

14th March, 1925

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

—
SECOND SESSION
OF THE
SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1925



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1925

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Thursday, 12th March, 1925—<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 19—Opium	2204-37
(i) Opium Policy of the Government of India	2204-35
(ii) Appointment of a Committee to inquire into the policy of the Government of India both in regard to the external and internal consumption of Opium	2235-37
Friday, 13th March, 1925—	
Questions and Answers... ..	2239-45
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2246-50
Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	2251
Message from the Council of State	2251
Statement of Business	2251-54
The General Budget—List of Demands—<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 19—Opium— <i>contd.</i>	2254-73
(i) Opium Policy of the Government of India— <i>contd.</i>	2254-73
Demand No. 20—Stamps	2273-74
(i) Charging of Expenditure on the Security Printing Press Buildings to Revenue... ..	2274-78
(ii) Desirability of Devanagari Script on Stamp papers	2279-82
Demand No. 21—Forest	2282-89
(i) Indianisation of the Forest Service	2282-86
(ii) Greater Expenditure on Forests than the Revenue realised from them	2286-89
Demand No. 22—Irrigation, Navigation, Embankments and Drainage Works—including Expenditure in England... ..	2289
Demand No. 23—Indian Postal and Telegraph Department... ..	2289-2308
(i) Amalgamation of Post and Telegraph Traffic	2290
(ii) Grievances of Telegraph Peons	2290-92
(iii) Burdensome rates charged by the Postal and Telegraph Department	2292-2305
(iv) Long Distance Telephones	2305-06
(v) Capital outlay on the Postal and Telegraph Department, etc.	2306-08
Demand No. 24—Indo-European Telegraph Department	2308-13
(i) General Retrenchment	2308-12
(ii) Transfer of the Headquarters of the Indo-European Telegraph Department from England to India	2312-13
Demand No. 25—Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2313-42
Saturday, 14th March, 1925—	
Questions and Answers	2343-44
The General Budget—List of Demands—<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 28—Executive Council	2344
Present Political Situation in the Country, etc.	2344-2405
Demands Nos. 26, 27 and 29—88	2405-1
	-23
Monday, 16th March, 1925—	
Member Sworn	2419
Questions and Answers	2419-22
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted	2422-86

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 14th March, 1925.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

LOSS ON STRATEGIC LINES.

1196. ***Mr. E. F. Sykes:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to give a rough estimate of the amount of reduction in the loss on Strategic Lines (Grant 14) which would result from crediting them with the net earnings by main lines from interchanged Traffic?

(b) Will the Government kindly say whether there would be any objection to such figures being given in future Budgets?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) and (b). Government regret that they are unable to give any estimate, especially as it would be very difficult to ascertain now with any degree of accuracy what portion of the net earnings of commercial lines from traffic interchanged with strategic lines would in any case have accrued to commercial lines, had the strategic lines not been built.

EUROPEAN, ANGLO-INDIAN AND INDIAN STATION MASTERS AND ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS.

1197. ***Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally:** 1. Is it a fact that stations on some of the Railways in India are divided into 7 classes? If so, on what lines? If not, into how many classes are they divided?

2. Is it a fact that as a rule no Indian (apart from statutory Indians) is appointed as station master to stations of the first three classes? If so, why? If they are appointed, what is the pay, in the case of Europeans and Anglo-Indians and when they are Indians?

[NOTE:—If the above information cannot be supplied for all Railways, it may be supplied only for the North Western Railway.]

3. (a) Is it a fact that assistant station masters at these stations (first three classes) can either be an Indian, European or Anglo-Indian?

(b) If so, what is the pay allowed when he is an Indian, European or Anglo-Indian, respectively, on the North Western Railway?

(c) Is it a fact that the duties performed are the same in the case of all three and they have the same number of hours of duty and responsibilities?

(d) If there be difference of pay, what are the reasons for maintaining that difference?

(e) Do Government propose to order that all these differences be removed in future as vacancies occur; and that men of the three classes be appointed to such stations as station masters and assistant station masters on the same rates of pay, and that the only criterion be seniority combined with efficiency?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am sending the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the North Western Railway for remarks.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Expenditure from Revenue—contd.

DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. President: The Assembly will now resume consideration of Part II of the Budget. In accordance with the arrangement made yesterday: we come to Demand No. 28—"Executive Council."

The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Executive Council'."

PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY, ETC.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be omitted."

One of the grounds on which my motion or rather leave to move the adjournment of the House was refused by you yesterday was that there will be an opportunity under this head as well as on another head to speak upon the very same subject. Now, Sir, this motion really is a very comprehensive one and covers the whole field of the administration. In fact, Sir, it is a motion of censure on the Government of India and as such it covers very large ground indeed. I shall therefore take the question which was the subject of my motion for adjournment later on at its proper place and deal with this motion as a whole. As I have already said this is a motion of censure on the Government of India, on the whole of that administration. I base my motion on the constitutional ground of refusal of supplies to a Government which has forfeited the confidence of the country. I know, Sir, that there is a difference of opinion on the point among Nationalists. So far as we Swarajists are concerned, we are perfectly sure in our own minds that this is the ground upon which to put this motion. It may be that in a certain section of the House this ground may not be approved but the fact remains that whether you call it obstruction, whether you call it refusal of supplies or whether you call it merely a protest against the action of the Government, the country is thoroughly dissatisfied with the present administration and the motion in its nature and scope remains a motion of censure. I can understand that we cannot, as we are constituted, give effect to this or for the matter of that to any other motion even if it is carried by the House. but I wish to make it clear that the circumstances

which have given rise to this motion are such that if we had the power to cut down all supplies we would have done so. If we cannot do it to-day it is not our fault. We cannot do it simply because you have disabled us from doing it. But the will is there to be enforced as soon as we possibly can and the Swaraj Party takes its stand upon this ground to declare and emphasise that will. It may be, Sir, that it is merely at present a mental attitude, but a mental attitude on a question like this is of the highest importance. It is not merely a protesting frame of mind: it goes much further. It goes to the extreme limit that is permissible under the constitution. Now, Sir, that being so, I do not think that any purpose will be served by my going at any length into the different view points from which this question is to be considered. Those who have the time and the inclination to do so may engage in the unprofitable task of weighing these different mental attitudes in golden scales if they like. So far as we are concerned, it is enough that the Government stands condemned to-day at the bar of public opinion. I wish therefore very briefly to lay certain facts before this House which will show that at this time of the day it is not possible for this House, if it is to do justice between the Government and the country, to refuse to pass this motion.

Now, Sir, I shall briefly sketch the events which have happened under the present régime. The history of the present Government begins in the year 1921, but the history of the trouble goes back a couple of years earlier. In 1919 there were a very large number of Indians who had been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for political crimes. In December 1919 there was a Royal clemency, and early in January 1920 a large number of these were released. Then, Sir, came the Special Congress in Calcutta in September 1920. It is very well known that the non-co-operation resolution was for the first time passed at that Special Congress, and that resolution was confirmed in the following December at Nagpur. After that, we find that in the years 1921 and 1922 there was a complete lull so far as revolutionary crime was concerned. I do not wish to go again into the question as to what that lull was due to. It will be for the future historian to chronicle the real causes. Of course the Government give the credit to their repressive laws; we give the credit to the non-co-operation movement. In December 1922 came the Gaya Congress when there was a split among Congress men, and the Swaraj Party was founded in January 1923. In February 1923 the Swaraj Party gave out to the world its programme of entering the Councils in order either to mend or to end them. Well let me now very briefly review the events which followed. That declaration, as soon as it was made, received a reply from the Government. The reply was that in May 1923 and in the succeeding months a series of cases were instituted in Bengal beginning with the Konah murder case. I have no hesitation in again characterising the more important of these cases as entirely false. In fact the Konah murder case and the Alipore conspiracy case, to mention only two, were held by the courts which tried them to be false, and in the case as put by the prosecution no political element in the crime was made out. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "What has that got to do with the Executive Council?") (*A Voice*: "Everything.") (*Turning to Mr. K. Ahmed*) Who is responsible for it? Are you? Then, Sir, the Swarajists were busy with their own domestic quarrels up to the middle of September 1923, when the Special Congress at Delhi passed the Resolution permitting Council entry. What was the reply? In the latter half of September 1923, we find Regulation III of 1918 put into force in Bengal, and a number of persons, mostly

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

Swarajists, taken under that Regulation, including the editor of the proposed paper *Forward* and the editors and managers of other Swarajist vernacular papers. Then came the election manifesto of the Swarajist Party, dated 14th October 1923, offering open battle to the bureaucracy; and that was followed in January-February 1924 by the actual entry of the Swaraj Party into the various Councils and this Assembly. The first important measure which was passed by this Assembly on the 18th February 1924 was the well-known Resolution on self-government, which, as the House is aware, was passed by an overwhelming majority. In the course of the debate the Government disclosed their policy. It was decided by the Nationalist Party that the response so made was highly unsatisfactory, and then followed the treatment of the Budget in the manner with which the House is familiar and the throwing out of the Finance Bill. I have already referred to the lull which prevailed in the country in 1921 and 1922. As Lord Lytton put it in one of his speeches, it was because the revolutionaries were then content to stand by and watch the development of the non-cooperation movement. Now it seems that their patience was exhausted, and there was political crime in Bengal. Then we come to the Bengal Council deadlock. On the 24th March 1924 the Ministers' salaries were rejected and when they were put up again before the Council in August following, they were again rejected. Meanwhile the Reforms Inquiry Committee was constituted and the Government Communiqué was published, I think it was in May 1924. Well after the Ministers' salaries were rejected for the second time in the Bengal Council, namely, in August 1924, we come to the next important date, the 25th October, the date of the Ordinance. This Ordinance was passed soon after this House was adjourned on the close of the Simla Session. Over sixty Swarajists were taken and a regular reign of frightfulness inaugurated in the country. This Assembly had during the Simla session quietly proceeded with its labours. It had passed many important Resolutions. To mention only two of them, there was the Lee Commission and there was the Taxation Inquiry Committee, both of which came in for a full criticism by this House, and the House expressed its mind unequivocally by passing Resolutions condemning both by large majorities but to no effect. Then, Sir, we come to the present session. I am only hastily going through the events to show the connection of cause and effect. We had the Ordinance debate which is fresh in our minds. The next important thing was the Reforms Inquiry Committee report and as to that the House has been gagged. It was said that it was impossible to announce the provisional policy of the Government during the present session and therefore Government were not prepared to give a day for the discussion of this most important matter. But it was also alleged that before any final action was taken this House would have an opportunity of discussing the report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee. Well, Sir, the provisional policy must be based upon something and we know exactly upon what it is going to be based. We know that His Excellency the Governor General is going to England at the invitation of the India Office to consult with them on the situation in India. It is not merely a holiday trip, which no doubt His Excellency richly deserves, but it is a business trip. What will happen there? There will be consultations between His Excellency and the Secretary of State and I suppose also the other members of the British Cabinet, and in those consultations His Excellency and the Cabinet will not be unassisted by other expert help, if I may so call it, from India. I find that by a fortuitous coincidence a galaxy of Indian administra-

tors will be present at or about that time. We shall have Sir Harcourt Butler, Sir Henry Wheeler, Sir Frank Sly, Sir John Kerr (*Voices*: "No")—he has come back, I take it—but his absence will not matter much—Sir William Vincent, and last but not the least, my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett. (*An Honourable Member*: "And Mr. Hindley.") Mr. Hindley too. (*An Honourable Member*: "Sir Campbell Rhodes.") These will be the veteran experts in the special art of governing India, and those first named by me the stalwarts in the preservation of law and order in this country. My friend Sir Basil Blackett of course has not had directly to do with the preservation of law and order in the country, but he will go there smarting under the cuts which this Assembly has inflicted on him. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "Especially in the sinking fund.") Now, Sir, it is said the results of all these discussions will only be provisional, which means liable to change by the vote of this House. Is there any Member of this House who would believe in that? I can very well visualise what will happen at that round table conference. We asked for a round table conference and we have had it with a vengeance now. At that round table conference, Sir, what will happen will be this. I can see it as clearly as if I were present there. If any suggestion of a real solid advance is made, we shall find at once Governor after Governor repudiating all responsibility in the matter. He will say, "I cannot go so far; I shall not be responsible if these powers are to be given to the Legislatures in India." (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "Who will make the suggestion?") Somebody will do it, either Lord Birkenhead or somebody else. My friend will allow me to remind him that there is enough suggestion of that kind in the minority report and that certainly will be before them. So, there is no lack of suggestion and I have not so entirely despaired of the British Cabinet, the British Parliament and British statesmanship generally as to think that there is not one man in England capable of suggesting a real advance in the Legislatures of this country. Well, that suggestion will be met by the threats I have mentioned. What can any Secretary of State or any Cabinet do when the man on the spot says, "I am not in a position to carry this out"? Well, the whole idea will be dropped. The meeting will break up in London, all the Governors will go back to their respective capitals and after all this the so-called provisional policy of the Government will be put before this House for discussion. Now, Sir, what impression would the vote of this House make upon that provisional policy? Not even the impression which the squeak of a rat makes on any Honourable Member on the Government benches when he hears it in his bed room. But I go further. This House is admittedly powerless but what can Parliament itself do? Is it or is it not true that the Conservative Government at this moment has an unprecedented majority in the House? Is it or is it not true that no Government in power can really be afraid that if a very important measure like this is once settled by the Cabinet it will be thrown out by Parliament? Parliament will simply refuse to go into the matter. It will be enough for them to know that those who are charged with affairs of this kind have come deliberately to certain conclusions. We all know what the amount of knowledge of Honourable Members of both Houses of Parliament is about India. They will be quite right. I do not blame them. The Cabinet has men in it who represent the party in power and not like here, gentlemen, very amiable and good but forced upon us against our consent. Well, I say that that provisional policy would be as final as any policy can be. In fact, it will be stereotyped for some years to come. And then what will happen in India? While these consultations and confabulations are going on there, what will happen

