

Saturday, 12th September, 1925

THE  
COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

Volume VI

*(20th August to 17th September 1925)*

---

SIXTH SESSION  
OF THE  
COUNCIL OF STATE, 1925



CALCUTTA : GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH  
1925

## SATURDAY, 12TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—

Resolution <i>re</i> Recommendations of the Majority Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee— <i>contd.</i> —Adopted ... ..	427—457
Statement of Business ... ..	457—458

## MONDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—

Questions and Answers ... ..	459—465
Carriage of Goods by Sea Bill—Passed ... ..	465—467
Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	467—468
Opium (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	468—469
Coal Grading Board Bill—Passed as amended ... ..	469—478

## TUESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—

Questions and Answers ... ..	479—487
Message from the Legislative Assembly ... ..	488
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the Table ... ..	488
Resolution <i>re</i> Work done by the Central Government in connection with transferred subjects—Adopted ... ..	488—495
Resolution <i>re</i> Railway freights on Coal—Adopted ... ..	496—518
Statement of Business ... ..	518
Message from His Excellency the Governor General ... ..	519
Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Negatived ... ..	519—559
Photographic Group of the Council ... ..	559

## WEDNESDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—

Questions and Answers ... ..	561—563
Message from the Legislative Assembly ... ..	563
Bamboo Paper Industry (Protection) Bill—Passed ... ..	564—576
Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	576—577
Resolution <i>re</i> Standing Committees to deal with Bills relating to Hindu Law and Mphammadan Law—Adopted ... ..	577—591
Valedictory speeches on the impending retirement of the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma ... ..	591—596

## THURSDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—

Farewell address of His Excellency the Viceroy to the First Council of State ... ..	597—601
---	---------

# COUNCIL OF STATE.

*Saturday, the 12th September, 1925.*

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

## RESOLUTION *RE* RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MAJORITY REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE—(*contd.*).

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The House will now resume the discussion of the Government Resolution moved yesterday by the Honourable Mr. Crerar. The amendments standing in the names of the Honourable Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna, the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu and the Honourable Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary were disposed of yesterday by the House. The next amendment on the paper stands in the name of the Honourable Mr. Khaparde. Apart from the fact that this amendment does not make any specific recommendation in its terms, I think it raises substantially the same question which the House disposed of yesterday, and that it falls with the amendments which were then disposed of. The next amendment is in the name of the Honourable Mr. K. C. Roy, and it would be convenient if that were taken up next.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY (Bengal : Nominated Non-Official):** May I suggest for your consideration, Sir, that my Honourable friend Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan has almost the same amendment as the one I have and I should like him to move his amendment first, if you will permit him to do so.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The Honourable Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan's amendment proposes to substitute a Resolution for the original Resolution. I have considered the point, and I think it would be more convenient to the Council to consider first the Honourable Member's addition to the Resolution which deals with the appointment of a Royal Commission at an earlier date than 1929.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY:** I submit to your decision, Sir. I move :

“That the following be added the original Resolution :

‘and that he do consider and recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission or any other suitable agency not later than 1927’.”

Sir, I have made this proposition simply because it is in consonance with the Government of India Act. His Majesty's Government and the Government of India, as you know, Sir, have pledged themselves to appoint a Royal Commission not later than 1929, and in the speeches which were made in the other place, although many Members have not distinctly stated their demand for a Royal Commission, we know that some Members like Pandit Madan

[Mr. K. C. Roy.]

Mohan Malaviya and others have claimed that a Royal Commission might be appointed earlier and that this will be regarded as a gesture on the part of His Majesty's Government. The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett almost made a similar statement when he told the other House that if they agreed to co-operate genuinely for the life of the present Assembly and till the beginning of the next they would be materially contributing to the debate. And only yesterday, Sir, the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman was good enough to say that, if sincere and genuine co-operation and good-will were forthcoming, there was no reason to believe that a Commission would not be appointed earlier than 1929. I know, Sir, from my experience of the other Chamber as well as here, that a good deal of co-operation is forthcoming from all sides. I hear excellent reports of committee work done by Swarajist Members and as far as we know, the situation, so far as the Central Legislature is concerned, cannot be improved beyond what it is at present. Under the circumstances, I trust the Honourable Mr. Crerar who represents the Government of India in this House will accept my motion as a gesture on behalf of His Majesty's Government. I move my amendment.

THE HONOURABLE SARDAR CHARANJIT SINGH (Punjab : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I regret I have to oppose this amendment. The Secretary of State has rightly said that wise men are not slaves to dates. I cannot understand how the Honourable Mover can consistently ask this House to tie itself down to the year 1927. I do not know if this is meant as a compliment to this House. Have the Reforms been given a fair chance? If not, is it not too early to say that the reforms have failed. In view of what has happened in some provinces and even in another place, surely, it cannot be said that the reforms have been given a fair chance and that they have failed. Democratic government does not mean a change to autocracy. It would in that case mean only a technical advance, an advance shorn of experience which is at the back of the present Government. That might launch India into a tarmoil of communal strife and personal jealousies. Capacity for self-government must mainly be measured not merely by the ability of its leaders but rather by the capacity of the electorates to become a reliable control upon the Councils. As soon as this is done, there is no reason why a Commission should not be appointed. If that state of affairs is arrived at before the year 1927, an inquiry may usefully be instituted before that year. But, on the other hand, if we fail to achieve that object by 1927, what good would it be to tie this House down to that particular date? The material in that case would not be such as to get the verdict of the Commission in our favour. For this reason, Sir, I am strongly of opinion that, instead of binding ourselves to any particular date, we should concentrate all our energies to educate the electorates and make them fit for advance. Then and then alone would be the proper time for further inquiry and advance. I therefore oppose this amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN (United Provinces West : Muhammadan) : Sir, I support the amendment moved by the Honourable Mr. K. C. Roy. I do not see, Sir, that it would make much difference if a Commission came out in 1929 or in 1927. The object of fixing the date of the

Royal Commission for 1929 was probably based on one principle, and that was it was thought that within ten years it would be seen how the new reforms would work and how the constituencies which have been given the franchise would exercise their right of vote. There have been two elections since 1919. There will be a general election for the Council and for the Legislative Assembly in 1926, practically the test on which the Secretary of State postponed the consideration of this matter, and the objection advanced by him that the ability of the voters had not been tested would be met by the elections having taken place three times in the year 1926. If it is further postponed to 1929, there will be no chance of any further election in the beginning of 1929, because after the elections in 1926, the next elections will come off only at the end of 1929, and if the Royal Commission comes out in 1929, it will have no further material before it than what it can have in 1927. Now, as the minority report lays down, when the discussion of the Resolution moved by Rai Jadu Nath Muzumdar took place in the Assembly, the Government took upon themselves to forward the proceedings of the whole debate to the Secretary of State with a recommendation that a Royal Commission should visit India earlier than 1929. This principle was accepted by the Government of India, that is, to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State to appoint a Royal Commission.

But the Secretary of State for India did not accept this on three grounds only. One of them—the main ground—was that the ability of the voters had not been tested. As I have already said, Sir, their ability will be tested three times. Of course, we know on the first occasion that their ability was not tested at all because very few people contested the seats. The second time we had the Swarajists fighting everybody, contesting every seat, and we had the Liberals and the Independents also contesting these elections. Of course, we know in 1923 things were absolutely different from what they are to-day, and we found that the Swarajists gained a majority on account of a certain agitation in the country, so that that would not be a criterion or a proper test of the voters' ability to exercise their right of vote. Now, the country is peaceful. In these three years the country has learnt what the Liberals did, what the Independents did, and what the Swarajists have done. They are in a position to judge fairly and they are quite capable now of understanding how to exercise their right of vote. In 1926 they will use their votes and we will see what majority comes into the Councils. Of course, Sir, when this fresh material is before the Royal Commission, that will be the most proper time to see and judge, when the new Council will be sitting; the new Assembly will be sitting in 1927; they will be fresh from their electorates, they will have the mandates from their voters and they will be quite fit to lay before the Royal Commission the views of the whole country. I do not see, Sir, how my Honourable friend, Sardar Charanjit Singh, says that it will serve no purpose and I would like to know whose views he is representing in this House. I cannot understand his position. Sir, I see the whole of India united at present asking and demanding that the Royal Commission should visit India sooner than 1929. No dissentient view has been expressed on this point by any political party or from any corner of the country. I mean, Sir, that the persons who are concerned and who are returned on the vote of the people will,

[Mr. Yamin Khan.]

