 3½ per cent. securities and 6·6 crores are 3 per cent. securities. Look again at another fact which also is in favour of our doing some justice to these people. How was this money borrowed and invested by Government in those days? They were very wise, and in fact the Government congratulated themselves in 1918 upon the very wise way in which they administered the finances of this country. They invested them in railways, and in irrigation works. About 360 crores were invested in railways and 65 crores on irrigation works, and what are we making out of those investments? After paying interest and sinking fund on all these loans, in 1914 it is pointed out in this book which I hold in my hand, that we—I mean the country—were making a profit out of these loans of nearly 9 crores. So year after year we have been using these funds most economically, and most profitably. The country is profiting by these loans which we have taken from these poor people. Some of them may have been rich. But, speaking of these insurance companies, speaking of these co-operative societies, speaking of these Government servants, speaking of these charitable trusts, speaking of the various endowments made by benevolent individuals who invested their endowments in Government paper, most of these institutions have to depend upon the return they get on these investments. And we find at present a pitiable condition. And, what is the answer of Government? Government said, 'Oh! Our position is very difficult. Oh! We have been hunting after something at the expense of 35 crores and driving out capital from the country in the last two years. We have been pursuing a phantom. We have been trying to stabilise exchange at a heavy cost and to the ruin of this country'. Then, the financial condition did not prevent them from doing that. Take, again, the large increases of pay, pension, leave allowances, travelling allowances, which have multiplied since 1918. Modestly estimated, as it has been stated this morning, it must come to nearly 5 crores on all the departments put together. Did this financial condition prevent them from giving their just due to those servants of theirs? Sir, a similar occasion arose somewhere in 1900 about the 3 per cent. securities. Government rose to the occasion then, and they made terms with the holders of 3 per cent. securities and gave them facilities for converting 3 per cent. loans into other loans by asking them to give up one-seventh of the face value of the Government paper. Has not such a situation arisen! I have been, again, by the courtesy of the Financial Secretary, furnished with the figures which would result if my Resolution were accepted. Now, if the interest were increased to 4 per cent. the net increased cost to Government will be 66 lakhs. If the interests were raised to 4½ per cent., the net increased cost comes to 1·37 crores. If it were increased to 5 per cent., it will come to 2·09 crores. I quite see that every pie that we can now save should be saved in the present financial situation. But, Sir, just as the Army requirements cannot be kept down—from 24 millions it has gone up to 78 crores or 72 crores, I forget which—just as the requirements of the

public service have been complied with, just as I find in another case where there was only a moral claim they have recognised it, I mean the Family Provident Fund or Pension Fund—I find in the Esher Committee Report that they are going to raise the rate, where they had promised to pay only 4 per cent., they have now agreed to pay 5½ per cent. on that Fund,—I say the same justice, the same sense of justice, ought to be allowed to prevail in this case also. What is the justice, what is the legal hold which those people, widows, and orphans perhaps, had on the Family Pension Fund in order to necessitate an increase in the contractual rate from 4 to 5½ per cent. The same moral justice there is, the same equity there is in the case of these people. Unless we create confidence in the public mind about the ‘secured’ Government securities, the word ‘Government securities’ will be a misnomer, it will be no more secure than quicksands. That has been the unfortunate experience of many a man, of many a family, of many an institution, who in their folly had to invest in these Government securities. We have to go to the public and appeal to them for loans. How are you going with any face to appeal to the public for loans, when even your recent loans are quoted at a discount, and a heavy discount, in the market. That shows that the people have lost faith in the secured investments in Government securities. Government, I say, will be merely doing justice to these people. They will themselves be retrieving their reputation. Two crores or one crore which you spend on this subject will be well spent. When you are prepared to spend so many crores, when you are prepared to lose so many crores in various matters, I do not understand what justice there is in withholding this. I say the country requires it, and the sense of justice demands it.