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

here? That has been envisaged by my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. In India, Sir, a great battle will be fought on the field of Allahabad. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief or his successor, if His Excellency goes away in the meanwhile, will lead all the land and air forces of His Majesty and meet my humble self with my 45 gallant Swarajists, all unarmed, and a great battle will be won to the eternal glory of British Arms. That is what will happen here. We are asked to wait and watch and it has been suggested by certain kind and well-meaning friends that there is nothing to prevent us from going to England and presenting our case there. Now, Sir, I for one disdain any eavesdropping at Downing Street. Unless we are asked to take an honourable part in any consultations, I do not think that any Member from this side of the House will ever dream of going to England simply for the sake of getting scraps of information here, there and everywhere and trying to convince the British public which, as I have already observed on several former occasions, is wholly unapproachable to us, as I know to my cost. Now, Sir, the Government may be so utterly devoid of imagination as to think that this fine distinction between "provisional policy" and "final policy" will deceive anybody. But we know what things are in reality. The most interested party will go wholly unrepresented and judgment will go against us by default. What will be said of us? Well, I can also picture that to my mind. "Look at these Swarajists," it will be said, "they are impossible men. They have no constructive policy of their own. They have not even taken part in the Reforms Inquiry Committee. The leader of the party in the House was asked to be a member of this committee and through sheer cussedness he declined. Then, throughout the proceedings of the Reforms Inquiry Committee not one Swarajist either appeared as a witness or submitted his memorandum or opinion in writing." This will be the impression created. A veil will be drawn on the real facts. Why is it that we did not take part? Our attitude has been fully justified by the reports both of the majority and the minority of the Reforms Committee. As the facts are not well known, I take the liberty to read the answer I gave to the invitation which I received from the Government to be a member of this Inquiry Committee. This is what I said on the 3rd of June. I read from a press cutting.

"I have carefully considered the terms of reference to the proposed Committee and have come to the conclusion that no inquiry within the limits, scope and extent prescribed can yield satisfactory results. It will no doubt be possible for the Committee to discover the difficulties arising from or defects inherent in the working of the Government of India Act and the rules thereunder and suggest remedies within the limitations laid down. But it is obvious that no such remedies can meet the requirements of the situation. A reference to the terms of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 18th February 1924 will show that the action contemplated by the Resolution must necessarily go beyond the structure, policy and purpose of the Act, and that the object in view cannot be served by merely rectifying any administrative imperfections. The proposed inquiry would perhaps be justifiable if its real and avowed purpose were to collect evidence to be subsequently placed before a representative conference constituted in the manner described in the Resolution of the Assembly with unrestricted powers to propose such changes in the constitution as the circumstances required. But as I read the press communiqué it commits those who agree to serve on the committee to the structure, policy and purpose of the Act and gives no indication of any intention to hold a subsequent conference with wider powers or to take any action beyond that necessary to rectify administrative imperfections under the Act and the rules as they stand. For these reasons, while thanking the Governor General in Council for the invitation, I regret my inability to serve on a Committee constituted in the manner and for the purpose set out in the press communiqué."

Now, Sir, this Committee did meet and it came to certain conclusions and made its report. That report, I submit, has fully justified the position that I took. There is the majority report and there is the minority report. So far as the majority report is concerned, I thought that I was reading some administration report, something like what is issued year after year by the heads of the departments relating to their own departments. I see no indication in it of any attempt to reach the root of the question. Of course, there was the formula before the Committee—"not to go beyond the structure and the purpose of the Act"—and therefore any attempt in that direction was abandoned on the plea that it would not be within the scope of the inquiry. Then, when they came to discover defects and imperfections, they acted just like one who inspects an office and after going through the books and files recommends changes of procedure and transfers of certain routine items from one head to another head, and things of that kind. The only real recommendations of any substance did not go beyond the transfer of such things as the Indian Law Reports, Boilers and Gas and Forests where they are not already transferred and Excise in Assam where it is not a transferred subject. Now, the whole joke of it becomes quite apparent when you read that report in conjunction with the Resolution which was passed by this House and the debate which was held on that occasion showing the objects with which this Inquiry Committee was constituted. This Committee undoubtedly was a thing which the Government had done in response to that Resolution. Sir Malcolm Hailey from his place in this House made it clear twice—once in his opening remarks and then in his concluding speech—that all they were prepared to do was to explore possibilities. But the intention was to get at the bottom of the trouble and not merely to provide a sort of an eye-wash by adding something of no consequence or transferring one or two items of no importance and thus to throw another sop to the country and see if it can be satisfied. What Sir Malcolm Hailey said was that if it was found that no substantial advance could be made, which was desirable, within the structure and the scope of the Act, then he said "I give you no undertaking whatever. It will be a matter to be considered when the occasion arises." I quite admit that he did not commit himself to anything particular if it was found that nothing could be done within the scope of the Act itself. But surely the fact that nothing could be done within the scope of the Act could not have been a revelation to the Reforms Inquiry Committee or rather the majority. It did not require a prophet to tell us at the time that it will be so. We knew that nothing was possible and therefore, Sir, so far as the position we took is concerned, both the majority and the minority reports have fully justified it.

This is hardly an occasion when I should detain the House by going fully into the merits of the recommendations of the majority report, or those of the suggestions contained in the minority report. All I shall say for the present is this that the majority report is a mere camouflage and the minority does certainly contain things with much of which we agree and with much more of which we do not agree. At the end the only substantive conclusion arrived at is that it is a matter which must be gone into either by a Royal Commission, or through some other agency. We had ourselves suggested a more suitable agency and we are no wiser to-day than we were when the Reforms Resolution was passed by the House.

Now, Sir, there is one part of the majority and the minority reports which I must deal with as it very seriously affects the Swaraj Party, and

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

in which I find that both of them have gone hopelessly wrong. I refer to the question of disqualification under the rules from membership of this House and the Councils on the ground of conviction for an offence involving a sentence of more than six months. Now, upon that point both the majority and the minority have, in a fit of generosity, extended the term of imprisonment which would be a disqualification to one year. That is to say, if a sentence is for more than one year, the disqualification remains, but when it is for a less period there will be no disqualification. Now, Sir, I am not at all surprised at the majority coming to that conclusion, but am greatly surprised at the minority, which consisted of most eminent lawyers like my friend Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah, having agreed in that conclusion. They were perhaps caught napping and did not fully realise what they were agreeing to. It is no doubt a rule of English statute laws based on Parliamentary practice and precedent that the disqualification applies on conviction for certain offences involving a sentence of more than one year, but it was overlooked that that disqualification attached to the person while he was actually undergoing the sentence and not after he had suffered the sentence, or had been pardoned for the offence. It is a very elementary principle of criminal law that an offence is purged by undergoing the punishment for it, and it is on that principle that the English practice is based. Even convictions for high treason are treated in that way. That is to say, if the sentence imposed has still to run, you cannot elect the person who is undergoing that sentence. But once he has served out the sentence there is nothing to prevent his election because it is for the electorate to judge whether the man is fit to represent them or not. What is provided against is that the electorate must not put the Government in a false position. When the Government holds a person in jail and they elect him it would create difficulties, and to avoid that, that rule was framed. Now, Sir, the rule as it obtains in India came up for consideration before the Parliamentary Joint Committee. It was discussed from the 27th May 1924 to the 1st July 1924, and it was discussed at the recommendation of the Government of India, the recommendation being that the disqualification should be removed. That recommendation in its turn, Sir, I flatter myself to believe, was based upon a Resolution which was tabled in this House very early in the beginning of the 1924 session, but unfortunately has not yet been favoured by the ballot and come up for discussion in the House. However that may be, the recommendation of the Government of India was there, and on that recommendation discussions were held in the Joint Committee on various dates. Witnesses were examined, among whom Lord Meston was one, and I will only read what was resolved at the final sitting:

"Then it was moved by Lord Clwyd that the Committee shall advise the Secretary of State for India to adopt the proposal of the Government of India to amend the rules made under the Government of India Act, 1919, so as to remove the disqualification for five years which the rules at present impose upon any person against whom a conviction by a criminal court involving a sentence of transportation or imprisonment for more than six months is subsisting."

—note that the motion was to remove it altogether.—

"On the question whether the proposed motion be agreed to the contents were 10 and the non-contents were 5."

In spite of that Resolution of the Joint Committee, which was based on the recommendation of the Government of India themselves, we find the

majority and the minority both falling into the error that I have mentioned. Now, Sir, it is an error which very deeply affects us. As is very well known, it is we, the Swarajists, who come under that disqualification, and not only ordinary Swarajists, but men like Gandhi who is disqualified, men like Lala Lajpat Rai and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who are disqualified. There are numerous others who are disqualified but those I have named need no introduction in this House or outside it. And so far as that goes, in the early manifesto of October 1923, which I had the honour to issue, there was a challenge to the Government to withdraw the disqualification before the elections, and see the result. I now challenge the Government again to dissolve this Assembly, after withdrawing the disqualification. If this is done I promise this House will contain a vast majority of Swarajists.

These, Sir, are in brief the more important events which have happened during the present régime, and the whole policy of the Government may be summed up in a very few words. If you bear in mind the dates that I have given, you will find that the policy of the Government comes to this: they give full play to their repressive laws and inaugurate a reign of terror by making indiscriminate arrests throughout the country. When they are satisfied with their own terrorism and feel confident that they have crushed out the spirit of freedom, they obtain a Royal clemency and let off a number of persons in the hope that that spirit will not revive. But what do they find? They find to their utter discomfiture that the same spirit rises again in the more chastened form of non-violent non-co-operation. What happens then? They again begin pin-pricks of mild repression; which is followed up by more and more severe repression, until some unbalanced youths in Bengal go mad

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Why not in the United Provinces?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Because Bengal is more political than the United Provinces and Bengal is more sensitive, and more patriotic if you like. If you want that compliment I am willing to give it though I do not think it will be fair to the United Provinces. However in Bengal, when these unbalanced youths are driven to madness, some of them resort to crime, and the opportunity is at once taken of proclaiming to the world that there is a deep-seated conspiracy in Bengal. The Ordinance is passed, and what is done under the Ordinance? Out of 70 odd arrests made the first day, 60 of the prisoners happened to be Swarajists. In the whole round-up of Calcutta not a single bullet, not a single ounce of gunpowder, nor any material for the manufacture of bombs was found. But I need not go over the ground which was traversed in the discussion on the Ordinance. Then comes the Reform Committee's Report; but why it comes as a sort of solace to some, I do not know. There are friends in this House and outside who have great hopes at least from the fact that the minority has made certain suggestions which will perhaps be accepted by the Government at Home. As far as we are concerned, Sir, I have already submitted that we have no such hope. We shall wait and see; but what shall we do in the meanwhile? Well, I can only say that we shall go out into the country again to work among our people and to work as long as it is necessary unless of course His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief finds other occupation for us either in this world or the next. But that is the only thing that we have got to do. Now that is the whole of the policy of this Government. That is why you cannot do without repressive laws. That is why you dare not concede any substantial advance in self-government. You know all

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

this but you forget your own traditions. You forget that the spirit of independence once born can never die, do what you like. Your repression will only recoil on yourselves. Go on trying it as long as you like. So far as we are concerned, we, I can assure you, shall never be tired of opposing that repression and of suffering whatever hardship it entails. Meanwhile all we can do is to speak out our minds clearly and fearlessly, and that is what I have attempted to do to-day. I ask the House now to take the view which I have placed before them, to accept that view and to support the motion and pass it with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, Pandit Motilal Nehru, the recognised leader of the House, spoke this morning as the leader of the Swaraj Party. I wish he had spoken as the leader of nationalist India instead. So far in this House in his speeches he has spoken as the leader of the people of India, but to-day he confined himself to his 45 followers and spoke on behalf of them. I am a humble fry in the Independent group of this House . . . (Pandit Motilal Nehru: "May I correct my Honourable friend? I did not speak only on behalf of the 45 Swarajists: I spoke on behalf of my country.") But, Sir, whatever party we may represent in this House, we also represent the people of India. There are 315 millions who are looking forward to our action in this House, and, although I am myself a humble member of the Independent group, the leader of which is Mr. Jinnah who sits on the opposite bench and who has the full support of our group and who will speak for us later on, Sir, I speak on behalf of nationalist India. (Applause.)