I am sure, Sir, support me in this matter; they will agree with me that their constituencies also desire that the Royal Commission should be appointed before 1929. As was suggested by my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy yesterday, the acceptance of the main Resolution as moved by the Honourable Mr. Crerar is absolutely a different thing from the suggestion that the wishes and the demands of the country may be put separately before the Royal Commission. Of course, Sir, the demands that have been put forward in the form of a Resolution moved by the Honourable Mr. Sethna and Mr. Ramadas Pantulu yesterday before the House in substitution of the main Resolution are the aspirations of India. We may accept them to-day or not. That is a different thing. We may not be willing to accept them to come into force at once. Some people may think that it would be injurious to the best interests of India if they were to come to-day to India. But, quite apart from this point, is it desirable or not that these demands should be properly investigated by a Royal Commission? Well, Sir, we find that all the Governments practically have said that dyarchy has to a certain extent been found to be unworkable. It is not a desirable system which is working. The United Provinces Government most emphatically said on this point that dyarchy was making the position of the Ministers very precarious when they had to defend the Government on the reserved side, and they had to be responsible to their supporters in the local Council. We find that this objection is coming from all quarters of India. All Governments practically want that this matter should be inquired into. And of course, as far as I see from the majority report, they do not feel that a sudden change is desirable. They do not make any recommendation because they were not given any power to make any recommendation by the terms of reference. But, if the terms of reference had been wider, I think we would have found this matter also included in the majority report. The minority went beyond the terms of reference and the majority differed from them only on a constitutional basis, not on the practical issue—not because they did not share the views of the minority, not because they did not think it practicable that there should be a Royal Commission earlier. I do not think that any member of the majority would have desired to suggest the postponement of the appointment of a Royal Commission later than 1927 if they had been given the option to deal with the matter in the report. We find, Sir, that the Government of India Act as it is worked has inherent difficulties and defects which are so numerous that they require a real consideration and overhauling. Now the Reforms Inquiry Committee had not the power to investigate and make a recommendation on this point. What other machinery is there that could be given this power? That is why my Honourable friend, Mr. K. C. Roy, suggests in his amendment that there should be either a Royal Commission or some other agency which may investigate this matter and make recommendations which the Reforms Inquiry Committee was precluded from doing by the terms of reference. And these wider terms of reference might be given to this agency which will come in 1927, and they will be enabled to deal with the wider issue. I have found, Sir, speaking from the Muhammadan point of view, that there are many demands which are quoted by the Muhammadan community and by the repre-

representatives of the Muhammadans, the Moslem League, and other individuals who gave evidence, leaving aside certain others who never came before the Reforms Inquiry Committee, which demands of the minority Communities under the working of the present constitution are hampered, and they demand really further progress with a view to safeguarding their interests. What they really want is a Bill that will protect the minorities and secure their interests which are often checked by the majority and cannot be achieved, with the result that the minorities are not able to get what they want. For this purpose a Royal Commission is really desirable to give effect to this and to remove this defect from the present constitution. It has been laid down constantly, Sir, by the people who represent Moslem views that if two-thirds of the Muhammadans are not united on any Bill or measure or if they oppose a Bill which affects the Muhammadan community, then it should not become law.

In a similar way, I have found that the majority report has quoted the Resolution passed at Agra by a mass meeting of the Muhammadans. What is the safeguard? The Reforms Inquiry Committee had no power to deal with these questions. They made no recommendations at all. Therefore, Sir, in order to remove all these defects, I support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend that this Royal Commission should visit India not later than 1927 and that will be the most proper time for the visit.

THE HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MUDDIMAN : (Home Member) : Sir, before I deal with the actual amendment moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Roy let me take this opportunity of congratulating him on the wise and statesmanlike speech he delivered yesterday. I had not the opportunity of referring to that matter before this.

Now, Sir, the proposition in this amendment is of course a very harmless one at first sight. My Honourable friend proposes to do exactly what the Secretary of State and the British Government would not do. That is, he proposes to be a slave to a date—to the date 1927. I endeavoured when speaking in this House before to indicate that, at any rate in my own opinion, the date of the Royal Commission is of very little importance compared with what the Royal Commission is going to do when it is appointed. A premature Royal Commission obviously would not have results which would appeal to Indian opinion or to those who think that the best interests of India will be served by an inquiry at the right moment. My Honourable friend Mr. Yamin Khan has pointed out the incidence of the various times of the elections. That, Sir, is not in itself of very great importance. What is wanted is experience of the elected bodies. We may indeed hope that in the course of time the electorates will produce legislative bodies which will exercise their responsibilities wisely. But the test that the Royal Commission must apply will be, and obviously must be, largely directed to the work of those Legislatures. The electorate can only operate in the indirect way of securing good and suitable representation in the Legislatures.

Now, Sir, I must at this stage read to the House one or two passages from the Secretary of State's speech. The Secretary of State said :

“ Even assuming co-operation, it was thought that a period of ten years would be required to afford the data for reliable conclusions and generalisations. But I do not hesitate to make clear my own view that it was not the intention of the Legislature to

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

attempt to shackle succeeding Governments, if a spirit of cheerful and loyal co-operation was generally exhibited on the one hand, or if upon the other, grave and glaring defects disclosed themselves."

And he went on to say :

"There will be—there can be—no reconsideration until we see everywhere among the responsible leaders of Indian thought evidence of a sincere and genuine desire to co-operate with us in making the best of the existing Constitution."

Now, Sir, I feel in addressing a House composed as this is, with the record such as it has, that it is an ungrateful task to me to press the question of co-operation. Had co-operation been received in other quarters to the extent that it has been received in this House, I have no doubt we should be far further on the road to the desired goal. Still, important as this House is, it is not the only legislative body in India, and in two Legislatures at any rate, there is even at the present moment no attempt whatever to work the reforms which were granted by the Government of India Act. What is wanted, if I may say so, is not statement but action, and the test for the acceleration of constitutional progress must be the test of fact and act. We cannot, here and now, and I am sure my Honourable friend does not really wish me to do so, commit ourselves to any date, certainly not to the date which is named in his amendment. He will, I think, agree with me that what we have to do is to endeavour by our actions to bring the date of the Royal Commission nearer. That date will be the appropriate date when India will be in a position to present facts to which the Royal Commission will be able to give full consideration. I hope, after what I have said, my Honourable friend will see his way to withdraw his amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE DR. SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY** (West Bengal: Non-Muhammadian) : Sir, it is difficult to see how the two parts of the proposition as they will stand if Mr. Roy's amendment was accepted would hang together. He proposes, in the first instance, the adoption of the Honourable Mr. Crerar's Resolution in its entirety, which is the acceptance of the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, and he proceeds to add :

"and that he do consider and recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission or any other suitable agency not later than 1927."

Sir, as was explained by the Honourable Mr. Crerar yesterday, and as Sir Alexander Muddiman also emphasised to-day and yesterday, the principle of the majority report is the full working of the machinery as it stands and as it may be improved by reason of the adoption of the recommendations of the majority of the Muddiman Committee's Report. The principle, as such, has never in the course of that long report been overtly laid down in the same way as the minority has clearly and unequivocally laid down the principle that the present measure within its limitations cannot work and should be changed early in the manner indicated. Sir, if the principle of the majority report as set forth above is to be accepted, Mr. Roy's amendment cannot from our point of view find acceptance. After effect has been given to those recommendations in the way invited by the Resolution, Mr. Roy's suggestion will have the chance of becoming operative.



Regarding insistence on the necessity of absolutely, and everywhere thoroughly, working the machinery which is now in existence as *a sine qua non* for further advance, reference must once more be made to the great divergence of opinion, and more than divergence of opinion, about even the possibility of working dyarchy by those who have themselves been working it for what it is worth, who have been giving their best in working it. Reference is also permissible to those who have been supporting the measure in spite of its admitted imperfection either in the Assembly or in this House in the earlier stages. The only question is: Can we now consistently with those opinions support the "principle" enunciated by the Muddiman majority report and yet in the same breath ask for the appointment of a Royal Commission within a certain specified short date? We have been told before and to-day—to-day with more purpose—that the Secretary of State and the Government must not be committed to the fetish of dates. Where and how then does Mr. Roy's amendment come in? Well, by the rule of elimination and by what has been often repeated, 1929 will probably not be the date of the Commission but some earlier date, if conditions are favourable. As we have just said the year of grace, 1927, suggested by Mr. Roy, is not acceptable by Government as the likely date of the Commission. That leaves only 1928 and by the theory of elimination one may expect and hope the Royal Commission may come in 1928 when the result of the election to the Assembly and the election to the Council of State will be perceived and also the views of the new legislators will have been ascertained so far as the period between 1926 and 1928 will have allowed. The Government say on the authority of what the Secretary of State and the Viceroy have pronounced that the results of further working must be awaited, and therefore they cannot say anything as to precise dates. If that is the position, I do not see how the acceptance of this amendment will help the situation particularly as it overtly commits us to the principle above indicated. And we are unable to accept and uphold those principles, having regard to the many and clear difficulties in the way. If I may for a short moment revert to the impossibility of working dyarchy, I would very rapidly place before the House what those who have been working it say. Sir K. V. Reddi of Madras has said that "dyarchy has absolutely failed." Sir A. P. Patro has said: "Transfer all the subjects to popular control". Messrs. Mehta and Jehangir of Bombay say that "no palliatives will be effective." Coming to some of the Executive Councillors, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad says "the only thing is to give provincial autonomy." The Rajah of Mahmudabad, than whom there is no more stalwart supporter of Government says "that dyarchy must go." Messrs. Sadaullah and Rajeswar Bali in the United Provinces say that "dyarchy should be brought to an end." Mr. Chintamani, who himself had to go, said that "dyarchy must go." Sir Sachidananda Sinha "can suggest no alternative to provincial autonomy". The Ministers of Bihar, Sir Fakruddin and Mr. G. Singh, say that "dyarchy is doomed and that it is not possible to work it successfully". But these gentlemen are still trying to work loyally and trying to run the "creaking coach" as it has been called. Mr. Joshi of the Central Provinces says that "all provincial subjects should be transferred." Mr. Chitnavis says "complete provincial autonomy is essential for progressive government." Mr. Kelkar, not the progressive in the Assembly, but the Minister of the Central Provinces, advocates "the transfer of all subjects." Sir Provash Chunder

[Dr. Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

Mitter, a late Member of Bengal, says that "dyarchy was unsatisfactory and unworkable and that it cannot be successfully worked any more as a democratic institution." Sardar Sundar Singh, another stalwart loyalist of the Punjab recommended "the transfer of all important subjects to Ministers," and Sir Fazl-i-Husain, who is with us here, and Chaudhuri Lal Chand asked for "the transfer of all subjects." Messrs. P. C. Dutt and Mr. Syedullah recommend "nothing shorter than full responsible government to be carried on by the Governor and the Ministers." The Ministers in Burma ask for "the transfer of all subjects to popular control."