In the speech made by the Honourable Member yesterday, he said, ‘Oh! we cannot hold out any hope whatever, although there is a strong feeling in the country about the 3 and 3½ per cent.’ He is not going to do anything, direct, but he is going to do something indirectly by redeeming the short-term loans, etc. But that will not satisfy us. Let us begin, let us do something. I am not wedded to 6 per cent. I am willing to accept any suggestion that the Government may make. Mere lip sympathy would not do in this matter. We have had enough of lip sympathy. We want some action on the part of the Government, and that action should be taken one way or the other, namely, increase the interest, or set apart some sinking fund, and promise to redeem ten or twenty per cent. of those loans, say 10 or 15 or 20 years hence. Make them more secure than they are. Otherwise you will be creating a great deal of discontent in the matter. I may say that I speak with utter sense of detachment in this matter. I am a holder of 3½ per cent. Government paper which is a Rs. 1,000 paper and I got it in this way and it impressed me a good deal last year. A poor Anglo-Indian clerk employed in the Advocate General’s Office put his savings in the Rs. 1,000 paper and he had to give medical aid to his family and he could not part with the paper in the market. He came to me with tears in his eyes and asked me to take the paper and give him at least two or three per cent. more than the market rate and I took it at 64 per cent. last year. It has gone down and I speak therefore from personal experience, and from what I have seen and heard from people who have spoken to me. As a Director of insurance companies and co-operative societies, I say, we had to write down capital year after year, which we had invested in these Government securities. I therefore say it is not right it is not wise that we should allow this state of things to continue. It is a serious matter for Government and any financial burden which may be

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

thrown on the country must be cheerfully borne notwithstanding the critical financial situation. I, therefore, Sir, commend the proposition to the House.

Chaudhuri Shahab-ud-Din: I rise to ask, Sir, whether on the date of maturity the face value will be paid by Government.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: There is no question of maturity. They cannot be redeemed at all.

Mr. M. G. Mukundaraja Ayyangar: I rise, Sir, to move the amendment which stands against my name and it is to substitute '4½ per cent.' for '6 per cent.' in the Resolution. I do not think that any lengthy speech is necessary from me to commend this amendment to the acceptance of the House, especially when the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar has indicated in his speech that he is inclined to accept my amendment. The Honourable Mover has given us an idea of the amount of recurring expenditure if the interest on these securities should be increased to 6 per cent. The Resolution does not take into account the existence of other securities, ^{for example} the 4½ per cent. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, wants that the interest only on the 3 and 3½ per cent. should be increased to 6 per cent. If the Resolution be accepted, what is to be done for the other securities which carry interest at less than 6 per cent. Should we not in fairness to them also, give them increased rate of interest?

It is said that these 3 and 3½ per cent. have not become marketable and negotiable because of the issue of loans during the war which carried a larger rate of interest, and therefore unless something is done to make them marketable and negotiable, there will be a huge cry of dissatisfaction. We shall examine how far the statement of these people is true. You will see that in July 1914, immediately before the war was declared, the 3 per cent. stood at 73½ and the 3½ per cent. at 86½. Thus, they had fallen in value even before the war and the issue of the war loans. Thus the statement that these securities had fallen in value because of the war and the issue of war loans is not *completely true* but only *partially true*.

I suggest in my amendment that the increase should be to 4½ per cent. and not to 6 per cent.

The House may legitimately ask me as to why should it be raised to 4½ per cent. and how the figure 4½ is arrived at. The answer is simple; my reasons for suggesting 4½ per cent. are these. What was the position of the 3 and 3½ per cent. security holders just before the war. If a man had invested in these securities at that time, what would have been his position. I have already given their value in July 1914. You will see that the investment would have brought him only a little over 4 per cent., and my amendment places him in a more advantageous position than he was immediately before the war and, therefore, they should be more than satisfied with this increase in the rate of interests.

Further, if you increase the rate of interest on the 3 and 3½ per cent. only to 4½ per cent., the 4½ per cent. security holders cannot ask us with any propriety for any increased rate of interest on their securities, whereas if you raise it to 6 per cent., I am afraid, they may also, with justice, ask us to show them similar concession.