Sir, my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru characterised the Reform Committee's majority report as a camouflage. I say it is an eye-wash and as an eye-wash we must sweep it out. It was a pity that the two Indian members who signed that report forgot their nationality. They forgot themselves. Of course one of them, Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi has now changed his views and we find him to-day advocating a Royal Commission. I wish he had had the moral courage in that report to speak out like an Indian, in spite of his being a Government Member. Mr. Chunihal Mehta and Mr. Cowasji Jehangir are also Executive Members in the Government of Bombay, yet they had the moral courage to speak out like Indians of what India needs. But, Sir Muhammad Shafi is a lost soul. (Laughter.) There was a Raja in the olden days in India—his name was Trishanku—whose soul would not go to hell, would not go to heaven nor would it reside on the earth: it hung in the air. Similarly, Sir Muhammad Shafi is not to-day on the Government Benches, he is not with the people of India, nor do we find him as the Governor of any province. He is in short a lost soul. (Applause.) He wants to come back to us, to the people of India, and he says he wants a Royal Commission. Where was his moral courage when he signed that report? But who is to be blamed for these lost souls among Indians? It is the Treasury Bench, it is the Government of India that is to be blamed for such lost souls. In the Mahabharata there is a story. When Yudishthira was asked he said he did not want to be a Raja in Kali-yuga; but the Government of India create Maharajadhirajas, Their Exalted Highnesses, Their Serene Highnesses: and these Rajas and Maharajas will sign any report and give any support. I do not wonder at these lost souls in India; but I ask of this Government not to make of Indians, of real men, true sons of India, lost souls. (Applause.) They are men of

India, they feel as patriotically as we the Opposition in the House feel; but by dangling before them little Governorships and seats on Executive Councils you make them forget their duties to their motherland.

However, when I think of the minority report, I am proud that my leader Mr. Jinnah had the moral courage to have accepted the Government offer to sit on the Reforms Inquiry Committee. He did consult his friends in the Independent group and had our hearty support. Sir, we are here not to obstruct, not to non-co-operate or to go back to our constituencies and our homes. We have come definitely to this Legislative Assembly to do some constructive work for the constitution and the country. (*An Honourable Member*: "Can you do it?") If we cannot do it, at least we are trying our best to do it. But we have no alternative. You cannot non-co-operate in this Assembly. If you want to non-co-operate your place is not here, it is outside this House. (*An Honourable Member*: "Our place is everywhere!"). We follow reason and reasonableness. My leader joined the Reforms Inquiry Committee and collaborated with his colleagues Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Dr. Paranjpye in bringing out constructive suggestions and constructive proposals for fresh Reforms. That is what we want. I know we want Swaraj; we want complete self-

12 NOON. government; yet under the limited scope of the inquiry they show us a way out. We admire their courage; we admire the way in which they have suggested a *via media*, so that the country, the Parliament and even His Excellency the Viceroy and our Finance Member during their discussions in England a month later will find their way to satisfy the aspirations of the people of India. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "Ask them to take your leader there.")

Sir, this morning I was reading the *Bombay Chronicle* of Thursday, the 12th instant; and in commenting upon the bravery and the courage of those two Indian Executive Members of the Bombay Government which I have already referred to, it quotes the views of those two members on party policy in the Councils as follows:

"The existence of parties on policies postulates the possession of full responsibility by the representatives of the people."

Well, Sir, much has been made by the Government about the existence of so many parties. The *Bombay Chronicle* comments thus:

"In India the Government sit tight and expect Indians to play at parties and neutralise their energies to the relief of Government."

It is a very pregnant remark to be addressed to the representatives of the people of India in this House. Are we here to play at being Swarajists, Independents, Moderates or Liberals, or are we here to work as Nationalists, as representatives of the people of India, to take united action against a bureaucratic Government that is not going to part with one inch of its power, with one inch of its vested interests? We must unite; we must not repeat what we exhibited last evening during the late hours that the Honourable the President allowed us to sit and vote against each other. We must unite and show this Government and the country, show to the world at large, that India wants Reforms, that India wants Swaraj and we must get it out of this Government. (Applause.)

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Sir, it is with some diffidence that I rise to take part in the debate initiated by my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru; and I use that term "friend", Sir, not only in the formal courtesy

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

which we extend to every Member of this House but because I and my colleagues feel that socially too Pandit Motilal Nehru has been our friend. Recently, only last week, we were the guests of the Honourable Pandit and of Mr. Jinnah at a dinner at the Western Hostel and on that occasion the courtesy extended to us as to other Members of the House was second to none. I allude to this point, Sir, because I am a believer in the building up of conventions. One Honourable Member at that dinner party—he was an Indian—alluded to the differences which exist in this country and in England; he said in England no matter how strong are the differences of your political opinion, you do not allow it to interfere with the courtesy dictated by society. Sir Campbell Rhodes in a very valuable analysis of the Muddiman Report which he has given to the Press has alluded to the fact that political progress in this country in his opinion can primarily be established by conventions, and I believe, Sir, that the Honourable Pandit and Mr. Jinnah have made a very valuable contribution to the political progress of this country when they decided that, no matter how strong may be the difference of political opinion in the House, hostility on those grounds shall not be allowed to extend to our social relationships or disturb the relationship which ought to exist normally between all communities.

I would like, Sir, to return to the fact that I said I rose to take part in this debate with diffidence. My diffidence arises from two points, one, that I belong to what is numerically a minority community and I have that feeling, due to the fierce campaign of racial bitterness in the Indian press, that minority communities at present lack confidence in the future of a government formed on any other basis than that which exists. (*Pandit Shamlal Nehru*: "What about your *Statesman*, *Englishman*, *Times of India* and others?") My second point is that we are always being accused of being "birds of passage" whose only interest in India is that of her exploitation. I vehemently repudiate that assertion and I do so on the grounds that the service which Britishers have given to India is second to none. If I may be allowed with due modesty to give a brief account of my own family connection with India, I would like to tell the House that my eldest brother, a member of the Indian Civil Service in the United Provinces, died serving India; and if you can judge anything from obituary notices, he was loved by all classes of Indians with whom he came in contact. In Southern India my sister died from cholera contracted in helping the poorer classes of India during a cholera epidemic. I myself, Sir, have taken my turn in defending India's frontiers. But that is a poor example of what very many British families have done for India. Sons of Great Britain have come out here and given of their best not only in a professional capacity or administrative capacity, but in assisting India to develop and exploit her own resources in the realms of trade and commerce. Our youths come to India in the heyday of their youth after receiving the very best training that the British Empire can give them; they give the best part of their lives, if not their lives themselves, to the service of India; and if they retire it is to a very short period of well-earned rest after an arduous service for India in this country. It is these conditions, Sir, apart from our stake in the country altogether, which I say entitles us to an opinion on the nature and the measure of constitutional progress in this country and which justifies that opinion receiving that consideration at the hands of the Government of India and at the hands of Indian politicians which it is certain to receive at the hands of the civilized world.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I interpose and say that we do not deny that my friend and his community have that right; in fact I may remind my friend that I invited him and his Association to a conference to consider these very things.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: If I may pass on to the question of the Muddiman Report, the Honourable Pandit proposed yesterday to move the adjournment of the House to consider the attitude of Government on this subject. Had he done so, I would have felt obliged to rise and oppose the adjournment, not that we want to burke discussion, but because we feel, recognising our responsibility as representatives of our electorates, that we could have made no valuable contribution other than that of our own personal views to the debate at the very short notice which had been allowed to us. This is an important question, Sir, and a very important one from the point of view of minorities; and it would not have been possible and we do not believe it is desirable to discuss this question until we have had an opportunity of consultation with the leading men of our community and with the organised bodies which we represent in this House. I therefore do not propose to examine in detail the recommendations of the Muddiman Report. I take it, Sir, that the motive underlying the Honourable Pandit's Resolution is the lack of responsibility of the Executive Council to this House. Might I remind the Honourable Member that we Members in this House also have a responsibility to our electorates, and if we take part in this discussion, it is because we believe that those electorates are not yet in a position to have any control over their representatives in this House. I may give the House

Pandit Motilal Nehru: You profess to know our electorates better than we do.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I may give the House one or two instances. In an election to the Legislative Council in Bengal, quite a number of electors came up and said that they had received instructions to vote for the Lal Sahib, the usual practice of having coloured boxes having been adopted in that particular constituency. They were not aware of the name of the candidate standing in the red colour or of the candidate standing in the black. But they said

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: May I remind the Honourable Member that at the last British elections, many voters came and voted against particular candidates merely because they were asked to vote against the red letter?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: They came and said that they had received instructions from the agent of the man who owned the house in which they lived that they were to vote for the Lal Sahib, and that if they did not do so, they would be turned out of the house. The process of secret balloting was explained to them, but their education was such that they could not bring themselves to believe that the Babu in the balloting office would not know how they had voted

Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammedan): May I know, Sir, what evidence the Honourable Member has in support of the statement he makes? Will he kindly produce the evidence?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I have no written evidence, Sir.

Mr. Chaman Lall: May I then ask the Honourable Member not to make any statements in this House unless he has sufficient evidence to support them? It is misleading the House to make any such statement as the Honourable Member is making without evidence.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Perhaps the Honourable Member will observe that rule himself in future.

Mr. Chaman Lall: May I remind the Honourable Member that I have never on a single occasion in this House made a statement which I am not fully prepared to support.

Mr. W. S. J. Willson (Associated Chambers of Commerce: Nominated Non-official): Even if it is 10 years old?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: The other case was one which was related to me by a Muhammadan representative of this House. He said that there were 180 polling booths in his constituency

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I be allowed to say one word? If the Honourable Member will refer to the reports of the cases tried under the Corrupt Practices Act in England, he will find worse examples than those he is citing now.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I do not see, Sir, that because there are mistakes made in England, there is any reason why you should commit the same mistakes in India.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: That is training up the electorates.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: If the Honourable Member will allow me to go on, I shall mention the second instance. Now the Honourable Member whom I mentioned just now said that it was impossible to be present at 180 polling booths over large districts, and he said that, as a matter of fact, he did not think it had been necessary for him to address all his constituents because in most cases they voted in accordance with the wishes of the zamindars. I do not say it is wrong, Sir, but I allude to the fact of the very great power which may lie in the hands of one individual citizen until the electorates are educated to take to their own line.

Then the third case occurred in Bihar and Orissa where, I understand, a certain section of the municipality in a municipal district did not approve of the policy that was being carried out by the existing chairman, and in spite of the fact that there was a bye-election coming off, they did not realise the powers that lay in their hands and that they had the opportunity to express their opinion on the policy of the municipality by recording their votes at that particular bye-election. They, however, went to the Collector and asked him if he could not take some steps to have the chairman removed. That, to my mind, shows that we have a long distance yet to go before we can be certain that our electorates are capable of looking after themselves.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: That may apply to your constituency.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I allude to this point, because it has often been pointed out by my Honourable friend Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha in this House, that this House is capable of exploitation by big interests . . .