I have advisedly limited this analysis on the basis of the opinion of those who are giving their best to the working of this defective machinery, not men speaking with outside knowledge, not men with "fantastic ideals", but men who have been every day of their life for the last three, or four or five years working the machinery and have made a piteous appeal for change. That being so, I do not see how Mr. Roy can ask us not to accept the principle of the majority report of the Muddiman Committee set out by the Honourable Mr. Crerar and the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman. I can understand the Honourable Sahibzada Muhammad Aftab's amendment better and yet suggest the advisability of a Royal Commission in 1926. Therefore, however, much we should like to have a Royal Commission earlier than 1929, I do not think it is possible for us to accept the proposition as it would stand even when amended by Mr. Roy who was "wise," yesterday and ceased to be so to-day.

Yesterday, I do not know, Sir, how exactly my Honourable friend the Home Member got the idea that with regard to whatever we had been suggesting in the course of either of the amendments that we discussed, we wanted to rule out all inquiry, even the statutory commission or the Royal Commission or any other agency that the Government might think fit to bring into existence for considering further reform. Simply the fundamental and the basic principles embodied in the amendments were laid before the House for acceptance on the basis of which further constitution framing would in the first instance be essayed by us. I do not think either of the amendments, certainly not mine, went any further than that. From that point of view we should welcome any suggestion for the acceleration of the Royal Commission but that cannot be at the expense of the adoption of what has been called the "principle" of working yet this machinery which has been so universally condemned by those who have worked it. Therefore, Sir, without being misunderstood and without for a moment suggesting that we do not want an early Royal Commission, I find it difficult to support Mr. Roy's amendment as a part of the original proposition.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (West Punjab : Muhammadan): Seeing all the amendments which came before the House yesterday and seeing those which have come to-day, one thing we can say and that is if the Members were satisfied with the original proposal brought forward by Mr. Crerar there would have been no amendments at all.

THE HONOURABLE SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY : Of course not.

**THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN :** The minority report, whatever it wanted, could not get it unless the Royal Commission came and all that is being tried is that the Royal Commission should come earlier than the date appointed. In this senior House, we have got a senior man in Sir Dinshaw Wacha and I think when he spoke yesterday he very clearly said that we should not hurry things. I think we ought to take his advice. Another reason why I am opposed to this amendment is that the Punjab came under the British Government much later than other provinces, and though I cannot say that we are backward at any rate it is not on a par with the other provinces. What has happened since the reforms have come? We find that throughout the agriculturists are not properly represented and whenever their cause is brought up here it is defeated. We are progressing very slowly and the longer it takes for the Royal Commission the more we would be prepared and our constituencies will be prepared to ask for their rights. If it comes soon, we shall be as backward as before. I represent Muhammadans and zamindars. Zamindars, as I have said, have suffered. What have Muhammadans gained in my province? We are 58 per cent. of the population and some of us have gone and admitted that we should be quite pleased if we get 40 per cent. in the franchise. Why on earth should we not get our rights and the actual proportion on the basis of population? Now we have certain municipalities in our part of the country which are now being administered by our own men. Well, Sir, things cannot be worse than what is happening there. I mention this, Sir, by way of illustration. Now all that we have seen, Sir, with regard to these reforms is that some lawyers come and make clever speeches, and they no doubt then derive all the benefit and get the high posts. But we are concerned with the masses. In the course of the debate, Sir, there was one thing brought forward about people in various countries making fast progress, while it is said that we do not make such fast progress. But, Sir, if you take the British Parliament itself, you will see that the present stage has only been attained after thousands or perhaps hundreds of years. Yesterday it was said about the United States of America, which is another big country, that it progressed in 150 years. Well, they were all mostly men who went from Europe and who had already been very much advanced. Can we say that of our own people in India? Then again it is said that Japan progressed rapidly in 50 years. Both America and Japan are countries which are bounded on all sides by the ocean, and they cannot be easily invaded; but that is not the case with India. In India if we are not strong enough, we are always afraid of an invasion. We should therefore not always be experimenting, always having new reforms and new reforms, changing the Army, changing the administration, because when we are in the stage of transition, we are weak.

I will say one thing more, Sir. With the rapid communications, telegraphs and so forth, we at once learn perhaps on the same day everything that happens in Europe. In that way Asia is also progressing; and there are powers—it is not a hidden secret—which are trying to get at a very big, populated country and trying to organize it. There is danger in the East. Well, if we are now in such a big Empire, which has got such a big navy and which is so strong that, if anything happens, it will come forward and fight for us, is it not better for us to remain under the protection of that Empire, than to become, through these reforms, like some Colony, because in the latter event we would have to

[Colonel Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Khan.]

do everything ourselves, and it would only be an act of kindness for that Government to come to our rescue, and most of the spade work would have to be done by ourselves? If all the affairs of State were put into inexperienced hands on account of these reforms, it would be very difficult for us to keep on a par with other nations. It is for these reasons, Sir, that we, in the present state of affairs in Asia, would not like experimenting in such matters of government.

Then, again, Sir, all the speeches that are made in India urging further reforms bring forward the same arguments, and nothing new is brought forward. So I hope I will be excused for repetition. It would be exactly the same thing to unite all Europe, which is as big as India, into one nation and to have one set of reforms for all the parts of Europe as for India. Moreover, the task is much more difficult in India than in the other case, for, to give an example, if there was somebody speaking in Bengali, I would not understand. The difference between religions and communities and castes and creeds and even nationalities is so great that it is impossible for us to be able to progress so soon as our friends want, in two or four or six years. If in such a short time we are given such a thing to play with, I think it would be a great blunder. For these reasons, Sir, I would like the Commission to come as late as possible so that before that Commission comes, some of the backward communities may be so educated that they are able to ask for their rights, so that they may not be caught unaware again by the legal and politically-minded people capturing the high posts, and we remaining behind, because such a result would be neither in the interest of the country nor in the interest of the Government. In that case you would give the wrong people the lead; those who are strong would naturally resent it, and you sow the seed of discontent. Directly you give us autonomy, what would happen? Of course those men who feel they are not getting their legitimate share will again fight with the others, and the stronger will win. As we would have to fight with each other, in that way, we would get weaker and weaker. I would therefore say that we ought to be very cautious, and not accept all these amendments which strike at the root of the main Resolution, which is quite good enough and should be accepted.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DASS (Panjab : Non-Mutahmiradan) : Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment which has been moved by my friend, the Honourable Mr. Roy. My reasons for opposing this amendment are the same as those mentioned by my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary. I am thankful to the Honourable the Home Member for complimenting this House for the co-operation which this House has extended in the past; and as now even the Swarajists have offered a promise of honourable co-operation, I think the difficulty which the Government anticipated in giving further reforms will be made easy. As for the request which my friend, the Honourable Mr. Roy, has made, if it could have been made without the rider which he has added, I think we would have supported his amendment, since our original amendment has failed.

My friend, the Honourable Colonel Nawab Sir Umar Hayat Khan, has made a few observations on which I should like to put in a few words. In

the course of his remarks, the Nawab Sahib said that agriculturists have not been very well represented in the various Councils. I might tell him, Sir, that in the Punjab the agriculturists form the majority in the Council. Then he said that the education of Muhammadans has been ignored, and I shall try to show.....

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL NAWAB SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN: Did I say so? I do not think I said so.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS: Then what did you say?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Order, order.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS: Very well, he has said, I think, that the Mussalmans are backward in education. But he has not realised the efforts which have been made by the late Punjab Minister of Education, the Honourable Sir Fazl-i-Husain, in the promotion of education of Muslims and the results attained. He has also complained that two municipalities in the Punjab have failed to administer their affairs well. In this connection, Sir, I might say that in Lahore it has been due to communal tension only, and since one community had to clear out, the other community was unable to manage the affairs well. My Honourable friend has also said that other countries have progressed much more quickly than we possibly can. I do not agree with him there. The Punjab is progressing as fast as one can conceive; and I think when Japan has accomplished a great deal in 50 years, why should not India do the same? Although Japan is surrounded by water on all sides, India is surrounded by water on three sides and the argument of my Honourable friend Malik Sahib does not hold good. With these few remarks, I oppose the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. V. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, we have had a Commission now and the reports of that Commission are being discussed now. Now, the amendment proposes another Commission, and that is a Royal Commission, and that is before 1927. Sir, if this amendment only means that we pass a vote of censure on the present Commission or on the Government that ordered the issue of the terms of reference, then it is permissible; but if it means any other thing, if it means really a Royal Commission in 1927, then we should oppose that amendment. Sir, human ingenuity could not devise a common way of going to the opposite poles at the same time. We know what we want, and what we want to retain is the wealth of India. We want a check on the economic drain of India, and it is for that that a Commission is wanted by the Honourable Mr. Roy. If that is so, I think the Government are perfectly aware of our demands; the Secretary of State is fully aware of what India wants, what the masses want, what the educated classes want, what the Congress wants and what the Council wants; and I do not think a Royal Commission can any more enlighten the points that are needed for the country at present. Sir, I reserve my remarks on the merits of the Resolution; but I oppose this amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY :** Sir, with your permission, I should like to withdraw my amendment. My purpose of eliciting the opinion of the House on the question of a Royal Commission has been served.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** Does the Honourable Member ask for permission to withdraw the amendment ?

**THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY :** Yes, Sir.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** Is it your pleasure that the Honourable Member be given leave to withdraw his amendment ? (*Voices :* " Yes ".)

The amendment was, by leave of the Council, withdrawn.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The Council then comes back to the original motion moved by the Honourable Mr. Crerar. There is an amendment in the name of the Honourable Mr. Raza Ali. Does he propose to move that ?

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI** (United Provinces East : Muhammadan) : Yes, Sir.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE** (Berar : Nominated Non-official) : May I know, Sir, if my amendment has been rejected ?

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** I think when the Council met this morning I ruled that on two grounds the Honourable Member's amendment did not arise. In the first place it was not specific enough. It proposed that effect should be given to the recommendations of the minority report. The Honourable Member was not specific in explaining what Government was to do when the recommendations of the majority report and the minority report were incompatible. In the second place, the amendment was not specific in that it contained the words " to attain the goal as early as opportunities occur ". That may mean something very definite to the Honourable Member, but it did not seem to contain anything very definite to me. Thirdly, I think, the substance of the Honourable Member's amendment was disposed of by the debate which took place yesterday and the decision of the Council thereon.

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI :** Sir, to the Resolution moved yesterday by the Honourable Mr. Crerar in a very lucid and cogently reasoned speech, replete with literary skill, I beg to move the following amendment :

" That the word ' and ' after the words ' Reforms Inquiry Committee ' be omitted ; the word ' effect ' be substituted for the word ' consideration ' ; and at the end of the Resolution the following words be added, namely :

" and that he do take into careful consideration the recommendations contained in the minority report."

Sir, the points of difference between the majority and minority reports resolve themselves, briefly speaking, into two main heads. While the majority content themselves with making recommendations which would go to rectify certain administrative imperfections felt in the working of the Act and the Rules made thereunder, the minority proceed to recommend that by virtue of

the experience gathered during the last 4 years it is high time that steps should be taken to introduce in the first place provincial autonomy and, secondly, such alterations in the constitution of the Central Government as would introduce an element of responsibility therein. The reports made by both sections of the Committee are documents on which, if it may not be considered impertinent on my part to say so, I would like to congratulate both sections of the Committee. Both have reasoned out their points clearly; both have brought out the difficulties that have been experienced in the working of the Act and the Rules, and both have adduced a number of cogent and reasonable arguments in support of the recommendations they have made. The majority have admitted—and it cannot be easily denied by anybody—that Indian opinion has forcibly pronounced itself in favour of the present system being abolished and a unitary system being set up in its place.

I do not think it is necessary for me, after the many speeches that have been made, to quote the long catalogue of honoured and respected names, in Indian public life to-day, of persons who have had very considerable experience as

12 NOON.

Executive Councillors of the Provinces or Provincial Ministers and who have unhesitatingly, definitely and strongly pointed out that dyarchy as a system has failed and it is time that a unitary system be adopted. Only a short while ago my friend the Honourable Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary mentioned some of the names of *ex-Executive Councillors*, *ex-Ministers*, as well as the present Ministers who have taken that view. But, Sir, in view of the elevation of my Honourable friend Sir Fazl-i-Husain to the inner counsels of the Government of India, special significance, I dare say, attaches to the opinion with which he supported this view. That opinion will be found at page 198 of the Report of the Committee. The minority have thus referred to the opinion of our Honourable colleague :

“The Honourable Messrs. Fazl-i-Husain and Choudhuri Lal Chand (the latter had lately to resign office) in a Joint Note, dated the 1st May 1924, recommend the transfer of all subjects in the provinces except the nomination of members, because dyarchy prevents, in their opinion”—

and that is a quotation—

‘(a) the creation of a united Government, (b) the development of the party form of Government, and (c) the developing of a sense of responsibility in the Legislature.’”

The minority then go on to say :

“They also suggest that a certain amount of responsibility should be introduced in the Central Government.”

I do not think it is worth while to tire out this Council with the opinions of other distinguished Indians who have expressed stronger views. The majority, while admitting the difficulties and the perplexities attendant on the working of a dyarchical system, point out that no doubt the difficulties are there, yet it was the intention of the framers of the reforms scheme that this system should work for a certain number of years and as such, apart from the removal of administrative imperfections, it is not wise to go at too rapid a pace. They have proceeded to point out a number of difficulties, the importance of which cannot be minimised by any reasonable person. I do not think, Sir, it is necessary for me to point out all the difficulties which the major-

[Saiyid Raza Ali.]

riety have pointed out, but I think I will be doing scant courtesy to the report of the majority if I refrain from saying a few words on two or three points that have been raised in their report.

In the first place, they point to the lack of education of the electorate. Now, Sir, that is a point which has also been noted by the minority. Unfortunately I cannot say that the attitude of a section of our countrymen has been such as to furnish an answer to this objection. Very little was done unfortunately, owing to the circumstances which are too well known to Honourable Members, to educate the electorate at the first general election in the year 1920. We fared better—and on that I congratulate the country—in the next general election held in the year 1923. The education of the electorate has not proceeded at that pace which the framers of the Act had a right to expect. But a very considerable change has occurred in our political atmosphere, and I do not think it is unreasonable to hope that at the next general election, in view of the encouraging experience of 1923, political leaders will set themselves in right earnest to educate the electorate in the proper sense of the term.

Another difficulty that has been pointed out by the majority relates to the big size of our provinces and their want of homogeneity. That, no doubt, is a valid objection as far as it goes. But, Sir, the objection does not go far enough. Assuming that the provinces are big, surely it ought not to be beyond the resourceful grasp of true statesmanship to tackle that problem. In fact, the question has already been discussed publicly whether we cannot redistribute our provinces on a linguistic basis. I do not say that the time has come for us to embark on that campaign. I simply suggest this as one of the solutions.

Now, reference has been made by the majority to communal differences. The majority, I am glad to notice, have not made much of that difficulty. And yet I am free to admit that that difficulty is there. That, again, is a matter which will, I hope, in the fulness of time be settled by the leaders of the communities as well as the masses realising the absolute necessity of their living in peace side by side. And, while I am on this question, I think it is my duty to point out that the criticism that is raised at times in a certain section of the Press that these communal differences are the outcome of the policy of the Government or of the attitude that is taken by Government in handling them, is without any foundation whatever. As one who has something to do with the law courts and who occasionally appears in criminal cases, I can say, basing my remarks on my own experience, that no case has hitherto come to my knowledge in which the responsibility for these disputes and conflicts between the two major communities could be laid at the door of the Government.

Another difficulty, which is allied to the one I am discussing, that has been discussed both by the majority and the minority, concerns itself with the rights of the minorities. On this question I do not think I need say much, since both the majority and the minority have made it quite clear in their reports that in any scheme of reforms that may be considered hereafter it will be the duty of the Government to give adequate and effective protection to the minorities.



And, I think, so far as this particular difficulty is concerned, I must leave it at that.

Another difficulty, and this is the last which I propose to discuss, that has been very lightly touched upon by the majority, is the question of the permanent services. Now I must acknowledge that after the inauguration of the reforms scheme, the permanent services, especially the Indian Civil Service, and other Imperial Services, were dissatisfied owing to two reasons. In the first place they were dissatisfied with the allowances, pay and pension that they were receiving at that time. Secondly, the inauguration of the reforms scheme produced a sense of insecurity in their minds as to their future prospects. Now both these difficulties fortunately have been solved. The Lee Commission was appointed, it came, made a report, and the recommendations contained in the report relating to the Imperial Services have been given effect to. As regards the question of allowances, pay and pension I think all their grievances have been remedied.

On the second question, there is no doubt left now that the reforms cannot affect their prospects, cannot operate prejudicially to their prospects. That difficulty which was one of the biggest has also been removed. Then what else now remains that stands in the way of the recommendations of the minority report being given effect to ?

Sir, the Honourable the Home Member this morning said a few words with regard to the attitude taken up by this Council on public affairs. I am led to make a few observations on this point because of the amendment that has been adopted in the other House in place of the Government's Resolution. Sir, the other House consists of a large number of men who chose to non-co-operate with the Government in the year 1920. I do not propose to go into the rights and wrongs of that policy. Suffice it to say that it is open to Government to say now when they have chosen to return to the Councils that though they have come now they have come as defeated opponents, and it is open to Government to view the amendment in the light in which the proposals of defeated opponents are usually viewed. Speaking for myself, the amendment that has been adopted by the other House is no more than a tentative proposal that is to form the basis of discussion between the Government and the political leaders of the country. Whatever might have been said in the other House this is the view that I take of the amendment. There is at present no basis to go upon. Government take one view, and the people another. What is it that can form the basis of negotiations between the Government and the people ? This amendment contains all that can reasonably form the basis of future negotiations.