For these simple reasons, Sir, I request the House to accept my amendment.

The Honourable the President: The following amendment has been moved:

'That the words '4½ per cent.' should be substituted for the words '6 per cent.' in the Resolution.

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey:—Sir, I recognise the spirit of detachment in which the Honourable Mover of this Resolution has, as he himself states, put his proposal forward. He has made it perfectly clear to us that he has no personal interest whatever in the matter. Indeed, so far does his detachment go, that he has permitted himself to say that it is sheer folly to invest in Government securities. He has permitted himself to say that he and his friends, and I assume the public, have lost all confidence in public securities. Well, Sir, I can only regret, in view of the great necessity under which we labour of continually raising more money for capital purposes, for railways and for irrigation, that any Member of this House should find it possible to say that it is folly to invest in our securities or should allow himself to announce that the public had lost all confidence in them. However, I do not wish to answer his Resolution in a dialectical spirit or to treat the matter as one of verbal argument. But the House will notice that very frequently, both in private and in business matters, the intrusion of a prosaic man is not without its value. You will often hear sentiments put forward which seem for the moment to command universal acceptance; you will hear sentiments aired to which nobody can take exception, and the matter in hand seems to be going happily forward until, as I say, some prosaic person turns up with what is always objectionable, that is to say hard facts and figures. Then, the matter seems at once to get on to the plain of reality. The intruder is not perhaps popular, but I think he has his uses, and, on the present occasion, I claim that I can be of some use to the House as representing that prosaic element.

Now, let me take my first objection. It is perfectly true, as the Honourable Mover said, that large numbers of Government servants, large numbers of persons in humble positions, have invested in our 3 and in our 3½ per cents. He has added that it is deplorable that they should be under a sense of injury at the depreciation of their capital. There again, nobody can take exception to this statement. I am prepared to go further and to say that there may be even undesirable political consequences in allowing this class to suffer under a sense of injury in this respect. But, Sir, what he has not noticed is this, that there are very large numbers of persons indeed among the holders of our 120 crores of 3½ per cents. who did not buy at a premium or even at par. There must be very large numbers—there are to my knowledge large numbers—who in the last few years must have bought at 56 or 58. They, therefore, have bought a very good security at a very fair price, and is it proposed, Sir, that the general taxpayer should make a clear gift of 1 per cent. or 1½ per cent. or 2 per cent. to people who already enjoy a 6 per cent. security? Then, again, there is a large number of institutions which have bought purely for the sake of investment, and have never desired to realise the capital value of their investment. They get their interest, and they will continue to get their interest. Is it any injury to them that the capital value should have fallen if they do not want to realise that capital value? None at all. And would

[Mr. W. M. Hailey.]

it secure us any gain commensurate with the cost to us if we were to make a sheer present to those institutions of an increase to their income?

I do not think for a minute the House will agree that there would be any commensurate gain whatever in such a proceeding. As the Honourable Mover has himself admitted, any proposal for compensation of this nature must take due regard to its cost. Now we have out about 120 crores of 3½ per cent. and 6½ crores of 3 per cent. The interest on the former, therefore, is 420 lakhs and the interest on the latter 19½ lakhs. If you raise the 3 and 3½ per cents. to 4 per cent. that will cost 66 lakhs. To raise them to 4½ as proposed in the amendment will cost 129½ lakhs; to raise them to 6 per cent. as proposed by the Honourable Mover will cost 319½ lakhs a year, that is, nearly 3½ crores.

Now, there is only one way of providing those 3½ crores. You will have either to reduce your expenditure in other directions or add to your income. You cannot take it out of capital, and you cannot leave it in suspense. Well, I explained yesterday at great length to the House—I fear perhaps at too great length—what our difficulties were, in providing even for our obligatory deficit this year; and the simple question before the House is whether it feels that it could conscientiously recommend us to increase our deficit by 3½ crores to meet the desire of the Honourable Mover of the Resolution, and to add in consequence that amount to our taxation. It is further for the House to decide whether it will adopt the line of the Mover of the amendment and thereby add to our taxation a sum of just over a crore.