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: Including the representatives of your community.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: And it is essential that we should make perfectly certain that the responsibility should be not so much to ourselves as to the peoples of India.

I would allude, Sir, to just another point that arises from the Honourable Pandit's motion. I observe always a merry twinkle in his eye, and he seems to say to himself, "Well, thank Heavens, I can get off my annual grievance on this occasion without any fear of anything happening", and he is thereby really building up a convention to which I do not believe this House desires to agree and to which my Honourable friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal only the other day referred.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I thought you were in favour of conventions.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: In the right direction. This convention that he is building up is to say that he approves of the retention of gubernatorial powers of restoration and certification, and I cannot believe that it is sound for us to build up such a convention. He is also, to my mind, building up another convention

Pandit Motilal Nehru: My friend ought to know that it is by the law itself, and not mere convention, that the power of certification and veto is given.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: My friend is building up another convention, that the opportunity given to the representatives of the tax-payers to criticise the expenditure should be wasted in the annual voicing of our grievances. I am quite certain that it is not a sound policy. We have plenty of opportunities by Resolutions and by other means to put forward the points of view which we favour, and I cannot believe that it is desirable that we should establish a convention to put forward at this time those Resolutions rather than that we should examine with the very greatest care the expenditure and income which are plac'd before us on this occasion.

Finally, Sir, I would make an appeal to the House. I believe with Sir Campbell Rhodes that progress lies along the road of a proper establishment of proper conventions.

Mr. V. J. Patel: What are they? Dinners?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: A dinner is a useful one.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Mention some more.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Firstly, that law and order is the primary duty of every Government, that minorities must be protected, Budgets must be balanced, and that the finances of the country must be sound. These are the lines (A Voice: "Lee Commission.") These are the lines, Sir, upon which political progress in this country can develop to the interests of India and of the Indian people. With these words, Sir, I beg to oppose my Honourable friend the Pandit's motion.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I regret, Sir, as much as my gallant friend, Colonel Crawford, the painful necessity that has been imposed upon us of not discussing the expenditure and

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

income of the Government of India when the Budget comes on. That necessity has been imposed upon us by the peculiarly painful political situation in the country. This is really the one occasion on which we can freely and fairly discuss the policy of the present Government. It has been one of the functions, I may remind my gallant friend, of the Legislative Assembly in India before the legislators were permitted to vote upon the Budget, to discuss general questions of public policy on the pretence of discussing the Budget. That was in the old Imperial Council. The figures in the Budget were more sacred than the sacred thread of the Brahmin to the pariah. So far as the old constitution went, we could not move any amendment on the Budget, all that we were given was to enjoy the sound of our own voice inside the august Chamber, criticising (within reasonable limits, of course, because the Viceroy was presiding) the action and the policy of the Government. But since the introduction of the new Government of India Act, this House has been given this privilege, this power of criticising the policy of the Government, the general policy of the Government, the acts and attitudes of the Executive in the country, in discussing the Budget. This year we have been allowed a certain amount of latitude in regard to this matter by a convention, which I understand, Sir, you and the Leader of the House between you two, have established or have commenced to establish, namely, you have given us this item No. 28, dealing with the Executive Council of the Government of India, to discuss general questions of public policy. This is our excuse. If you had given us full responsible Government, if we were made responsible when we threw out a Budget to carry on the administration according to our own lights, if we were permitted when we rejected a Budget to transfer ourselves from these impotent benches to the potentialities on the other side, and cast our own figures, carry on our own administration in the light of our own conscience and with a due sense of responsibility to our constituencies and to the country in general, then we would not have wasted your time and our time upon this fruitless discussion of general policy over these figures dealing with expenditure and revenue. Now, Sir, I am glad to be able to support the motion of my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, those cheers are a little too previous. (*Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta*: "Make hay while the sun shines.") But, though I support his motion, I do not actually accept all the reasons upon which he has supported that motion. We are all agreed, Sir, whether we are Swarajists or non-Swarajists, whether we are extremists or moderates, whether we sit on this side or on the other side or elsewhere, we are all agreed, every Indian Nationalist and politician who is not a place-hunter and a flunkey, agrees with every other Indian Nationalist and politician, that we must have full complete real responsible Government and must have it as quickly as we can possibly have it. Upon that point there is absolutely no difference of opinion between my friend Pandit Motilal and his Swarajist iron-sides and my friend Mr. Jinnah and his poor following. (*Pandit Shamlal Nehru*: "What about yourself?") There is absolutely no difference. We have cried for it, we have worked for it according to our own lights—early establishment of Swaraj. Early establishment of Swaraj has been and is the one objective of all our struggles. And by early we have always understood, before the statutory period of the end of ten years after the institution of the Reforms, that

is, before 1929. At the Amritsar Congress, when in his unregenerate days my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru presided over us, we agreed that we should work the Reforms for whatever they might be worth with a view to secure the early establishment of responsible Government in the country and by the early establishment of responsible Government in the country we meant earlier than 1929. We are striving for the same thing. And if you read this report, you will find that the minority has also practically made it clear that they want as anyone of us who are not with them in other matters, everyone of them wants as early establishment of responsible Government as possible. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "So does the Government. Government have agreed.") Sir, when my friend Mr. Kabeerud-Din Ahmed becomes the Government, I shall take his word for the word of the Government. Now, we are all agreed upon that, and we want it. The only question is, how shall we get it? Our differences, whatever little differences there are, are differences not of ideal, not of objective but only of methods. My friend Pandit Motilal thinks that by throwing out the Budget, by an obstructive policy, by destroying Council Government he will have his Swaraj Government. That is what my friend Mr. Patel thinks. I do not know if Pandit Motilal thinks the same. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "I don't know if Mr. Patel even thinks that.") Those were his words, Sir.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: He thinks he must try to demolish. But he does not mean to say that by simple demolishing these Councils he will get Swaraj. There is something more to be done.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I might explain, Sir, that there is no construction without destruction. We will construct after we have destroyed this system.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Yes, Sir, I am familiar with that excellent dictum—no construction without destruction. But my friend is still on the mechanical plane; he has yet to rise to the biological plane, where there is no destruction before construction. Destruction and construction go on hand in hand; there can be no construction in the biological sphere after destruction. My friend, Dr. Lohokare, cannot destroy me and the pathological tissues in me with a view to replacing them by healthier tissues. I must be kept and the Government must be kept. That is our position. The Government must be kept. The Government is our Government. Simply because for the time being those other gentlemen with a different colour from ourselves hold authority to steer the ship of State, the ship of State is not theirs. It is the Government of the Indian. It is our State and we claim to guide and control and shape the policy of that State instead of my friends opposite. That is all that we want. We do not want to destroy the machinery of Government. We do not want to destroy the State as State. We do not want to destroy the power of the State as a State, because upon the existence of that power depends whatever rights I enjoy and whatever rights I demand and whatever rights it is possible for me to ever enjoy as a member of a civilised society and State.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: You only want to change the colour.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I do not want to change the colour, Sir, because I know the brown bureaucrat will be no better than the white bureaucrat (Laughter). I want not to change the colour but the character. That is what I want.

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

Now, Sir, we do not want to obstruct. I support Pandit Motilal's motion but let it not be understood that when I give my vote and go with him to the lobby (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "Not the same") I accept his policy of obstruction.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I have made it quite clear myself.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: What I want is to enter a protest. But it may be said that the other day I said that if we want to enter a protest, a 100 rupees cut would be as good as a lakh of rupees cut. I say that as a general statement that holds true. I do not assess these protests by their material measurements. A lakh does not carry more moral weight behind a protest than a hundred rupees. But, in this case, we stand upon a different footing. We know that His Excellency is going to England. I have not the legal poetic imagination of my friend Pandit Motilal to be able to visualize the flow of spirits and the feast of soul that will take place in London when Lord Reading and Lord Birkenhead and the others will meet there. I cannot visualize the picture which my friend has visualized, but I know this, Sir, that Lord Reading is going out to consult the authorities regarding the Indian situation. It is out in the papers—not in Indian papers but in the English papers—that His Excellency is going out to consult the Secretary of State and the British Cabinet in regard to the constitutional issue in India. That is an open secret. We do not want to make a small cut which His Excellency may refuse to restore. On this occasion we want to make as big a cut as we can, so that His Excellency will be forced to restore, and in being forced to restore, will have to place his reasons for the restoration on record and those reasons will be before the Secretary of State for India, before the British Cabinet and before others who may be invited to join that Conference. It is for that reason, Sir, to make the position of this House absolutely clear, that divided as we are in regard to our methods, we are united in our demand for the early establishment of full responsible government in this country, and we shall not cease from wrestling until we have our desire fulfilled. (Hear, hear.) That is what we want to make plain in the country and before the world. What are our demands? We want immediate establishment of full provincial responsibility. That is the first thing we want,—immediate establishment of full provincial responsibility, not a transference of the control of Assam Forests that might be profitable to me if I were the Conservator of Forests (*Pandit Shamlal Nehru*: "Or Fisheries") or the Member in charge of Forests or the control of Fisheries or the control of the publication of Law Reports or the control of other things. The days are gone by, Sir, when you can please us and satisfy us by these little toys. When we were children we thought as children and we played as children, but having arrived at man's stature, we demand the right of man to determine and carry on the business of our own household ourselves in the light of our reason and in the light of our own conscience. No, Sir, this transference will not do, and the minority report makes it absolutely plain and clear as clear could be that this will not do. Of course, they had to work within the limits of their reference. They could not go beyond the limits of their reference. But they make it absolutely plain that what they want is a change in the present constitution. I will read, Sir, just a little. I am not a good reader, but I will try to:

"The Indian Ministers and Members of the Executive Councils also, upon whom new opportunities of service were conferred, appear to us to have been within the

sphere of their Executive duties, equally eager to work the Constitution in the same spirit of reasonableness, and yet differing from the majority of our colleagues we have been forced to the conclusion that the present system has failed, and in our opinion it is incapable of yielding better results in future."

I am sure if my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru had been on this Committee he could not have put the case for us in stronger and clearer language than has been done in this sentence. What do they say again?

"To our mind the proper question to ask is not whether any *alternative transitional* system can be devised but whether the constitution should not be put on a permanent basis, with provisions for automatic progress in the future so as to secure stability in the government and willing co-operation of the people."

Those words represent the united voice of India. No tinkering, Sir, no transference of a few departments from the reserved to the transferred side, but what we want is a change in the constitution which will make automatically for future progress, which will ensure stability, a change in the constitution such as will not force my reasonable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, a moderate of moderates as he has always been in his life, to change into a red Swarajist and going in for breaking while all his life he has been anxious to construct. We do not want this constitution. This constitution, this hybrid constitution, this wretched constitution unknown to political history and unknown to any political science, this dyarchy within monarchy and monarchy within dyarchy, this unity in duality and duality in unity, this one in *Ousia* and two in *Hypostatis*, this constitution unknown to anywhere except in mediæval scholastic theology, this, Sir, is not wanted by us. We never asked for it.

Mr. D. V. Belvi: Dyarchy is a political monster.

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar: You want to work it.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I am prepared to work a monster if the monster will serve my purpose and I am working with you to-day to serve my purpose. (Laughter.) That is our position. Why should I not want to work a monster if the monster will not eat me but I can control the monster? (Laughter.) That is the whole question. If you lack the skill and the courage and the strength to drive your motor car, your motor car will drive you into a ditch. But if you have the vision and the skill and the strength to drive it correctly, however powerful it may be, you will reach your goal thereon. That has been, Sir, our position. Now, Sir, we are not in love with this present constitution. We are not in love with what Sir Alexander Muddiman and his colleagues have given us. Even those who have signed the minority report have made it absolutely clear that they are not in love with their recommendations. They had to make certain recommendations; they have made them. One thing I find in the minority report is that they have simply said, "We agree with the majority here, we disagree with the majority there." They do not put forward any constructive proposal except in their concluding paragraph where they say that this will not do. They say "We want a constitution that will work for stability." The Governor of Bengal wants stability. He wants to have a Ministry that will work for stability. The Governor of the Central Provinces wants a Ministry that will work for stability. We want here a Government which will work for stability. What is that Government we want? As I said, give us full provincial autonomy, and give us some effective control over the executive in the Central Government in the transitional period. We do not say that

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

we are fit according to the standard of my gallant friend Colonel Crawford to govern ourselves. If he will apply that measure to his own people in England he will be forced to admit, honest man that he is, that even they are not fit for enjoying full responsible government there. But what we want is to grow into this fitness and we shall never grow into this fitness unless you give us the power to exercise the rights of free citizenship in this country. It is by the exercise of real power and responsibility that the sense of responsibility grows. Give us responsibility and the sense of responsibility will grow. The sense of responsibility grows there among your brown colleagues because you give them responsibility. And the same sense of responsibility will grow even in these benches if you make them responsible for carrying on your work the moment they try to thwart you in the prosecution of your policy or throw out your measures.