Now I may remind Government as to what has been the attitude of, and the output of activity of, this Council. This Council stood by Government in the years 1921-22 when Government were isolated, and when Government felt all the weakness which is always due to isolation. I do not propose to read a long list of what has been the record of the achievements of this Council, yet I can fairly claim in the name of my Honourable colleagues that on important questions of disagreement between the other House and the Govern-

[Saiyid Raza Ali.]

ment, the Council of State has very frequently lent its support to Government measures. Take, for instance, the Princes' Protection Bill of 1922 which had been rejected by the Assembly. Take the Finance Bill of 1923 and the Finance Bill of 1924 which also had been rejected by the Assembly. Coming to the Repressive Laws Bill that came up for discussion only as recently as the 3rd September, the Council of State after going into the whole question carefully deemed it their duty to lend their support to Government. Even when this Council has doubted the wisdom of the attitude of Government on some of these measures, it has deemed it their duty, in the interests of ordered progress and stability of government, to lend their support to the Executive. And now in this Council, the record of whose achievements I have just described, a very inoffensive amendment is moved by one of its humble Members, who has been associated with this Council ever since its constitution, and what is the Government reply? In view of the services that this Council has always rendered to the Government, what is the reply that the Government Benches propose to make to this amendment? The amendment has not been drafted or proposed with a light heart; in fact from the very wording of the amendment it would appear that every conceivable effort has been made to take the Government's difficulties into consideration. This amendment does not commit Government to any definite line of action. We are entitled to ask that Government will give effect to an early date to the recommendations of the majority report, and to take into careful consideration the recommendations made by the minority. Let me make it quite clear that I mean what I say by the words "careful consideration", namely, that Government should not go to sleep over it and after some time come and tell us, "we have considered your proposal carefully and are of opinion that no action can be taken." I am sure that that is not the attitude that will be taken by Government. I have too much confidence in the good faith of Government to be suspicious of their attitude if they adopt my amendment.

Sir, I should like to make it quite clear that the amendment that I have proposed does not necessarily commit the Government to the acceptance of all the recommendations of the minority. The question of reforms is such a big question that it is very difficult, in the course of the limited time at my disposal, to make any detailed suggestions.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** I am glad that the Honourable Member has at last realised the limited time at his disposal. He has already far exceeded his time limit.

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI:** I will try to bring my remarks to a close in a few minutes.

Now the action that is to be taken by Government, Sir, will have to be action on a vast scale. In fact there are many courses that are open to Government in order to give effect to the wishes of the people. One of these is the appointment of a Royal Commission; another course that has already been adopted, on which I congratulated the Government, is the appointment of Sir Frederick Whyte

to investigate the question of the relations between the Provincial and Central Governments as obtaining in other countries, with special reference to Indian conditions. Sir, my own impression is this, that the question is so big that, if Government want to take up that question in right earnest and come to a definite conclusion, they will have to appoint, not one man, not one Committee, but many men and many committees before the Statutory Commission can come out to India with any usefulness to the cause of constitutional advance. Sir, my amendment simply requires that the Government will take into consideration the recommendations of the minority report, it may be by the appointment of a committee of the Central Legislature, it may be by the appointment of a mixed committee of both Houses and of the Provincial Legislatures or by adopting other means. The vitally important point is this, that the two main questions which I enunciated in the beginning, namely, provincial autonomy and responsibility in the Central Government, should be taken into consideration seriously and in right earnest. Sir, I appeal to the Government Benches to respond to this call that has been made upon them in this Council. I move the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR (Home Secretary) : Sir, in explaining the attitude of Government towards the amendment moved by my Honourable and learned friend, I should like, in the first instance, to acknowledge very warmly the courtesy of the observations which he passed on the arguments which I laid before the House in moving the original Resolution. I should like to acknowledge, at the same time, the extreme moderation and impartiality, and indeed penetration and sagacity, which have distinguished my Honourable friend's review not only of all the matters contained in the reports of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, but of the general political situation in India to-day. I desire to make all those acknowledgments because it is with very genuine regret that I cannot intimate on behalf of Government an acceptance of the Honourable Member's amendment.

Now, Sir, let me invite, in the first instance, the somewhat close attention of the House to the precise implications of the amendment. The Government of India are invited to give early effect to the detailed recommendations contained in the majority report and to give consideration to the recommendations contained in the minority report. On the first part of that amendment the situation has been clearly explained by His Excellency the Viceroy in his address to the Legislature. He said :

" My Government are prepared to accept in substance the view of the majority that the constitution should be maintained and amended, where necessary, in order to remove defects in its working on the lines recommended by them. My Government cannot at present commit itself to all individual recommendations, or to the form or method by which they should be carried into effect, inasmuch as there has not been sufficient time for full consideration of them with the authorities concerned, or even by me with my Council. An opportunity will be afforded to the Legislature for debating this policy and every consideration will be given to the views presented to us before final conclusion are reached."

That, Sir, is the position with regard to the first part of the Honourable Member's amendment. With regard to the second part, I must once more invite the attention of the House to the fact that the main recommendation of the minority report was that the Act as it stands is radically incapable of working, and that the only remedy is an early or immediate inquiry by a Royal

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

Commission or some similar body. Now that issue has been fully debated by the House and it has been rejected. In view of the considered views laid by Government before the House, and in view of the degree to which they have been endorsed and ratified by the House, could we consistently undertake to take into consideration that part of the proposition? And that, Sir, is the main proposition. With regard to the other recommendations of the minority committee, and the recommendations of the majority, subject to the important exception which I have just made, I have before me a very careful analysis of those parallel series of recommendations, and after a very careful perusal of this and of the Reports themselves, I have been very much surprised by the extraordinary coincidence between the views of the majority and the minority on the points which really arise on this aspect of the question. In a few cases the minority did not perhaps go quite so far as the majority; in a few cases more the minority went further than the majority. Let me give an instance which is typical. I recently brought before this House a proposal to endorse the recommendations of the committee on the subject of women's franchise. Now I explained very fully the situation as it would be if the majority recommendation was accepted. The minority recommendation was that immediate steps should be taken to complete the grant of the franchise to women and to complete the removal of all restrictions upon their standing as candidates for the Legislatures. Now, the only difference between the two propositions is, that the majority deliberately intended to reserve the right of the local Legislatures and of the provinces to be heard in a matter of so much constitutional importance. The House then affirmed a general proposition which goes some way with the expedient proposed by the minority committee. So also the point of difference in a very large number of the recommendations that have been made by the majority and the minority is largely one of method and expedient.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member referred in terms, which I am fully prepared to accept, to the attitude generally taken by the Council of State on propositions laid before them by Government, and he suggested that there ought to be some reciprocity in the matter. I will admit that the Honourable Member's proposition has at least one merit. He referred to the amendment which was passed in another place and which was very fully considered and rejected in this House. Well, Sir, one peculiarity of that amendment, in my opinion, is this, that it corresponds very much to a remark once passed upon another very important document, which says:

"This is a Book where each his dogma seeks.

And this the Book where each his dogma finds."

It was a protean and chameleonic proposition. It gave the Honourable Mr. Natesan a Pisgah sight of Palestine. It induced the Honourable Mr. Phiroze Sethna to hope for an immediate and almost cinematographic millennium. It filled my Honourable and learned friend opposite with the fear of certain dire consequences which led him into the slough of despond and the valley of the shadow of death. Well, Sir, it is of course difficult to address oneself to a proposition which, if it was correctly understood by any one of

the Honourable Members opposite who supported, was certainly not correctly understood by the others and was very imperfectly comprehended by any one of us.

My Honourable and learned friend's proposition by contrast is a perfectly comprehensible one, but for the reasons which I have put forward we cannot accept it. It is not that we do not desire to show the fullest measure of reciprocity to the reason and the goodwill displayed not only by the Honourable and learned Member himself but by the Council as a whole. It is because we cannot commit ourselves to the full implications of his amendment. It is true he promised that if we accepted his amendment he would not be too strict in his construction of the action which we took upon it. But after all, though I acknowledge very deeply the eminent reasonableness of the Honourable Member's own attitude, I would remind the House that what we should be committed to would be the actual letter of this amendment and the actual implications which it conveys.

I shall only say one word more. The Honourable and learned Member, in speaking generally of the question of co-operation and reciprocity, asked the Government Benches to say whether, in view of the acquisition to the Legislature of a Party which hitherto had stood out of it, we proposed to regard that Party as defeated opponents. My reply to that, Sir, is: "Most certainly not!" Government only rejoice in the thought that wiser counsels have prevailed in that Party and they will rejoice more if those wiser counsels prevail further yet.

I referred just now to the visions which were excited by the alternatives presented to the House. Those visions were iridescent to the eyes of some of those who supported the amendments and gloomy in the view of others. But what is embodied in the Resolution which I have had the honour to move is not a vision, it is not a dream, or at least if it is a dream it is that kind which an old poet calls a vision of the truth which is destined to be fulfilled!

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE (Berar: Nominated Non-Official): I am very glad, Sir, that certain circumstances have combined to keep me back because I appear to have the last word of it now which is very pleasant to me. The amendment moved by my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali is nearly the same as mine but only put into different and perhaps better words. So I am able to say what I meant to say, though in a shorter time but I will do that.

One general observation I shall make is that it appears to me that we are like the old knights who had a shield between them. One side of the shield was painted red and on the other side it was painted white. The knights on one side of the shield said it was white while the knights on the other side said it was red; and on that they went to fight over it. It looks to me very much like that in the present case. It has been said and it is admitted, that the difference between the amendment which was carried in the other House and which was revived here by my Honourable friend Mr. Phiroze Sethna, who is unfortunately not here, and the report of the majority is merely a little difference of method and a difference of speed, I suppose. They want to have it done very soon and Government advise or the majority advises them to do it slowly. Well the difference of course is there but it is not so great.

[Mr. G. S. Khaparde.]