Now, as to the merits of the case. I have admitted, that there is a feeling of distress, perhaps there is a certain amount of real distress, among a certain number of the original holders of our 3 and 3½ per cent. securities. But are they single or alone in that situation? We, before the war, were as cautious as possible in attacking the rupee loan market. I maintain, that on the whole, the result of that has been satisfactory to the country. I will not go into a discussion of the comparative advantage we have enjoyed from a slow development of our assets, nor dilate on the profitable return this has given us. I will only say (and I am sure the House will agree with me here), that by this cautious—perhaps very cautious—policy we left ourselves at the beginning of the war with a large reserve of money power in the country available for use when the emergency came: further, our moderation in attacking the market meant that the capital price of our securities showed little depreciation. The one thing is a corollary of the other. When the war came on us, we had to meet the necessity for raising money in the same way as any other nation; that is, we had to raise it by any means in our power,—short term bonds, treasury bills and even floating debts. That was an unavoidable fact. Even countries which have always regulated their finances on the most conservative principles found themselves in the same difficulty. We had consequently to offer more for our money—first 4 per cent., then 5 per cent. and finally, for our 10-year bonds, we had to offer 6 per cent. free of income tax. The inevitable result has of course been the capital depreciation of the 3 and 3½ per cent. securities. The holders of these are in exactly the same position as the holders of Consols, where there has been a similar, though slightly different, fall in the ratio.

As my Honourable friend, Mr. Cook, told the other House a few days ago, the holders of French stock have suffered even more severely than the holders of consols of 3½ per cent. ; their stock has fallen 68 points, as against our 40. But it is not only Government stock that has suffered in the same way. What, for instance, is the value of your Calcutta Port Trust stock or your Calcutta Municipal Loans ? There has been, not exactly an equal depreciation of, but nevertheless a strong depreciation of, capital value there. Equally the case applies to commercial debentures. Where does English ordinary stock—once regarded as gilt edged security—stand to-day ? Where do English commercial debentures, raised on the 4 per cent. and 5 per cent. basis, stand to-day ? Why, in England to-day even the very best commercial houses issuing debentures can only do so at 8 per cent. ? The holders of our 3½ per cent. are therefore in exactly the same position as holders of consols, in the same position as holders of old standing commercial debentures ; they are for the matter of that in exactly the same position as all those who were before the war in receipt of a fixed income and who have remained in possession of the same fixed income in face of a great fall in the purchasing power of money due to its inflation. Now, I think, I have put it clearly to the House, that you cannot make discrimination between the holders of one stock and another ; you cannot make a house to house inquiry in order to find out at what rate each holder bought his stock, and how far he deserves or requires relief. Now, as to the general merit of the case, it would be difficult for us to say that so strong a case exists for the relief of holders of our 3½ per cent. stock that we must put the general tax-payer at a heavy charge to carry out that operation, in view of the fact that no other country, no other authority making capital issues, has considered any such general compensation necessary, though the holders of our 3½ per cent. stock are in exactly the same position as holders of old Government securities throughout the world. If I may, I should like to quote to the House a portion of a newspaper article which refers to this particular subject. It is from a Bombay paper which has often been a strong financial critic of our policy in the past.

It says :

‘ The fall in Indian Government securities arises from the appreciation of money and they have shared the fate not only of all securities in India, but of all securities in the world When industrial concerns of the greatest stability and prosperity have to contemplate paying nine per cent. for debenture or preference stock, there is no evidence of want of confidence, rather the reverse, in three and a half per cent. paper being quoted in the neighbourhood of fifty and other Government securities in proportion. The national credit in India is amongst the best in the world. The total debt and, in particular, the unproductive debt is only a fraction of the national wealth. All other securities have fallen with the rise in the value of money and Government cannot, at the expense of the general taxpayer, be generous to one class of investors when holders of Port Trust and Municipal stocks are hit equally hard.’