Now, Sir, the situation, so far as we can see, is very critical. It is very critical in Bengal. We have got two Ministers, but it has yet to be seen how long this new Ministry will last in Bengal. Everywhere, almost in every province—in the Central Provinces the Reforms are practically stopped owing to the deadlock created by the Swarajists. In Bengal the Ministry is in a state of unstable equilibrium. It has been in a state of unstable equilibrium for the last 12 months and more, and it will continue to be so until better counsels prevail. (*Mr. V. J. Patel*: "Do you approve of that policy of obstruction?") No. I do not approve of obstruction. I believe in constitutional opposition. I do not believe in the obstruction of Government. (*A Voice*: "But you did.") I have answered that question and I will not take notice of it again. The situation is this. In Bengal we have got that situation, an unstable Ministry. In the Central Provinces we have got that situation. Here this time you are a little more comfortable because of the freedom of my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah and his friends from the Swarajist trap. Last year they voted with them. They are not going to vote with them and you are trying to exploit that situation to-day. But it will only be for a little while. It cannot last long. The moment there is any vital issue before us as on this occasion we will not vote with Government. We have got a proverb in Bengali which says that the horn of the buffalo is bent, it is not straight, but when buffaloes fight their horns become straight. And when we fight all our horns become straight and you will find it to-day and on future occasions also if any serious problem arises. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "You are again falling into the Swarajist trap.") No. I am driving the Swarajists into my trap. We shall see who goes into whose trap. We have seen it during the last year, who have been changing and who have not. Why should you give the Government Benches so much pleasure? They do not give you pleasure. The issue really is this. Are we to reach our goal by constitutional means or by other than constitutional means? That is the whole issue. (*An Honourable Member*: "No.") (*Another Honourable Member*: "By all available means.") The other day His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief gave us a bit of his mind. (*Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha*: "Did he frighten you?") Well, well, do I look like it? Some friends have been looking very much afraid either through the Commander-in-Chief or through somebody else ever since they entered this House during this Assembly. I did not get frightened. I only enjoyed that. I thanked in my heart of hearts His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief for that frank statement when he said that India is not a nation and you cannot expect to have a national

army until you are a nation. That is the whole argument—until you are a nation you cannot have a national army. And my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman will rise up and say, "Until you have an army you cannot be a nation." Mr. Frederick Smith, before he was transferred to the Upper House, declared in the course of the debate over women franchise in England that "The old law was no representation, no taxation. The new law is no fighting, no vote." That was what Lord Birkenhead before he became a Lord declared in the House of Commons many years ago, and that is practically what my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman will say and what His Excellency will say. We are in a vicious circle—Pandit Motilal's vicious circle. He said when discussing the Resolution on the King's commission that we are in a vicious circle, "We cannot have self-government before we have a national army and we must have a national government before we can have a national army." You cannot have a national army before you have a national Government—that is really the meaning of His Excellency's dictum the other day. Now I do not like to take that as the only alternative before us. We want to proceed, as my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford said, from point to point, from convention to convention, from precedent to precedent, into our goal. We do not want a revolution. I do not think that even my Honourable friend Mr. Patel wants a revolution. (*Mr. V. J. Patel*: "Peaceful revolution.") Peaceful revolution! This reminds me, Sir, of a Sanskrit couplet which I am sure my Honourable friend, Mr. Patel knows. The couplet means: "When two goats fight they begin with a great show, and when a great saint dies there is a great show, but no food on the *sradh* occasion of a Rishi. When a man and his wife start quarrelling there is a great show, but all these end like a morning cloud, not in shower but in vapour." That is the kind of peaceful revolution that my Honourable friend Mr. Patel wants. A revolution is a revolution. I can understand a moral revolution. I can understand

Mr. V. J. Patel: My friend forgot 1920-21. That was a peaceful revolution.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I will not disturb the self-complacency of my friend Mr. Patel. I know, Sir, 1921, but where is 1921 in 1925? Where was 1921 in 1924? Three times before the cock crowed you denied your master and now you come and call upon us to remember 1921. Now the whole question is this: Are we going to have, Sir, constitutional advance or revolutionary advance? We are for constitutional advance but the country is getting impatient and it may be impossible even for the most moderate of my moderate friends to control the country or a section of the country from rushing into revolutionary ways unless this constitutional question is solved with wisdom, with statesmanlike farsight and solved betimes. With these words, Sir, I support the out proposed or rather the rejection proposed by my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): After the torrential diversions which we have had, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the plain issue which it has to face to-day. As I conceive it, the plain issue before us to-day is that by means of this vote we want to record the opinion of this country—I am speaking for the Indian population—that the Government as it is now carried on does not command the confidence of the people of this country. That is the plain meaning of the vote which I wish to record, not with an idea to obstruct, not with the idea of exercising our constitutional right of refusing supplies, not even with

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

the idea of making any emphatic protest, but with the idea in my mind of making another attempt to see if the heart of the Government can be made to change. Sir, I say that the heart of the Government really requires a change. Speaking in the presence of my Indian friends who form part of the corporation called the Government of India which we condemn, I say unhesitatingly that, notwithstanding their presence, they have not by their presence contributed to a change of heart. They have become diluted themselves. They have been overpowered by the masterly elements which control the government of the country. Sir, at this time, especially when His Excellency the Viceroy is proceeding to England to discuss momentous issues which affect the well-being of the millions in this country, it is but right that His Excellency should convey to the responsible people there what the real feelings of the people here are. When His Excellency came to this country in 1921 and when we began the reformed constitution we met under the big long shadow of Amritsar and we, Sir, who were taught Milton and Shakespeare remember the great sayings in them. In one of Shakespeare's plays we read :

“ Wise men never sit and wail their woes, but presently prevent the ways to wail.”

Now, Sir, we came to this House in 1921 notwithstanding the upbraiding process of our non-co-operating countrymen, notwithstanding their attempt to deride us by letting loose dogs and asses with placards round their necks saying “ Vote for me ”. We, who came in here in 1921, offered our co-operation wholeheartedly to remove the evils which, as we conceived them, existed in the constitution of the government of this country. Sir, the Government were very unpopular in 1921. We tried to diagnose the causes of that unpopularity. We tried to help the Government to remedy those vital defects which made them unpopular. We recognised that the disease lay in the political atmosphere, lay in the sentimental side, lay in the economic disadvantages and burdens of this country. The political atmosphere of the country was then shrouded. We had then just emerged from the troubles in the Punjab; we had just then the grim memory of the Rowlatt Act and the agitation which swept the country. We were also under the repressive press laws. And we diagnosed that all these causes contributed to the unpopularity of the Government—the economic disadvantages which the country lay under the fiscal policy of the Government, the administration of the Railways and in connection with various other matters we found that there were radical defects to be cured. On the sentimental side, there was the political aspect also of the racial distinctions in procedure, and there were various other miscellaneous causes which went to make for the unpopularity of the Government. We found, Sir, that Indians were not generally adequately represented either in the civil service or in the military service of the country. Therefore, Sir, we set to work to help to re-frame the laws, to re-frame the constitution, to re-frame the machinery of the various other matters affecting the government of this country. Sir, the year 1921 was eventful in that respect. We had the Esher Committee on the Army, then the Committee of this Assembly which sat to consider the Esher Committee's Report which made recommendations under 14 or 15 heads to remedy vital defects in the administration of the Army and also to effect the Indianization of the Army. We pressed for a Committee to examine the press laws and the repressive laws and got the same appointed. We got a Committee appointed to

remove the racial distinctions and similar other defective procedure. And, Sir, where we found also plague-spots like the North-West Frontier Province, where the people were groaning under the disadvantages which surrounded them on account of their position and on account of their neighbours, we tried to influence the administration of this country; we tried to effect reforms by getting the procedure modified; and we also got Committees appointed on the economic side, as regards the fiscal policy of the Government and also in connection with various other matters, for example, the position of the Indian bar. Sir, all these were achievements of which we of the first Assembly were naturally proud notwithstanding their belittlement on the part of the public. We produced some impression, Sir, we know that we were flooded with applications from both the Princes and the people of India to redress wrongs as if we were mighty people who could work wonders in this Assembly and in the Council of State. But, Sir, when we come to realities, when we come to consider whether we had begun in effecting any real change of any substance, when we examine that position honestly, we recognize that we have failed, miserably failed. That is the conviction which has forced itself upon my mind and also upon the

1 P.M. minds of the thinking people of this country. There have been certain advances, certain improvements, in matters of detail, not in matters of substance. But where matters of substance come, the Government are tardy, niggardly, grudging, in the spirit in which they accept those proposals. Sir, take, for instance, the Army. We pressed for speedy Indianisation in the Army. We suggested various methods by which it can be effected. That was in 1921. We are still in the year of grace 1925, and what is it that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief vouchsafed to us only the other day on the floor of this House? Sir, it was an insult to the people of this land. We take it as an insult to us to be told that it will take many many years before we can think of any substantial Indianisation of the Army. Sir, if that is so, where is this goal of responsible government you promised to us stage by stage, step by step? Did His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief speak with the authority of the Executive Council? If so, Sir, I have no hesitation in condemning that Executive Council by means of this vote. Sir, are the Indian Members in this Council content with the position which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief put to us the other day? Do they recognize that the country will be content with such a position assigned to them? Many many years. There is the conflict of religions, there is the conflict of races, there is the conflict of languages, there is ignorance, there is illiteracy. Sir, it goes on to the end of time. Such arguments have been repeated times without number. Sir, if such arguments are to prevail with an intelligent Government with which we are face to face, I say, Sir, all hope must be lost. Still, Sir, I do not want to give up hope, because I still expect that better sense will prevail, that better political instinct will be brought to bear upon a consideration of these problems. Sir, what is it that has been done in the matter? Quite true, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief had promised to Indianise 8 units, which will take about 30 years, if I am not mistaken, and they themselves confess that the process they have selected is not popular with Indians. They know it. Why is it not popular, Sir? Because you wish to create a pariah group in the Army itself. You want to seclude them, confine them, to units which are entirely Indian, instead of fusing them in all the units of the Army. You want to create separate units for the Indian Army and therefore the Indian officers feel that a second class or third class of officers is being created in that respect. And that is