They admit also that it is right, but what we tell them is to go slowly which means of course that we approve of what they are doing but we think they should do it a little slowly and not go ahead as they try to do. Therefore I approach this subject in the same spirit as the passage from His Excellency's speech that was read out to us and I wish to take advantage of the permission given then to debate the matter. His Excellency expressed the view of his Government and that is embodied in the Resolution but with the permission given to us to talk about it and to suggest anything we like to suggest. That attempt I humbly endeavoured to make and my Honourable friend has made. It is the same in both cases, namely, that the proposals made in the original proposition as put here should be carried out, given effect to, and the proposals made in the minority report should be taken into consideration, and as they lead the same way we also say they may be given effect to. I can see nothing very great in this and nothing which Government need oppose in this amendment. It is a proposal in the same direction. Then why this opposition? That is the declared policy of 1917, that the people of this land should be more and more associated in all departments of Government. It is also part of that declared policy that we have got to come together and consider as far as possible how to do it best. And I believe the principle of this Reforms Committee to have been to find out how to make the reforms more acceptable and how to make them more cheerfully accepted and worked so as to secure the approbation of the people. The second paragraph of the reference it is true restricts the remedies to be suggested; those remedies must be within the structure of this law as it obtains. Well, I quite accept all those limitations, and the spirit of those limitations. The Resolution which I support says: "Will you kindly carry out the recommendations of the Reforms Committee, the recommendations of the majority, that is, and also take what the minority say into consideration as conveniently and as soon as you can." Surely there is no opposition between the two; the recommendations of the minority and the majority are not mutually exclusive. For that purpose I wish to give a short analysis. I shall not go into details because my time will not permit that. At page 187 of the report of this Committee I have counted that there are 34 proposals put forward by the minority. Out of this I find that 15 are the same as those made by the majority. Therefore these 15 measures which are contained in that report, 10, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31 and 32 made by the minority and by the majority, are practically identical. And being practically identical it is natural that we should say that the majority and minority have really unanimously passed at least these fifteen proposals, and that there is no difference of opinion worth mentioning about them. In that case, I suppose we are right in asking the Council to recommend to the Viceroy that at least these fifteen proposals may be carried out immediately, because the Committee is unanimous on these points.

As regards the rest there is a difference of opinion, but not so great as is believed. There is a little bit of difference here and there as to the pace at which the reforms are to proceed or the way in which they are to be popularised; and those may be left over for consideration later on and could be

taken into consideration as early as convenient. That being so, there is nothing revolutionary or extraordinary or very difficult that we are asking here. My Honourable friend, as Honourable Members will remember, made a distinction between taking into consideration and giving effect, when he spoke of giving effect to the majority recommendations. I do not think that that distinction exists. They are only two modes of expressing the same thing. When we ask the Government to do a certain thing, they do not say: "We will do it"; they say "We will take it into consideration." We say: "Kindly give effect to it"—it is really one and the same thing. Therefore, I support this amendment very heartily, and I want to draw particular attention to these paragraphs which I mentioned, which are really speaking the unanimous recommendations of the Reforms Committee.

There are two matters about which I should have liked to speak more, but I believe I can finish them in one minute. One is this: this question of franchise has to be considered, and when it is considered I agree with my Honourable friend, Sir Umar Hayat Khan, in thinking that the landowners' interests, both in the Central and in the Provincial Legislatures, are not represented in our Legislatures as they should have been. That matter may be taken into consideration. I attach importance to the representation of landholders because in all countries and in all places they form the permanent element, and that permanent element has certain views and those views are always worth considering, more especially in India where 80 per cent. of the people make their livelihood by agriculture. So they represent a permanent part of the country. The merchants of course are very rich people and they are a very useful class; but they partake sometimes of a floating nature; a millionaire to-day may speculate and next year he may not be able even to have a seat. So are the professional people including poor people like myself. But I am a landlord in a small way, on the same scale on which you can say that the domestic fly is a bird. It has got all the attributes of a bird, it has got wings and so forth. I am like that, but I am a landlord all the same, and I think that these permanent interests in the country should be more represented than the floating interests. The floating interests also ought to be represented; they are very much represented now, and the agricultural part is very poorly represented, more especially the aristocratic part, that is to say, the landowners who have been owning lands for generations. There are a few of them in this Council at any rate, there is no doubt about it—but in the other House they are in a very small minority and that ought not to be. This is a matter which ought to be considered but I do not want to talk about it further.

To bring my remarks, then, to a close, I recommend that those matters on which the minority and majority are agreed should be given effect to at once; and as regards the others they may be taken into consideration as early as convenient, as occasion arises; and, lastly, that the landed interests or the landowners' interests, which are very poorly represented at present, should, if possible, be better represented and more adequately represented here so that their views would be available to us. For all these reasons, Sir, I heartily support the amendment put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Saiyid Raza Ali.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. V. RAMADAS PANTULU** (Madras: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rejoice most profoundly that the Government have opposed the amendment of my Honourable friend, Saiyid Raza Ali; and I welcome even more gladly the speech which the Honourable Mr. Crerar has made. It is clear from what the Honourable the Home Secretary has said that all the co-operation is to come from one side. I thought that the Honourable Mr. Raza Ali's amendment—a most innocent one—was one which the Government could easily see their way to accept. All that it asks for is that the recommendations of the majority may be given effect to and the recommendations of the minority may be taken into consideration. Well, Sir, if His Excellency the Viceroy has asked the Legislature to co-operate with the Executive and if the same appeal is made by the Honourable the Home Member, I do not see how it is possible to extend our hand of co-operation when even such a small amendment as this is opposed.

One of the Ministers of the Madras Government asked me what attitude I would take in the debate on the reforms in the Council of State, and he asked me one pertinent question. He said "It is very clear from the report of the Madras Government and from the evidence tendered before the Muddiman Committee that the party in power in the Madras Legislative Council have heartily co-operated with the Government and tried their best to make dyarchy a success. That fact is incontrovertible. Then, are the Government prepared to-day to transfer all the subjects in the Madras Presidency so as to abolish the distinction between the reserved half and the transferred half? After all in a federal system of government it is not possible to take the whole of India together. Therefore if their profession of sympathy for those who have worked dyarchy is genuine why have they not done something to give provincial autonomy to Madras?" I put it to the Home Member, Lord Birkenhead profoundly praised the Madras Ministers for their hearty co-operation with the Government. In that case what have you done for Madras? We are therefore, Sir, inclined to be sceptical as to the genuineness of the Government's appeal for co-operation, and I am strengthened in that view by the attitude of the Home Secretary towards this amendment. I am myself not inclined to accept it—I am equally opposed to the amendment, though for different reasons. My friend asks that the recommendations of the majority may be given effect to and the recommendations of the minority may be considered. Now, Sir, after reading the report very carefully, I see there is a certain amount of incompatibility between the two which cannot be really bridged over. The majority report insists upon working the existing system. That means that dyarchy has got to be worked for what it is worth. Many arguments have been addressed against the continuance of dyarchy, and I do not want to repeat them now. My own experience of dyarchy from what I have been able to observe of its working in the various provinces is this. It has brought three new evils into the constitution, which did not exist before the reforms. The first evil is the poison of communal representation and separate electorates, which is disintegrating our national life to-day. The second thing is that it has strengthened the position of the Services to such an extent that they are now placed practically beyond the control of the Indian Legislatures. Thirdly, in some provinces, of which I have personal experience, the position is this. Where the party in



power has not got the support of the elected portion of the House, they depend entirely for their existence upon the sweet will and pleasure of the bureaucracy. In my own province, Sir, the party in power has no majority, except with the help of the officials and the nominated Members, and so they win their point always with the help of the bureaucracy and their nominees. The result is that for the very existence of the party they have got to depend on the bureaucracy. Sir, on the very first day of the meeting of the present Madras Council, a motion regarding a vote of no confidence was brought, and every elected Member of the opposition voted against it, but the party in power succeeded in defeating it by one vote with the help of the bureaucracy. That shows that the bureaucracy is much stronger to-day than it was before the reforms, because even the party in power has to depend for its very existence upon the bureaucracy. These are the three things which the Reforms have brought to us. Therefore, we are opposed to dyarchy on broader grounds of principle and not merely upon the details of its working. While the majority report says that dyarchy can be worked smoothly and better by removing some of the administrative obstacles which now stand in its way, we not only hold that it is unworkable but also believe that the working of it will lead to more and more dangerous results, and that the constitution will be more and more impaired. The minority report, no doubt, as correctly pointed out by the Government, technically makes only one recommendation, to appoint a Royal Commission. But it lays down certain principles. The minority enunciate three fundamental principles. The first is the transference of power from the Secretary of State to the Government of India; the second is that while the Government of India are now responsible to the British Parliament for the good government of India, hereafter, the minority want to make the Government of India responsible to the Indian Legislatures; and the third principle is that the system of dual responsibility in provinces should be abolished, and in its place, a unitary form of government responsible to the Legislature should be established. These are the three fundamental principles which the minority lay down, though their recommendations tend to culminate in the appointment of a Royal Commission. Therefore, Sir, I see so much of incompatibility between the majority and the minority view, that it is really not possible to frame any amendment or Resolution to give effect to the proposals of the one as well as the other. You must have either the one or the other. But advance is not possible under either. I can accept neither the one nor the other as a Swarajist. Both are opposed to our demand. That is the view of Swarajists, and I for one make no secret of my view in the matter that I am opposed to both the majority and minority reports.

There is one thing more, Sir, which I would like to say. Yesterday when I was referring to the majority report, I said that a majority of the majority were officials. Out of the five, I believe, three are officials, and therefore much weight should not be given to the views expressed by them. The Honourable the Home Member was pleased to say that we have taken to condemning the capacity of officials and that we have not judged properly their services to the country. After all he said there is no reason why people who have grown grey in the service of this country and who mean well by the people and the country should be distrusted. Well, Sir, it is not a question of trust really. It is a question of our past experience. I will only quote,

[Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu.]