Now, Sir, if it were not that the day is far advanced and that it has been a tiring day for many Members here, I would go on and try to explain to this House how I think the country could profitably dispose of 319 lakhs or 129 lakhs if it had them at its disposal. It is an alluring picture and, I am sorry, that I have no time to paint it in detail ; but, I think, there are many men of financial training here who would be very clear that the best way in which we could dispose of that money in order to restore our money power in the country, in order to get a healthy money market again, would not be by helping the holders of 3½ per cents., but by reducing short term debt and getting

[Mr. W. M. Hailey.]

rid altogether of floating debt. But, I have no time to indulge in this alluring fancy. I will only put this to the House, do you or do you not think that the case made out for the holders of 3 or 3½ per cent. is sufficiently strong for you to desire to add to your deficit and to tax yourselves for their benefit?

Lala Girdharilal Agarwala: Sir, nearly 25 years ago, I remember having read a book called Mill's Utilitarianism, and in that book it is laid down, 'the greatest good for the greatest number of people.' Now I beg to apply the same principle here, and I oppose,—I hope the Honourable Mover of the Resolution will excuse me,—very strongly this Resolution on this ground alone. I submit, that the good that is likely to accrue by passing this Resolution is very little, compared with the loss which many poor people will have to suffer. The Honourable the Finance Member has only yesterday introduced the proposed Budget in this House. That voluminous book lays down that not only are our luxuries going to be taxed, but also some of our bare necessities of life. For example, the Honourable the Finance Member said, that post-cards which are at present sold for quarter of an anna will be sold for half an anna. Similarly, tobacco, which poor people smoke, was going to be taxed. I am not speaking of motor cars, the tax on which is going to be . . .

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey: As the Honourable Member is referring to a statement made by me, I think perhaps I am in order in saying that tobacco, to which I referred yesterday, is imported tobacco.

Lala Girdharilal Agarwala: Thank you. What I submit is this, that the proposed financial budget shows that there is likely to be a new imposition of taxes, and we cannot escape the new taxes, otherwise we will be driving our Government towards insolvency. Now, I submit, the Honourable Mover of this Resolution will kindly reconsider this matter and see whether it is necessary that those persons who have purchased Government Promissory Notes at small prices should be put in the same position as those who had purchased the securities at higher rates. It is very difficult at this stage to make calculations and apportion the profits or losses. So, I submit, it is not desirable that in this critical year when we have to meet a heavy demand we should saddle the rate-payer with a further demand for the sake of those gentlemen who happen to be fortunate enough to possess a good many securities of this kind.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, I entirely oppose this Resolution, and I shall state very briefly my reasons for doing so. As the Honourable the
5 P.M. Finance Member has pointed out, the investors in the 3 and 3½ per cent. rupee loan may be divided into three classes, namely, those who are the original investors, secondly those who are middle men and speculators who purchased these loans at the market rates and sold them, and thirdly purchasers and intermediate brokers. Now as regards the last, these people have purchased these securities somewhere in the neighbourhood of Rs. 54 and Rs. 58, and, therefore, they are getting on their investment a return between 5 and 6 per cent. If the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar's motion is carried, it would come to this, that the speculator who is getting 6 per cent. upon his investment at Rs. 54 should be given a further bounty by the general tax-payer to the extent of 3 to 4 per cent. In other words, he would get a net return of between 10, 11 or 12 per cent. upon the investment he has made in the open

market. Now, nothing could be more iniquitous than to help a person of this character. When he purchased it, he purchased it far below the original price, and he is getting a very fair return on his money. So far as the last person, I mean the speculator or investor is concerned, I do not think that his case deserves any commiseration at all. Now, turn to the last man from whom he purchased. I would assume for the sake of argument that he has been in the market; I would assume for the sake of argument that he invested at the rate, we will say, of 100 per cent. But, how are you going to reach him? You are going to reach him in that old Chinese way where they feed you in the presence of your enemies so that their starvation becomes much worse than it would be if they did not have the food before them. He has already lost because he has sold to the present holder, and after he has sold and suffered that loss you give the present holder an additional sum accumulated to 6 per cent, making his loss double. Now, I do not think that that man deserves any consideration.