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

why, Sir, the thing is becoming unpopular. Sir, while we are thankful for the training college at Dehra Dun, which I had the privilege of seeing only the other day, where I was glad to see the magnificent results produced in the youths who are there, many more such institutions are needed in India. It is a misnomer to call it a college. It is a mere public school. What we do want are training colleges, like Sandhurst, for the creation of Indian officers. Sir, they may not be as efficient as European officers I quite admit. As you have to make the best of the material which you have got, it is no use trying to cry over the inefficiency question. If they are not efficient to-day, if they are not efficient in this generation by failures, they will become more and more efficient later on. That should not stand in the way. Sir, these difficulties require courageous statesmanship and confidence in the people to overcome. Unless you have got confidence in the people and unless that courage comes out of the confidence of the people, your attempts will be failures. You have to make attempts and serious attempts in that direction, and therefore, Sir, that is one respect in which there has been some improvement only in detail. There has been really no marked advance on which we can congratulate the Government. So also in the matter of the Indianization of the Civil Services. Sir, in this matter we cannot but feel with warmth—when we find the readiness of this Government to recognise the just grievances of the existing services which are mostly European and the tardiness which they exhibit in recognizing the just claims for Indianization is again a matter for deep regret. Well, Sir, we have been complaining for the last four years why the back benches behind the Treasury Bench are not manned by Indians. We want Indians to occupy all those places behind the Members of the Government. They, the one or two Indians now there, can give creditable account of their work here. We have been crying ourselves hoarse in that direction. I think since 1921 about two or three Indian officers have been taken in some of the departments. Can my Honourable friend Mr. Bray point to one or two Indian officers in the Political or Foreign Department who have been taken in responsible posts? (*Mr. Denys Bray*: "Yes".) Can he find Indians in responsible posts in his Department such as Under Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Joint Secretaries. Additional Joint Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Secretaries? Can my Honourable friend Mr. Burdon point to instances where he has taken Indians in the responsible posts which I have named? It is in that direction that we want Indianization. True, you are making a beginning. But, Sir, you have delayed it so long that we are not contented with these small beginnings. Having delayed it so long, the pace should be greater. That is our complaint. Take, again, Sir, the repressive laws. The Repressive Laws Committee, which was a responsible committee, made certain recommendations. You have removed the Rowlatt Act and certain other Acts. But the Committee also made certain recommendations as regards the Bengal Regulation III of 1818. That portion of the Committee's report you have ignored. That is where the people have been feeling the pinch of it and there the Government have stayed their hands. Now they are faced with my Honourable friend Mr. Patel's amendment for the wholesale abolition of those laws. The same is the case with regard to various other matters which I have mentioned, for instance, matters which are of economic advantage to the country. Take, for instance, the Mercantile Marine Committee. That, again, is a matter on which the Government have delayed, long long delayed, cruelly delayed the taking of steps to promote the growth

of an Indian Mercantile Marine in this country. Sir, that report has been in the hands of the Government for more than a year. Sir, the Lee Commission's report was considered with lightening rapidity and the Government were not faced with any financial difficulties. My Honourable friend the Finance Minister is not troubled about the finances of the country in regard to the Lee Commission's recommendations. But when it comes to the cotton excise duty, the plea of finances is raised. He says, "We have no doubt made a promise. We have done this and we have done that. but the finances do not permit." But, Sir, when it comes to voting more than a crore of rupees for the purpose of extending the privileges to the railway officers, to the army officers, and so on, financial considerations do not stand in the way. There is no tardiness; there is no sloth. There is, on the other hand, all expedition in giving effect to the recommendations of that Commission. What is it, Sir, that stands in the way of at once taking steps for training Indians in the mercantile marine service? You have delayed it so long especially when you appointed a responsible committee to make recommendations. It was a unanimous report so far as the training of Indians is concerned. Sir, there is nothing but delay. In these days of rapid communications when almost every day and every minute you are in communication with the Secretary of State, how is it that delay takes place in these matters?

Sir, there is another matter which I must also mention. My Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer moved a Resolution as regards the North-West Frontier Province. The people there were really groaning under various disadvantages. At the time that we moved there they thought heaven had sent them relief in the shape of this Committee. That was in 1922. If I mistake not, our report reached the Government in November 1922. Here we are in March 1925, and the Government have not yet passed orders on that report. We do not know yet what they have done. Is this the way to treat serious problems? When I compare and contrast the haste and hurry with which they carry out certain recommendations with their tardiness in these matters, to what am I to attribute this conduct of the Government, except that the heart is not sound there? That is why I wish to ask for a change of heart in these matters. Then again take the Deck Passengers' Committee. The deck passengers are suffering grievously. They are not travelling in comfort; they are huddled together. The cubic space given to them is so small in these passenger ships, and what is the Government doing in this matter? That Committee's report has been in the hands of the Government for more than three years, and we do not know what steps are being taken to relieve the trouble of these people.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Did the Honourable Member support the third class passenger Resolution?

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I am not here to answer my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta who is on the war path? Then again, as I said, their action is always tardy and grudging. Look at your attitude in the matter of the Reforms. While we took note of the diseases which affected the administration in order to improve them, we at the same time felt the new Government of India constitution was not good and required modification thoroughly. We began it in September 1921; we repeated our request in 1923 and again in 1924. What is it they do finally? First of all they say, "We will constitute a departmental committee in order to find out whether there are any defects in the working of the Act which

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

can be remedied by rules. Then after that, under pressure from England, they enlarge it. They drop their departmental committee and appoint a committee with circumscribed references which prevent them from making recommendations which are suited to the occasion. The majority make certain sundry recommendations which absolutely are unconvincing. They had better not be made at all. What is the object of making those improvements? If you examine the recommendations of the majority, what are they worth? Are they going to satisfy the people? Are they going to put contentment in the hearts of the educated people? Is that the object? If that is the object, it will be a gross failure on your part if you think that will be the result of it. So that when you come to that, the position is not at all satisfactory. Take again the way they act when serious matters happen in the country. Take the fleeing of a whole section of the population of Kohat last September. They have not yet gone back to their homes. Look at the way they are dealt with. They are arrested and put in jail and are told: "Now you agree to a compromise and we release you. If you do not agree to a compromise we will re-arrest you and put you back". Is that the function of the Government? What is the function of Government? Should they not induce them to go back to their homes, affording them such unconditional protection as is necessary? Is that all that a Government will do when a whole population have to flee from a place out of fear. Would it not be the duty of Government to give them unconditional protection and ask them to remain there at all costs and have the question of their crimes investigated afterwards? And then we find these people, Sir, begging in the streets of Rawalpindi, and people going about on their behalf begging all the way down to Madras. Is it creditable to any Government that a whole population should be wandering in the streets of Rawalpindi? What are we to think of a Government that do not pass restless, sleepless nights over an incident of that sort? Sir, people come to us with their grievances in various matters, but our powers are limited. As I said already, they come to us from Kohat, they come to us from Indian States, they come to us with various bundles of grievances. People come to us as if we had any power to redress their grievances. The other day Mr. Jinnah and other friends of mine had the misfortune to see a number of people who exhibited wounds on their bodies, scars on their bodies, saying that these were inflicted by some political administration or at the instance of some political administrator by the police. (*The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman*: "What political administrator?"). In the Nabha State. (*The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman*: "Was it Mr. Wilson-Johnstone?") No, no. What they said was they got those injuries when confined in the jails in Nabha State. Well, they come to us, but what is the power we have to deal with such cases? What are the Government doing in these matters? That is what I want to ask the Government? Did the Government investigate? Did the Government see these people? They are there in Rawalpindi. They are here in the streets of Delhi. Sir, they come all the way to Delhi showing the marks upon them. Are we not Indians? Would our hearts not be moved when we see such sights? What is it we ought to do when they complain of all sorts of grievances which we have no power to redress? My Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya communicated the matter to His Excellency the Viceroy and there it has to be left. We are not able to bring it up here. This is one of the disadvantages

under which we labour under the present constitution. We are not able to take official notice of such things, and therefore we complain that the constitution is thoroughly unsound. It requires radical change in various other matters also, and that is why we say with reference to all this there should be a radical change in the constitution. Sir, it is quite true that law and order is perhaps better maintained now in 1925 than it was in 1921. But are we to be content with that? Sir, many Governors who were unpopular, many Kings and Emperors who were historically unpopular, maintained law and order. But, Sir, what is a greater ideal of government is to see a contented and prosperous people over whom God has placed them in charge. Sir, it is that ideal they should aspire to. Law and order are nothing compared with contentment and prosperity. Sir, can it be said that there is any contentment and prosperity among the people of India or rather that people are contented with the present situation in India? That is why we lodge our protests by means of these votes; we record our want of confidence in the Government because they are not really responsible to the representations of the people. As I said before, the Government are unresponsive to the people. No doubt they are irresponsible under the law to the people; but they are also unresponsive to the demands of the people, and that is why we wish to lodge this protest.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support the motion which is before the House. The motion is of an extraordinary character, and therefore it is necessary that we should not record our votes without giving reasons in support of it. My Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru has already stated at length the reasons which have urged him to put forward this motion. In addition to those reasons and in emphasising them I wish to make it clear that the necessity for this motion arises from the very peculiar situation in which the country is placed. We have for a long time past asked that the constitution of the government of this country should be modified. We have succeeded but very partially. Before the war we agitated for a real constitutional government being established here. After the war also we agitated, and we know that the fruits of that agitation have been very small. The system of government which has been introduced has in our estimation been found to be very inadequate and very unsatisfactory. The system has had its trial; it had its trial before this present Assembly came into existence—during the first Assembly; and we find now that there is greater unanimity among Indians than there was at any time previous to this, that the system is inadequate and unsatisfactory and that it requires a real and radical change. The motion before the House wants to challenge, to arrest attention to the necessity for this change. How do we find ourselves situated at present? Dyarchy has been established in the provinces; dyarchy has been pronounced to be a failure by the Minority of the Reforms Committee which was appointed by the Government last year. The reasons in support of that view have been so well summarised in the minority report of that Committee, that it is hardly necessary for me to go into them. They have also pointed out that there

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

is a necessity for the introduction of responsibility in the Central Government. The reasons which they have given briefly in support of this view are already known to Members. And I submit that the time has come when the question should be very closely and carefully examined. Under the old system the Governor General occupied a position different from the one which he occupies now. What is our grievance against the present system of the Executive Council of the Government of India? Our grievance is that it is a hybrid system, that it is a system which is neither a clear despotism nor an approach to anything like a democratic constitutional government. The Governor General has some powers, which powers are especial to him. He exercises them as the Governor General, and he exercises other powers as the Governor General in Council, and over him is placed the Secretary of State. These three entities constitute the Government of India, which is the agent of the British Parliament. Now, the Governor General exercises a great deal of power which is not exercised in any country where civilization has reached the stage which India has reached, where a regular system of government prevails such as has prevailed in India for a hundred years and more. The Governor General ought not to have all those powers which he enjoys at present. The question requires to be examined, and it is not right that it should be left any more without being fully examined. In the constitution of the Government of India, as the Executive Council, the Governor General is in charge of the Foreign Department. There is no Member for Foreign Affairs, and the Governor General discharges those functions. We think that this is a very unsatisfactory arrangement. The Governor General has a great deal to do, and the foreign and political affairs of the Indian States demand that there should be a separate Member in charge of these affairs who could deal with them in the first instance, so that they may be dealt with later on by the Executive Council as a whole. We feel that this power should not continue to remain in the hands of the Governor General, and we think that this is also a change which has become overdue. We find that under the existing arrangements, the Governor General having charge of the Political Department, matters are not always satisfactorily arranged. We find, for instance, that the Governor General exercises a great deal of power so far as the Indian Princes are concerned, and yet we do not know that there is any body of people on the face of the earth who require to have matters which concern them more carefully looked into than the Ruling Princes of India. We feel that there ought to be a separate Member in charge of foreign and political affairs so that they may receive more attention. We have seen in the case of one of these Indian States that when we tried to raise a question regarding its administration in this House it was disallowed. It is inconceivable that in the supreme Legislative Assembly of India it should be prohibited by rules and regulations, and that any question or Resolution relating to such a State should be disallowed. I tried last year to have a discussion raised in connection with the occurrences at Jaito. The Honourable the Home Member raised an objection to my doing so. I tried it a second time: I was again opposed. Recently I gave notice of some questions relating to what was reported to have happened in Jaito, and those questions were ruled out by the President of the Assembly under the existing rules. I do not complain that he has acted wrongly. As the rules stand, I think the President was entitled to say that it was doubtful whether my questions could be allowed.

I say doubtful, because it was admitted last year by the Honourable the Home Member that the Government of India were in charge of the Nabha administration through the Administrator whom they have appointed, and I venture to submit, without any disrespect to the Chair, that the Government of India being directly in charge of the administration of Nabha—it has been so for the last eighteen months—it is nothing more than doubtful whether the rules would or would not justify the asking of questions relating to that administration in this House. But as the rules stand, I do not complain of the President's ruling. I draw attention to this merely to show the need for revising the constitution. It is an anomaly that while a question can be raised in this Assembly relating to any subject of His Majesty in any part of the British Empire, we cannot ask any question relating to what has happened or what is happening in an Indian State of which the Government are in charge. We hear stories of what has happened which are very disquieting, which are alarming. We have heard recently that there has been a great deal of complaint of ill-treatment of prisoners in the jails in the Nabha territory. We have tried to have the facts ascertained. Some of us asked for permission to visit Nabha and to see things for ourselves. The Government did not see their way to acceding to our request. We have tried to raise the question by questions in this House and we have been defeated. I submit, Sir, and I hope everybody will agree, including the Home Member, that this is a very unsatisfactory state of things, when we cannot raise a question regarding the ill-treatment of His Majesty's subjects in a territory which is being administered by a British officer directly under the Government of India. I therefore, think, Sir, that that also shows the necessity for the revision of the constitution of the Executive Council of India.