Sir, two small opinions with regard to the British official in India. The late Mr. Gladstone, speaking of the "man on the spot" theory in the House of Commons said about Indian officials :

"It is a sad thing to say, but unquestionably it happens not infrequently in human affairs, that those who ought from their situation to know the most and the best, yet from prejudice and prepossessions know the least and the worst."

I will quote another statesman of India who is much respected, and who was not hostile, I should say, to the Government. The late Mr. Gokhale said :

"The worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule are its utter contempt of public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, its cool preference of service interests to those of the governed. So, an appeal to its sense of justice becomes a mockery."

These are the words of Mr. Gokhale.

Therefore, Sir, that is an opinion which is shared by a large portion of my countrymen. Therefore, we do not want any committees or commissions on which the advice of the officials prevails. That is the reason we have no faith in them. It is now further strengthened by the fact that before the Reforms the Services were against dyarchy because it meant at least the partial transference of power out of their hands into those of the representatives of the people, but they are now so much enamoured of it that they do not want to leave it. They want to stick to it, because any step forward would mean a further transference of power into the hands of the representatives of the people. Therefore, they say, let us stick to the position we have secured. And the second reason is that under dyarchy the position of both the Services and the bureaucracy in the Council has been immensely strengthened and they do not want to part with the advantages they have secured. Therefore, a very heroic attempt is being made by the bureaucracy to stick to dyarchy. Therefore, Sir, any amendment which seeks to give effect to the majority report is certainly not going to receive our support, and I rejoice that the Honourable Mr. Crerar has opposed this and given a very good reason for it by saying that he would not co-operate with the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali because the amendment did not concede all that the Government wanted. Therefore, Sir, if we are unable to co-operate with you, we are not to blame. We have tried to extend the hand of co-operation to you on honourable terms. But if you say we should co-operate only on your own terms, I think we can do without it, and I think we have convinced the country that the Government are wrong and not those who have come to work the constitution to the best of their ability.

THE HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MUDDIMAN (Home Member) :  
Sir, I am very pleased that the Honourable gentleman opposite has been allowed to speak at length (although he has not dealt very closely with the amendment, if I may say so) for in the course of his speech he did bring out one or two matters on which I had remained in doubt. In the first place, I was distinctly amused at the attitude of my Honourable friend in regard to the recommendations of the majority report. He says, he will have none of them. Yet he jeers at Government and at my friend the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali

for putting up a Resolution dealing with them. In his view the majority report was worthless. We knew that from his first speech ; we knew that from the amendment which the House has already rejected. However, he did raise one or two matters which I am very pleased to have an opportunity of referring to. It is his contention, as I understand it, that dyarchy has promoted communal differences. And when he said that he brought out the fact, for it is a fact, that dyarchy whatever may be its merits or demerits has at any rate given the people some sense of realities. If you hand over power—and dyarchy has handed over power, and the proof of it is exactly my Honourable friend's statement—if you hand over power, you get to facts ; and his charge indicates we have got to facts. What has been the cause of these communal differences ? Just this that power has been granted and the loaves and fishes are now being divided. People are feeling that the vote matters that they are getting something into their own hands, and that, Sir, is one of the greatest defences of dyarchy that is possible. Realities are what the Honourable Member should bear in mind and when he is reminded of them by facts he will have to take notice of them. It is not by controversy, it is not by speeches that these matters are brought to notice. It is by the hard logic of facts. So much for that portion of the Honourable Member's speech. I must further point out that it ill becomes him to try to make capital out of the attitude of Government towards the recommendations of the majority report. I was told in another place by one under whose banner the Honourable Member serves that I can take a gift of them. They were returned to me thrown back. I explained in that House, as I explained here again, that these are recommendations which I at any rate consider are of importance, for I myself was a signatory to the report. If they are returned to me, they are returned in a spirit of non-co-operation. They were made honestly and fairly but that is not to avail them ?

As to the attitude of Government, that has been very carefully explained by my Honourable friend Mr. Crerar. He did not say he opposed the amendment except on the ground that it would commit Government to an extent to which Government cannot commit themselves. To give effect to the recommendations in terms of the amendment would mean that Government here and now accept all the recommendations of the majority report. That is not the case. There are many of them under consideration. Certain of them have been accepted and I have brought forward in another place Bills and moved Resolutions giving effect to them, and I understand that certain Resolutions have already been moved in this House. We are taking action. We have dealt with the most important recommendation, the investigation of provincial autonomy. We have been fortunate in securing the services of a Parliamentarian whose reputation has not yet been attacked in either House. Sir Frederick Whyte, the late President in another place, and who combines with his Parliamentary experience the advantage of a first-hand knowledge of the Indian Legislatures, has been good enough now at our request to undertake an examination of those points which are of primary importance in any serious consideration of provincial autonomy, namely, the relations between the Central and the Local Governments. My Honourable friend's amendment, as I say, would bind us beyond what we can be bound.

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

As to the second part of his amendment, I have not much to say. He recommends :

“and that he do take into careful consideration the recommendations contained in the minority report.”

In so far as those recommendations are recommendations dealing with the present constitution we have no difficulty. As regards the other recommendations, there is only one. The whole importance of the minority report is based on the fact that they recognise, as I hope this House has already recognised, that before you can have a great step forward in constitutional reform, you must have a Royal Commission or some inquiry of that nature. Therefore, subject to that reservation, there is no objection to that part of my Honourable friend's amendment. Indeed, there is not great difference at all between us. There is no rejecting co-operation.

I think that disposes of all I have to say on the amendment. But, as it is unlikely that I shall have another opportunity of addressing this House, I would ask you, Sir, to permit me to go a little out of order. Sir, as far as I can see, I shall not speak in this, the first Council of State, again. I was its first President and I think I may claim to have many friends in the House. First of all I must deal with the Chair. You have served with me, Sir, in many capacities, and you have succeeded me in several offices. Secondly, the Leader of the House. I knew him first as a personal friend, then as one of my masters, then as one who sat at my feet and now my colleague, but alas will not long remain so, though I hope he has been and will always remain my personal friend. And then those who sit behind me, to whose assistance and loyalty I owe so much both in the Chair and in my present position—the Home Secretary who puts forward the views of my department so ably in this House, Mr. Thompson and others. Then in this Council very old friends some of the stalwarts of the old Council—Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy, Sir Umar Hayat Khan, Raja Sir Harnam Singh, Mr. Sethna and Sardar Jogendra Singh who are not here to-day, Mr. Khaparde and last but not least that very old and dear friend of mine, the Nestor of the House, Sir Dinshaw Wacha who gives us the fruit of his long experience with the fire of youth. Long may he continue to do so! Then there are other friends whom I have met in this Council who attend its meetings so regularly and have done so much to give that corporate existence to this Council, of which I am so proud—Saiyid Raza Ali and Sir Arthur Froom who has set by his regular attendance a good example to some of his European colleagues and my distinguished friend from Bihar who speaks one word with great firmness.

It is not in the probability of things that we shall all assemble together. I therefore asked you, Sir, to permit me to break the rules of the House and I hope you and the House will pardon me. I have received from this Council the greatest kindness both in the Chair and as representing Government. The Council has been the means of my renewing many old friendships and making new ones, and I can honestly say that when I leave you to-day it is with a feeling of friendship for every Member of this Council.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN** (United Provinces, West : Muhammadan) : I had no intention of speaking on this amendment as I have already given my reasons and the views of most of the people whom I have the honour to represent in this House, but certain remarks from certain gentlemen who spoke before me have made it necessary for me to stand here and to make observations on this motion. I think, Sir, when my Honourable friend Mr. Ramadas spoke about communal representation he said that it is dyarchy which is responsible for the tension between communities and communities. He is ignoring one factor that, if instead of dyarchy self-government comes, this tension will be stronger and stronger. (*An Honourable Member* : "Question"). My Honourable friend says that communal representation leads to these differences and he wants to abolish them. I wonder whose views he is representing. Is he speaking on behalf of the Swaraj Party to which he has the honour to belong or is he representing the views of his constituency ? He did not make it clear. My Honourable friend, the Honourable Lala Ram Saran Das, said that it is communal representation which is responsible for these differences in the Punjab and elsewhere and further reforms should be undertaken to remove them. He has also said that these are the views of the Swarajist Party. . . . .

**THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS** : No.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN** : That is what he implied. The Leader of the Swarajist Party moved an amendment the other day in the Assembly. If he gets up as the Leader of the Swaraj Party and says that the views of the Swaraj Party are that communal representation should be abolished, I would like to see the fate of the amendment which he had put forward. They got the majority on their side simply because they found that they had laid down though very cleverly in hidden terms, that minorities should be respected, and that was the only point which led to my own people voting that side. If the voting had been on this point. . . .