I now pass on to the first class of investors, namely, the original holders of 3½ per cent. Rupee Debentures. If you investigate the history of these people, Sir, you will find that for a long period they have enjoyed all the benefits of a gilt-edged security. I do not agree with my friend, the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar, that a great many of these are Government servants and, therefore, they were compelled under the law to invest in the 3 per cent. and 3½ per cent. loans. The statement would perhaps be more accurate, if he said that they are compelled only under certain rules of the Government service. So far as the majority of the investors are concerned, whether they be in the Court of Wards, or Banks or Companies, they are only under certain obligation to invest in what are known as Trust Securities, Government Loans, Municipal Loans, Port Trust Loans, and the like.

Now, so far as the original investor is concerned, is he really hard hit? He has been enjoying for about 30 or 40 years a very steady return of 3 per cent. or 3½ per cent. and he finds now, that after a long enjoyment of this return, his profits have been cut down. But if, in that way, the man is an object of commiseration, so are we, Sir, professional men. On account of the war we have all been hit, and will there be a motion in this Assembly that out of the general taxpayers' budget the Honourable Finance Member should send a dole round to everyone who has suffered on account of the war, scarcity, famine or all those adventitious causes which regulate the rise and fall of the money market? I submit, Sir, such a proposition would never stand the scrutiny of this House for a single moment.

So far as these three classes of investors are concerned, I venture to submit, that the Honourable Mover of the Resolution has made out no case at all for any redress. He rightly admits that he has got no legal right. If he had any legal right, I am perfectly certain, that he would not be here but in a law court. The only right that he claims is a moral right, and I submit, that he has not got even any moral right on us, much less upon the general taxpayer. I say, still less upon the general taxpayer, for the following reasons, for whatever may be his losses, they are not losses which he does not share with the general taxpayer. Everyone of us has suffered on account of the war, all our securities have diminished in value and our profits have considerably decreased; but is that any reason at all why the Imperial Budget should be pressed into service for the purpose of offering assistance to us or to those who have suffered

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

from the exigencies of war and other economic causes in this country? I, therefore, Sir, strongly oppose this Resolution and I hope this House will unanimously throw it out.

Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy : Sir, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. S. C. Shahani : Sir, I should like to say that it will be a great hardship to have to sit from 11 A.M. till after 5 P.M., at every meeting.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : Sir, when I began, I anticipated this difficulty. I know that possession is nine points in favour of the man. Here we hold money which is invested and which we use and for which we are getting a good return, and I quite appreciate the legal points of view presented by the learned lawyer, Dr. Gour, and by other Members.

There is only one remark which is rather difficult for me to answer and that is how are we to distinguish the black sheep from the white? Admittedly there are many white but they are not necessarily the original holders. I gave you an instance of an officer who entered Government service and was forced to buy Rs. 10,500 worth of Government paper at 105 and is forced to sell at 55.

Well, I say, that this is the sort of question which you, Members of this Assembly, have a right to ask the Government whether they are going to allow such a state of things to exist. I am as keen, if not keener on the question of economy than perhaps my Honourable friend who has spoken against this Resolution is, but we have to look to our credit—our credit as a Government.

You cannot compare the Government with mushroom companies which were floated last year or the year before by which so much of the capital of the country was wasted. If we have invested and used their money, we are getting a good return for it.