I might also mention another matter to which the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar referred, namely, to the report of the Committee which was appointed relating to the North-West Frontier Province. There were two reports submitted by that Committee, a majority report and a minority report. Several years have passed. The people of the North-West Frontier Province desired that there should be a change introduced. I understand that they would like some change to be introduced, whether it was in the direction recommended by the majority, or whether it was in the direction recommended by the minority. But they do want that some action should be taken and they complain that no action has been taken. When the Government appoint a committee and then shelve its report indefinitely, when they do not carry out any of the recommendations of either the majority or the minority of the committee, it shows that the Executive Council of the Government of India is not quite as efficient a body as it should be.

There is another matter to which also Mr. Rangachariar drew attention, and that is the regrettable happenings at Kohat. Now, this is not the time to go into the details of what happened, but there are certain facts which cannot be overlooked. The facts to which my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar drew attention are important enough to call for an inquiry. It was in September last that these disturbances took place in Kohat. Thirty-five hundred of His Majesty's subjects left the place in utter fear of what they were exposed to. From that time up to this the Government have not been able to take these men back to Kohat, not been able to establish such conditions that they should be able to go back in confidence to Kohat to live there. These men have lived for these six months in

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

Rawalpindi on the charity of their co-religionists. The Government cannot say that this is a state of things which is creditable to them. We think that there should have been an inquiry. The House will remember that shortly after the occurrence took place, several Members of this Assembly, both Hindu and Muhammadan, agreed to recommend that there should be an inquiry instituted by the Government. The Government did not see their way to institute such an inquiry. They appointed a junior Magistrate of four years' standing to investigate and to make a report. The Magistrate made an inadequate and unsatisfactory report. Upon that report the Chief Commissioner based his review, and upon that review and the report the Government of India based their conclusions. Men who were most deeply and directly interested were not given sufficient and fair opportunity of presenting their case. There was no regular inquiry. I am aware that His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to ask the Foreign Secretary to visit Kohat. I am also aware that the Honourable Sir Charles Innes visited Peshawar and Kohat in that connection; but what we submit is that where according to official admissions a large number of men were killed and a much larger number were wounded, where the entire Hindu population had to leave Kohat in the most distressing circumstances, where extensive incendiarism and a number of deaths had taken place, the matter called for an open and independent inquiry. If such an inquiry were made, I do not care who was found to blame, if the Hindus were to blame they should have been censured and punished for it, and if the Muhammadans were to blame they should have been censured and punished for it. But the inquiry was not made. My complaint is that the matter demanded such an inquiry and my regret is that Government did not see the need for it. The result has been that there is a widespread feeling that the Government has shown callousness in regard to the suffering of the thirty-five hundred odd Hindus who were in Rawalpindi. Many of us feel that the procedure adopted by the Government has been extremely unsatisfactory. Whoever may have been to blame in the first instance for what happened, that the outrages were of a diabolical character nobody can dispute, and yet, the action taken, or rather the inaction, the omission to take action by the local officers, constitutes a very sad chapter in the incidents. My own belief is that if an inquiry were made, it would probably be found, as the Hindus alleged, that the local officers were responsible to a large extent, by reason of their inaction or failure to act in the right way and at the right time, for three-fourths of the sufferings which the people were exposed to. When definite charges like that have been made in the public press and in the memorials addressed by Hindus to the Government, the matter did call for an inquiry. But such an inquiry was not made. On the other hand, the Government caught hold of leading Hindus and put them into jail. The most prominent Hindu of Kohat was put into jail and he was kept in jail for several months. Other prominent Hindus were caught hold of and kept in jail. They were kept there long, and they were let out on bail only on the condition that they should go out and try to bring about a reconciliation between Musalmans and Hindus. When they failed to bring about a reconciliation they were again put into jail and finally released only when an agreement between Hindus and Musalmans was brought about. I submit that that was an outrage upon the outrage which had already been committed upon them.

Mr. K. Ahmed: How do you know?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I know it for a fact. I have made inquiries. I have got the facts with me. I submit, Sir, that the whole affair called for an open and independent inquiry by a committee on which Hindus and Muhammadans and Europeans should be represented. We did not want that there should have been a one-sided inquiry. We wanted an inquiry by a committee on which Hindus and Mussalmans and some Europeans would be represented, so that the truth may be found out and the facts established.

The questions that arise in this connection now are, what is to be done in regard to these people who are at Rawalpindi? Have the conditions which are necessary to restore a sense of security among them been established? If they have not been established so far, who is to blame for it? What is needed to be done? What steps have the Government taken to restore a sense of security? If the steps that the Government have taken are sufficient they should be explained. If they are not sufficient, they should be added to. The object is not to attack the Government for the pleasure of attacking them. There is no pleasure in attacking the Government. We want to know what has been done and we want to know what more it is proposed to do. An inquiry may yet be found necessary, to find out upon whom to lay the blame for the large scale incendiarism and loot which took place. I am told that nearly 475 houses and shops were burnt, and that the people were made to lose their property of enormous value. The question will then arise, it does arise, whether there should be any compensation given to them. If the Government officers were not seriously to blame, the matter will stand on one footing. But it will stand on a different footing if the inquiry shows that the Government officers who were on the spot did not do their duty properly. It is urged that as there was a cantonment adjoining the Kohat city, troops could be called in five minutes' time and the whole of the trouble could be nipped in the bud. Troops were called for a time, but they were withdrawn and placed outside the walls of the city to guard them and the frontier constabulary was left within the city itself with the police. That arrangement did not give the people the protection that they wanted. If when the disturbances broke out sufficient troops had been called and distributed in different parts of the city to strike a sense of security among the inhabitants, and also to strike a sense of terror in the minds of the wrong doers, probably the greatest part of the evil which was wrought in Kohat would have been averted.

Mr. W. S. J. Willson: What would have been your complaint if they had fired?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: If there was justification for firing, I would not have complained, but if they had fired without justification, I should have said that they deserved condemnation. It was not a question of firing. My conviction is that if the troops had been distributed in a proper manner in the different parts of the city, the trouble would have been nipped in the bud.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Do you think that the committee you propose would come to a unanimous decision?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Supposing you and I and two other Members, Hindus and Muhammadans, and two Europeans of this Assembly sit and inquire, why should we not be able to come to a unanimous conclusion?

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: We have had committees so far in which we have got a majority report and a minority report. What action is the Assembly to take in that case?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: That is a matter for the future. I expect we shall agree, as honest men should agree about the facts and the inferences about which we may disagree, we can discuss here.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Then those who do not agree are not honest?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I do not think that is a proper inference to be drawn from what I have said. The facts are clear. We want an inquiry, an honest, impartial inquiry by a committee of Hindus, Mussalmans and Europeans in order to find out what the facts are, and if the facts show that while we must condemn the action of those who indulged in incendiarism and in loot, we must also find out what part of the outrages and the evils that took place was due to the omission on the part of the authorities to take such action as they could have taken. That is an aspect of the case to which it is necessary to draw the attention of the House. I submit that if there was a proper committee to inquire into the matter, we should know what action the local officers took and how far they were responsible for what had happened. From all I have learnt from the Kohatase,—and I myself had been to Kohat, I have seen places of worship desecrated and the bazar burnt, practically from one end to the other, nearly the whole of it—I have seen numerous houses burnt, and I have heard with my own ears the tales of woe and sorrow from men, women and boys who repeated them to me at Rawalpindi. These are facts which require to be gone into, and I do not think it will be difficult to arrive at a unanimous conclusion regarding them. But the point I was dwelling upon was this, let us assume that it was found after an inquiry that the local officials had not taken the steps that they should have taken, that the higher officers also had not taken the steps which they . . .

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Does the Honourable Member make that charge or not?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I do make that charge that the local officials who were on the spot did not do their duty, and I regret to make that charge against the local officers, the Deputy Commissioner, and the Chief Commissioner, whose callousness in this matter I deplore. I also make the charge that the Government of India have not dealt with the question in the manner they should have done. I am very sorry to make this charge, but I make it, and I am ready to substantiate every bit of it if a committee is appointed.

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur (West Coast and Nilgiris: Muhammadan): Don't you want a committee to inquire also into the causes of the Malabar rebellion?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: When you take up that question I will express my opinion on it. I never opposed any inquiry into the Malabar rebellion. I have never said a word opposing it.

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadar: Don't you ask for it?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I am not at present asking for it, but when you ask for it I will express my opinion thereon.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Your opinion is not shared by the majority. (A Voice: "You are not the majority.")

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I beg Members of this House not to import any unnecessary heat into this matter. Let us discuss it calmly. It is not a matter in which we ought to take a partisan attitude. Let us consider the question calmly. If we disagree let us agree to disagree. What I am submitting is this. If it is shown that the authorities failed to do their duty, that the authorities, while they had troops available in the cantonment, did not call out or use the troops as they should have done, and allowed the disturbances to assume the proportions they did, and that for days together houses were burnt and looted and all the properties of the Hindus were taken away—if those facts were established, then it will be for the Assembly to consider what help, if any, should be given from the public revenues to the men who have suffered the losses. I wish to make it clear that my point is that the local authorities failed to do their duty by the people who were exposed to those outrages at the hands of their townsmen. Those who committed those outrages ought to be condemned: they deserve condemnation. But I submit with regret that their part almost shades into the background in the presence of the callousness and neglect which the local authorities, and later on, the higher authorities, have shown in this matter. Therefore what I want to know is what action Government have taken in this matter? To what extent have Government decided to help the sufferers? Is there any hope of a complete rehabilitation of Hindus and if so to what extent have the proposals towards that end gone?

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: On a point of order, Sir. Are we discussing the motion of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru in regard to the reduction of the Demand or are we discussing Kohat affairs?

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member suggest that Government are not constitutionally responsible for Kohat?

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Supposing the constitution is changed, and the Assembly was invested with full powers, would the Assembly from here direct the affairs in Kohat so many miles away?

Mr. President: That would depend on the discretion of the Assembly. Meanwhile, the North-West Frontier Province is under the charge of the Governor General in Council.

Mr. K. Ahmed: There was a Resolution before the Assembly and a date was fixed but unfortunately it was not reached. Let the same matter come before the Assembly again and the Assembly will consider it first and I think that unless it is decided the Honourable Pandit has got no *locus standi* to refer to the matter.

Mr. President: The subject is before the Assembly and the Pandit is quite in order in discussing it.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I thank you, Sir. I submit that the Government should make a clear statement as to the steps which have been taken so far to restore these 3,500 Hindus to their homes in Kohat. I submit that the Government should give this House an opportunity to express its opinion regarding the adequacy or the inadequacy of the proposals which

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

they may have on hand. I feel I must say, without any disrespect to any individual Member of the Government, that there should be a portfolio in the charge of a Foreign Member, so that he may be responsible directly to the Executive Council and to the Legislative Assembly for the administration of the affairs in a province which is not yet a regular administration like the Punjab and other parts of the country, and that is one of the reasons why I complain of the present constitution of the Executive Council.

I come, Sir, next to the office of the Commander-in-Chief. He administers the Army. The constitution of the Council in that respect also requires to be changed. The other day we have heard His Excellency's views regarding the reduction of the Army. While the Assembly is anxious further to reduce the expenditure on the Army, His Excellency told us that he would not agree, while he remained Commander-in-Chief. He would not agree to reduce the army any further. That is directly in opposition to the recommendation of the Brussels Conference which recommended that not more than 20 per cent. of the revenue of a country should be spent on the defence of the country.

Mr. E. Burdon: May I interrupt the Honourable Member? His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said that he would not consent to a further reduction of fighting troops—which is a very different thing.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Thank you. I do not think that the expenditure can be reduced sufficiently without reducing the strength of the fighting troops. However we would not complain of it, so far as it will go, but I go further . . .

Mr. E. Burdon: May I interrupt once more? His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief promised that he would look into this particular possibility.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I am thankful to the Honourable the Army Secretary for reminding me of it. I hope His Excellency will look into it. But I submit that during the time that has elapsed since the Retrenchment Committee reported the reduction in Army Expenditure should have been greater; it should have been nearer 50 crores than it is to-day, and while I acknowledge gratefully all that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has done for improving the Indian army and also in the matter of the reductions, I complain that enough has not been done, and that enough will not be done so long as the Executive Council will continue to be constituted as it is. It is necessary that there should be in the Executive Council of the Government of India a member for national defence, and that that member should be an Indian who should have the responsibility of presenting the Army Budget to this Assembly. The Commander-in-Chief should command the Army. All matters relating to the command should be directly under his charge, but the presentation of the Budget, the responsibility of laying the Budget before the Assembly, and of explaining to the country why the expenditure asked for is needed for the defence of the country, should be laid on the shoulders of an Indian member. An opportunity should thus be given to Indians to prepare Indians to defend their own country. His Excellency's remarks on the question of a Military College make us feel, Sir, that the constitution of the Executive Council requires improving. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief should be the administrative head of the army, but not

to be a member of the Executive Council. There should be a member for national defence, and especially an Indian member, who should be in charge of the responsibility of presenting the Budget and of asking for the Army expenditure.