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT** : Probably the Honourable Member may have been deceived by the occurrence of the words "majority" and "minority" in the Resolution and the amendment before the House into a discussion which is at present irrelevant. I must ask him to bring himself back to the amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN** : I am saying, Sir, that it is the minority report which has been interpreted in this way, that the further reforms which the minority recommend should be in this form, and that the majority has not recommended any further reforms in this direction. That proposition has been suggested by some of the Honourable Members, that the majority report should not be accepted because it does not recommend doing away with communal representation. This has led me to speak and show why I give my support to the majority report ; it is because they are not doing away with communal representation ; and if any gentleman here says that he wants to do away with that, then I shall make the most emphatic protest, and I will be the first to vote against him. It is communal representation, Sir, as far as I can see, which has mitigated the differences between the communities. It is communal representation which has stopped the racial questions which used

[Mr. Yamin Khan.]

to arise between candidates and candidates whenever any seat fell vacant, and there were two candidates from different communities appealing to their communities and to their co-religionists to give votes for them. Now that has been stopped by the system of separate communal representation. If that system is abolished again, the result will be that we will find the old story repeated again, that is, two opponents appealing to their communities and to their religion, as in fact we find even to-day. What do we find to-day even, Sir? If a Brahmin is standing and a Kshatriya standing, we will find that they are appealing to their respective communities to give a vote for them, and the Kshatriyas invariably will vote for the Kshatriya candidate and the Brahmins will vote for the Brahmin candidate; and if there is a Vaishya, he appeals to the Vaishya community to give a vote for him.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** I must really ask the Honourable Member to tear himself away from the question of the representation of majorities and minorities. He has already said quite enough on that subject. He must bring himself back to the amendment before the House.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN:** I think, Sir, under these circumstances, if by these propositions my Honourable friends mean that a Royal Commission should come to investigate among others these things and that these points should be entrusted to them, then the country will be the last to support the amendments which have been put up by the Swarajist Leader or by anybody else.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR:** I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The original question was that the following Resolution be adopted:

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do accept the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and that he do give early consideration to the detailed recommendations therein contained for improvements in the machinery of Government.”

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI:** Sir, with your permission, may I say.....

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The Honourable Member has no right of reply.

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI:** No, Sir. I am not going to reply.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** Does the Honourable Member wish to make a statement of personal explanation?

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI:** That is what I want to make, Sir. With reference to the Resolution, a very clear speech has been made by the Honourable the Home Member.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The Honourable Member is making another speech.

To which an amendment has been moved :

"That the word 'and' after the words 'Reforms Inquiry Committee' be omitted; the word 'effect' be substituted for the word 'consideration'; and at the end of the Resolution the following words be added, namely:

'and that he do take into careful consideration the recommendations contained in the minority report'."

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI:** Will you put it, Sir, in two parts, the first part and the second part separately?

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The question is:

"That in the original resolution the word 'effect' be substituted for the word 'consideration'."

The question is that that amendment be made.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR:** I rise to a point of order, Sir. The question is that the question be put.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** As no Honourable Member rose in his place when the motion that the question be now put was made, it was clear that no one wanted to speak and therefore unnecessary to apply the closure.

The motion was negatived.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The question is:

"That the word 'and' after the words 'Reforms Inquiry Committee' be omitted, and at the end of the Resolution the following words be added, namely:

'and that he do take into careful consideration the recommendations contained in the minority report'."

The question I have to put is that those amendments be made.

The Council divided:

AYES—7.

Aftab Ahmad Khan, Sahibzada.  
Borooah, Srijut Chandradhar.  
Karandikar, Mr. R. P.

Khaparde, Mr. G. S.  
Raza Ali, Mr.  
Roy, Mr. K. C.

Yamin Khan, Mr.

NOES—28.

Abbot, Mr. E. R.  
Akbar Khan, Major Nawab Muhammad.  
Aman Ali, Khan Bahadur.  
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.  
Charanjit Singh, Sardar.  
Crerar, Mr. J.  
Dadabhoy, Sir Maneckji.  
Dutt, Mr. P. C.  
Fazl-i-Husain, Mian Sir.  
Froom, Sir Arthur.  
Hadow, Mr. F. A.  
Harnam Singh, Raja Sir.  
Ismail Khan, Haji Chowdhuri Muhammad.  
Laird-MacGregor, Mr. E. G. L.

MacWatt, Major-General Sir Charles.  
Manmohandas Ramji, Mr.  
Misra, Pandit S. B.  
Mitra, Mr. K. N.  
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.  
Ram Saran Das, Rai Bahadur Lala.  
Sarma, Sir Narasimha.  
Sarvadhikary, Dr. Sir Deva Prasad.  
Sen, Mr. B. C.  
Tek Chand, Diwan.  
Thompson, Mr. J. P.  
Umar Hayat Khan, Col. Nawab Sir.  
Wacha, Sir Dinshaw.  
Zahir-ud-din, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.

The motion was negatived.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The question then before the Council is that the following Resolution be adopted :

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do accept the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and that he do give early consideration to the detailed recommendations therein contained for improvements in the machinery of Government.”

**THE HONOURABLE DR. SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY :** Sir, the amendment standing in the name of the Honourable Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan has not yet been disposed of.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The Honourable Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan's amendment has, in my opinion, disappeared with that which the House disposed of this morning which was moved by the Honourable Mr. Roy. If the Honourable Member wanted to support the Honourable Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan's amendment, he should have voted for Mr. Roy's amendment and then asked the Chair, if that amendment was accepted, to put the Resolution in two parts, to enable him to reject Mr. Crerar's portion and to accept Mr. Roy's amendment. That, I think, was the proper course for the Honourable Member to have taken.

The question before the Council is that Mr. Crerar's Resolution be adopted.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) :** With your permission, Sir, I should just like to say one word. Now that every amendment that was moved in this House has been rejected, there is no other alternative but to reject the Resolution as such.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. YAMIN KHAN :** I rise to ask for the ruling of the Chair. If two Honourable Members move similar amendments and one Member, after moving his amendment, withdraws it without leaving any option to the other Member who has got a similar amendment in his name and he does not want to withdraw it, what will be the procedure ? I want the ruling of the Chair.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** If an amendment has been moved and after discussion has been withdrawn by the leave of the House, it is obviously the sense of the House that it does not wish to discuss the subject-matter of that amendment again.

**THE HONOURABLE DR. SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY :** But Mr. Roy's and Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed's amendments were wholly different. Therefore, the course that you were pleased to suggest that I should have followed about Mr. Roy's amendment that the Resolution should be put to the House in two parts could not and did not arise, and would not affect the issue.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** Because the Honourable Member did not support Mr. Roy's amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE DR. SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY :** I submit it was not necessary, Sir, for every one to speak in support of that amendment when Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed's amendment was still on the paper.



**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** Order, order. The question is that the following Resolution be adopted :

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do accept the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and that he do give early consideration to the detailed recommendations therein contained for improvements in the machinery of Government.”

The Council divided :

**AYES—28.**

Abbott, Mr. E. R.  
Aftab Ahmad Khan, Sahibzada.  
Akbar Khan, Major Nawab Muhammad.  
Aman Ali, Khan Bahadur.  
Borooah, Srijut Chandradhar.  
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.  
Charanjit Singh, Sardar.  
Crerar, Mr. J.  
Dadabhoy, Sir Maneekji.  
Dutt, Mr. P. C.  
Fazl-i-Husain, Mian Sir.  
Froom, Sir Arthur.  
Hadow, Mr. F. A.  
Harnam Singh, Raja Sir.

Ismail Khan, Haji Chowdhuri Muhammad.  
Laird-MacGregor, Mr. E. G. L.  
McWatters, Mr. A. C.  
Misra, Pandit S. B.  
Mitra, Mr. K. N.  
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.  
Roy, Mr. K. C.  
Sarma, Sir Narasimha.  
Sen, Mr. B. C.  
Tek Chand, Diwan.  
Thompson, Mr. J. P.  
Umar Hayat Khan, Col. Nawab Sir  
Wacha, Sir Dinshaw.  
Zahir-ud-din, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.

**NOES—7.**

Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswamy.  
Karandikar, Mr. R. P.  
Khaparde, Mr. G. S.

Manmohandas Ramji, Mr.  
Ramadas Pantulu, Mr. V.  
Ram Saran Das, Rai Bahadur Lala.

Sarvadhikary, Dr. Sir Deva Prasad.

The motion was adopted.

**STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.**

**THE HONOURABLE SIR NARASIMHA SARMA** (Law Member): The Lists of Business for Monday and Tuesday next are already in the hands of Honourable Members. Thereafter the only business remaining for disposal will be the Honourable Mr. Crerar's Resolution regarding the amendment of the Indian Legislative Rules and Standing Orders to provide for the constitution of Select Committees to deal with Bills relating to Hindu and Muhammadan Law and the consideration of certain Government Bills which cannot now be passed by the Assembly in time to admit of their being laid on the table here before Tuesday next. When the Bills have been laid the question of the date on which they should be proceeded with—whether with short notice or otherwise—will be submitted for your direction. Mr. Crerar's Resolution, to which I have already referred, will be put down for the same day as the Bills in question.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** Should any Bills passed in the other House be laid on the table of this House on Tuesday, the question will then arise as to the date on which they will be proceeded with. I hope that Honourable Members will, in the meantime, bear this in mind, because I shall

[The Honourable the President.]

require the guidance of the House in the matter of deciding on what date those Bills should be taken into consideration here.

**THE HONOURABLE DR. SIR DEVA PRASAD SARVADHIKARY** (West Bengal: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, is the Leader of the House in a position to tell us how many Bills and what Bills are likely to come up? That will be necessary for us to know in order to comply with the suggestion you have thrown out.

**THE HONOURABLE SIR NARASIMHA SARMA**: Three such Bills. One is a Bill to provide for the fostering and development of the Paper Mill Industry in British India. The second is the amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code, 1898, Section 109, in particular, and other sections. The third is the Bill further to amend the Indian Limitation Act, 1908, as reported by the Select Committee.

**THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY**: They are all controversial Bills and will require a long time for discussion.

**THE HONOURABLE SIR NARASIMHA SARMA**: It is premature, I think, to say that they will be controversial.

The Council adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 14th September, 1925.

---