I say, it is a moral claim which the nation has to recognise—and the Government is not incapable of doing it—of raising the 4 per cent. to 5½ per cent. in the case of the Family Pension Fund and in the case of some other Funds; and some means or procedure should be adopted to set apart some amount, say, 100 lakhs; and it should be left to the discretion of district officers to invite applications for this purpose from such people who are really *bond fide* holders because they were forced to buy them and redeem such Government paper year after year. It would be doing justice to those people who would receive the value of Government paper in that way. I therefore suggest it notwithstanding our financial conditions. It is a duty which we are bound to do—for our own interests and to safeguard our own reputation. We should drop what I venture to call this petty sense of sticking to what we have got in cases where we have got their money. And, again, I am quite willing to accept the 4½ per cent. suggested by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ayyangar. It will be moving, at any rate, one step forward. We are allotting 50 lakhs in order to provide for keeping up the value of those short term notes—I am reminded that the amount is 80 lakhs. We can do something similar. We are going to the market for a loan of 15 crores, but, I am sure, the feeling of discontent will make our loan unpopular.

Therefore, I strongly press upon the Members of this Assembly not to take too narrow a view on this question and not to say that our financial condition is in such and such a state. It was asked, are we going to benefit traders who have lost by recent fluctuations in exchange: Did not we give exchange compensation allowance to our servants, and are we not increasing their allowance?

What justification is there for that? There was no legal claim. The same sense of justice, I say, must appeal to us in this matter. Then, as regards such a class of people who merely invested for investment's sake, the Honourable the Finance Member says, 'What claim have they?' Have they not a claim? Is 3½ rupees in 1890 of the same value as Rs. 3½ to-day? Now, supposing they invested in the faith that they would be able to do some charity, run some school or hospital? Now, can you run the same hospital, how can you run the same institution with the same 3½ rupees? Is not one rupee only worth eight annas to-day. Therefore, what is the good of saying they invested for investment's sake and that they must be content with 3½ rupees. Even looking at it from that narrow point of view, I say, there is justice in the claim which I am making. Therefore, on these grounds I cannot give way to the appeal for economy that has been made by the Honourable the Finance Member. On the other hand, I say, that it must be open to the Government to take some step in this matter. I do not wish to tie their hands, and the Resolution reads to either 'increase the rate of interest' or 'take such other measures as will secure the restoration of the pre-war market rates.' I am sure, the Government, the Honourable the Finance Member, with all the ability which, we know, he has assisted his Department, I am sure, will find some means of distinguishing the black sheep from the white sheep and do something to retrieve the situation. I, therefore, Sir, press this Resolution before the Assembly, in its amended form.

The Honourable the President : The original question was :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken to increase the rate of interest payable on 3 and 3½ per cent. securities to 6 per cent. or to take such other measures as will secure the restoration of the pre-war market rates of those securities.'

Since which an amendment has been moved, substituting the words '4½ per cent.' for '6 per cent'. The question is, that that amendment be made.

The motion was negatived.

The Honourable the President : The question is, that the Resolution be accepted.

The Resolution was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE MEETINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The Honourable the President : I call upon Mr. Price to move the Resolution against his name. If he merely moves it now, that will give the

[The President.]

House an opportunity of discussing on Saturday. I understand, it is a general desire among the Members of the House that this question be discussed.

Mr. E. L. Price : Mr. President, I rise to move the Resolution* standing in my name and I ask the attention of Members to the words in the second line *italicised*—‘*as far as possible*.’ And I would state at once that I am only asking for something to be done in as far as it is possible. I am not asking for any impossibilities ; I am not putting forward any exact demands in a very dogmatic way. I only want to afford the House an opportunity to discuss its own business ; and when certain Honourable Members who have put in amendments spoke to me and asked me whether I accepted their amendments, I told them, ‘I neither accept them nor reject them.’ I wish them to be left entirely to the discretion of the House, but it seems to me that the amendments are a little more dogmatic than my Resolution is meant to be. Sir, in this connection of course one can only base a discussion of a future programme on a past,—I wash out entirely the first 13 days of February ; but, from the 14th to the 28th February inclusive, which gave us 15 days, eliminating two Sundays, there were 13 potential working days. This Assembly actually sat for 5 days. Take again another shorter period, from the 20th to 28th of February, which gave us 9 days inclusive ; eliminating 2 Sundays, 7 potential working days were left. This Assembly sat on 2. Now, I personally am not a man who can afford to wait in Delhi for 9 days in order to sit two days in this Assembly. I had to seize the opportunity therefore to get about on my own personal affairs, and so, I am afraid, did many more and, in consequence, I am told, the attendance in this Assembly last week fell to little more than a third of its full strength.

I quite admit, Sir, that that is not very creditable to Members of this Assembly. But, I suggest, that any blame in that connection may very properly be borne by those persons whose want of *bandobust* occasioned the lapse. Then, again, I take an incident of yesterday, when this House was called on, as it were, to give a blank cheque to some Committee or other on an unknown subject because we never had any papers. This House very properly by a large and decided majority refused to give any such blank cheque at all. Then, again, there was another unfortunate incident in which notices of amendments had not been given in time. Taking these instances together, I think, everybody must admit that the *bandobust* on which we have been working has not been of the best. Now, Sir, we are really in a difficult position. I am only speaking for myself. It may be that we have revived the era, the happy era, spoken of by Macaulay when ‘None was for a party. But all were for the State.’ I know of no party in this Assembly. I am a Member of no party. I speak for nobody but myself. I put facts as I see them. But as I see them, the position of the non-official Europeans in

* ‘This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that in future sessions of the Indian Legislative Assembly the programme should be *as far as possible* so arranged as to provide for meetings being held regularly every day, Sundays only excepted, in order that the burden of service may fall more reasonably on non-official members attending and that the period of their detention at Delhi or Simla may be reduced to the minimum compatible with the efficient working of Assembly.’

this country is that we have no leisured class. We are working men. More than working men, we are hard working men. And it is impossible, Sir, for working men to come and stay in Delhi for periods like 9 days, 7 days of which they are doing nothing and for 2 days are attending here. Now, if I may refer to His Royal Highness' inaugural speech of this Chamber, there is a passage that, I think, is relevant. His Royal Highness said :

'May I say, in passing, that help will be expected from the representatives of the British non-official community. They have done great service to the trade and industry of India in the past ; will they now, with their special experience of representative institutions in their own land, lend their powerful aid in building up India's political life and practice ?'

With reference to that question, Sir, I think, I might make bold to say that the European non-official community have not unworthily answered it in electing and sending to this Assembly the men they have. But the difficulty of my community in maintaining that standard is going to be greatly enhanced if the Members who serve are called on to wait an interminable time in Delhi and Simla for a very few days of actual work.

Now, take again the other communities. Of course I am only speaking of facts as I see them. I quite admit, that the other communities have a leisured class. My own feeling, despite what has been said in this House to-day, is, however, that the place for elderly retired gentlemen is much more in the Council of State than here.

I do feel, that in this Assembly we want rather the younger men, men who have not yet doffed their harness, men who are still waging the battle of life, and again, I say, that if such men, busy in all sorts of professions, are to be kept here an interminable time with very few hours of work, it is going to make it very difficult indeed to maintain the practical working standard of this Assembly. I may say, that I have heard a comparison made between service in this Assembly and service in the House of Commons. Sir, that comparison will not bear examination. London is not only the political capital, but it is the centre of law, banking, finance, of stock-broking, commerce, industry, shipping, scientific research, libraries, of learned bodies, of learning, of publicity and of the fine arts. It is also in telephonic communication with most parts of the United Kingdom including all the great provincial centres. A Member of Parliament, therefore, is never wholly out of touch with his own private affairs while he is in London. But Delhi and Simla, apart from being political capitals, are what ? One, a decayed provincial town, the other a mere health resort so badly equipped with roads that men are used as beasts of burden. They are both remote in time and place, and what is worse, in temperament, from all the great activities on which our prosperity and progress are founded. A landowner, a lawyer, a doctor, a manufacturer, a merchant in Delhi is as much cut off from his affairs as if he were actually out of India.

Is it your wish, Sir, that I should continue ?

The Honourable the President: If the Honourable Member thinks that a convenient moment has come to adjourn his speech as well as the business of the Assembly, the Assembly will be willing to do so.

The Assembly then adjourned till Saturday, the 5th March 1921.