I draw attention next, Sir, to the Home Member's office. The Home Member under the present arrangement is also unsatisfactory (Laughter). I do not mean anything personal; I am not going to say anything personal of any Member of the Government. I hope my Honourable friends will accept the assurance from me that in the remarks I am making, there is nothing personal to any of them, and I hope they will not take it as personal. What I mean, Sir, is that while the Home Member is at present called the Home Member—I suppose "home" there means India—he has no responsibility to the representatives of the people of India for the administration which he carries on. I do not know whether the Home Member feels comfortable in that anomalous position. But we do feel the discomfort of it. We find that he has no power to respond to the wishes of the home people in the matters which are under his administration. This Assembly passes a Resolution, but the Home Member seems to be powerless to give effect to the Resolution. Last year there was a desire for a great constitutional change. The Home Member did help to create the Reforms Inquiry Committee, but he was not able to satisfy the desire of this House for a larger Committee, for a round table conference or for an inquiry on a larger scale. I do not blame him individually for it. I blame the system for it. There are other important Resolutions of this Assembly which have been disregarded. The Resolutions of this Assembly on many other subjects have been disregarded. I do not think, therefore, Sir, that the office of Home Member should continue as it is at present when the Member in charge is not responsible to the Legislature, and does not feel that it is his duty to respond to or carry out the wishes of this Assembly as expressed by its Resolutions. Let me remind the House of one or two other Resolutions. There was a Resolution passed by this House on the 26th February last which urged that the Governor General in Council should be pleased to appoint a Committee to inquire into the grievances of the Sikhs. I will not go into those grievances prior to the date on which that Resolution was passed. A whole year has passed since that Resolution was adopted by this House, and I regret to find that Government have not taken any action on it. The House will remember the details of the grievances of the Sikhs which were narrated in this House. Not only has no Committee been appointed since that time to inquire into them, but what is worse, the grievances of the Sikhs have become more acute. It was proposed by Sir Gordon Fraser last year after hearing the debate, that a committee of three High Court Judges should be appointed to inquire into the grievances of the Sikhs. But instead of appointing three High Court Judges to make a full inquiry, the Government of India appointed a junior Magistrate to try some of the men of the Jathas who complained that they or their fellows had been unjustly fired on. The Government of India was content with his Report. Such a Committee as was recommended was not appointed to inquire into the grievances. At one time it was reported that the Government had appointed General Sir William Birdwood as President of a Committee which was going to investigate the matter. We had hoped that the Committee would meet, but the Committee never met because, it was said, the Government and the Sikhs could not agree in certain preliminary negotiations. The Sikhs

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

complained that the Government, after having agreed to certain terms, went back upon their agreement, but the Government have not yet published the reasons why these negotiations failed, why they broke up. The Government ought to publish the papers in order that the public may know the truth. We are not accusing the Government of not doing any particular thing or of doing another thing; we want to know why the Government have not done anything? If they have done anything, we want to know what they have done so that the country may know what the situation actually is? The failure of the Birdwood Committee at a time when it was expected that the grievances of the Sikhs would be soon settled, has given great pain to the country. The prosecution of the Sikhs has continued. When His Excellency Sir Malcolm Hailey assumed charge of the Government of the Punjab, it was hoped that the grievances of the Sikhs would be inquired into and settled. Unfortunately this has not been so. I am sorry to say that His Excellency has adopted an attitude of partisanship towards what are called Sudhar Committees, or Sikh Sudhar Committees, which have sprung up since His Excellency went to the

3 P.M. Punjab. He has encouraged the formation of such Committees in numerous districts of the Punjab, and these Committees have been put forward as rivals to the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee. The Sikhs complain that their prosecutor has gone on and that they have been unjustly dealt with. I submit, Sir, that this is an extremely unsatisfactory state of things.

Now, who are these Sikhs? These Sikhs are men who have in time past rendered a great service to the Government. Writing about the siege of Delhi during the days of the Mutiny Charles John Griffiths said:

“Our Empire in Hindustan—during the month of May especially—trembled in the balance. There was infinite cause for alarm for months afterwards even to the fall of Delhi; but at no time were we in such straits as that period when the loyalty or defection of the Sikh regiments and people was an open question.

The genius of Sir John Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab, warded off the danger. That eminent man, the saviour of India, issued a proclamation calling on the Sikhs to aid us in our trouble. They came at once in hundreds—nay, thousands, to enlist on our side. Veterans of Ranjit Singh's Khalsa Army, the men who had withstood us on equal terms in many sanguinary battles, enrolled themselves in the ranks of the British Army, and fought faithfully for us to the end of the war. Their help was our safety; without these soldiers, and the assistance rendered by their chieftains, Delhi could never have been taken; while, on the other hand, had they risen and cast in their lot with the mutinous sepoys, no power on earth could have saved our Empire from total annihilation.”

Speaking many years afterwards in 1892, the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, Sir James Lyall, said:

“The British Government owed the Sikhs a debt of gratitude for their large share of the credit for victories won by Punjabi regiments in Hindustan and in China, and afterwards in Abyssinia and Afghanistan.”

In the last war, the Sikhs won one-third of the distinctions which the province of the Punjab earned and they contributed a very large number to the fighting force of the Army. The history of the war published by the *Times* gives an account of the services rendered by the Sikhs and it praises them for the continued support, for the steadfast loyalty and bravery which they have displayed in the service of the King-Emperor. I regret to say that it is a large number of these men who have been subjected during the last four years to a series of prosecutions. I will not relate the

whole story which was related last year in this House of the grievances of the Sikhs up to the 26th February last. But I wish to draw attention to a most pathetic description of the situation which was given by a Subadar Major, who had won distinctions in the Army, in the written statement in which he put the case of the Sikh military pensioners, who had gone in a Jatha to the Guru-ka-Bagh. I will read a portion of it to the House to give it an idea of how they feel:

"We avail of this opportunity," (*said the Subadar*) "to make it clear to the Government how the Sikh mind feels in regard to the Gurdwara Reform Movement generally and the Guru-ka-Bagh affair especially. The members of this Jatha are glad that they rendered services to the Crown of which no loyal heart need feel ashamed. We fought on the battle-fields of Tirah, Chitral, Afghanistan, Burma, China, East Africa, the Soudan, Egypt, Persia, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Gallipoli, Russia, France, and innumerable other fields less worthy of note. This service was done in the extremes of climate. While in France thousands of Sikh soldiers stood entrenched for days together in icy water. They also saw service at Rumadee, in Mesopotamia, where the thermometer stood at 135 degrees and there were no fewer than 190 deaths from thirst in one single day. The world seriously doubts if the onrushing tide of victorious German hordes could have been stemmed but for the hand to hand bayonet fight by the Sikhs at Neu Chapelle and Ypres. At Kut-ul-Amara we held out when all chances of help became entirely remote; when all communications were cut off and we had no provisions save the flesh of horses and mules to feed on. Twenty-four of us were wounded in action, and, having been incapacitated for further military service, retired on pension, while one lost his leg and two got their eyesight injured by gas. Almost all of us possess medals of one distinction or another, in addition to two I. O. M.'s, one D. S. M. and one M. S. M. Most of us belong to families whose blood has seen continuous military service since the unhappy times of the Indian Mutiny when the British flag stood tottering on the soil of India. We did nothing more than what our duty to the Crown demanded, and that we did to the utmost of our ability and strength. But since the Gurdwara Reform Movement began the official attitude towards it has given rise to painful misgivings in our mind which, as the days passed, have acted severely on our feelings. We have witnessed the Nankana Sahib massacre, the official sympathy for the aggrieved party. We have seen the Government's solicitude for the inviolability of their solemn pledges not to interfere in the religious liberties of their subjects, in the matter of Kirpan, black turbans and the Golden Temple keys affairs. All this we have seen, heard and felt; felt like Sikhs, felt like a friend rudely disillusioned from his loving and blind faith in the honesty of others."

Then he went on to speak of the Guru-ka-Bagh trouble. Sir, it is a thousand pities that these troubles have not yet been put an end to completely, that peace has not been restored to the Sikh community, and that their prosecution is still going on. The Gurdwara Bill is yet not before the country. I am told that five Sikh Members of the Legislative Council of the Punjab and two members of Government have prepared a Bill. At the request of several Members, Sikh and Hindu, of the Punjab Council I myself prepared a Gurdwara Bill which was sent to the Government of the Punjab some months ago. I do not know what decision the Government have arrived at. It is high time that the Government gave the Sikhs a really good Gurdwara Bill by means of which they should be able to control their temples in the right way. It is also high time that the persecution of prominent men of a community which has rendered such splendid service to the Crown during the last 75 years—service such as no other community has rendered—should be stopped and their services properly recognised. It is of course in the power of any man, not to speak of a Governor of a province it is in the power of even a District Magistrate to harass a number of His Majesty's subjects to a large extent. I do not mean to say that Sir Malcolm Hailey is harassing the Sikhs, but His Excellency and an important member of his Council, namely, Sir John Maynard have openly encouraged the formation of Sikh Sudhar Committees.

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

These committees have been formed in various districts of the Punjab to oppose the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee. While this has been going on, the Sikhs complain that a number of their men have been prosecuted and punished, and a large amount of fine has been imposed upon them. I submit that the case calls for the appointment of a Committee. The Sikhs have a claim upon the Government of India and they have a claim upon this Assembly that it should recommend to the Government of India that the problem relating to the Sikhs should not be left to be dealt with by the Government of the Punjab. This problem should be dealt with by a committee which should be appointed by the Government of India and which should consist of men who will command public confidence, so that the whole question may be properly gone into. I do not desire, Sir,—no man who is a well-wisher of the Sikhs would desire—that the relations between the Sikhs and the Government should continue to be strained. It is desirable therefore that a committee should be appointed which should inquire into the whole matter. The Sikhs complain that while their relations with the Government had come to be merely normal in June 1923, when they began to agitate in connection with the so-called abdication by His Highness the Maharaja of Nabha, the Government adopted an adverse attitude towards them. They challenged the statement made by the Government of India in their communiqué which was referred to in this House that the Maharaja of Nabha had voluntarily abdicated his *Gadi*. They challenged the correctness of that statement. They requested the Government of India to publish the facts relating to the matter so that the agitation might subside. But the Government of India did not do so. On the contrary, they began to prosecute the leaders of the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee. A case has been going on now for the last 17 months against a number of the leaders of the Sikh community who are in jail. It is not too much to expect that there ought to be some member in the Executive Council of the Government of India who should have the heart to feel what it is due to the Sikh community from the Government and who should have the courage to take action which will put an end to the grievances of a body whose loyalty has been surpassed by any other community in India. I hope the Government will recognise the necessity for such action and take such action at an early date.

Time will not permit me, Sir, to dwell at greater length upon this case. But I want very briefly to refer to one other matter before I close. That is with regard to the position of the Finance Member of this Government. I submit, Sir, that it is high time that we had an Indian as a Finance Member of the Executive Council of the Government. Without any disrespect to the Honourable the Finance Member, I feel that this question requires to be investigated. The management of Indian finance during the last 50 years has not always been happy. I think, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member will be the first to admit that the finances of India have not been managed as well as they could have been managed, and we have complained for a long time of many things in connection therewith. We have complained that the currency of this country has not been put on a sound footing; we have complained that the question of exchange has not been properly solved; we have complained that a State Bank has not been set up; we have complained that the finances of the country have not been so managed as to secure the largest measure of advantage to the people of India out of the revenues of the people of India. We have asked that the Gold Standard Reserve and the Paper Currency

Reserve should be brought to India, and we have asked that the amount of that fund should be made available to trade and industry in this country. But what has happened? While in India merchants and tradesmen have found it difficult to obtain money at 6 and 7 per cent., ay even at 8 and 9 per cent., of interest, money held in the Gold Standard Reserve in England has been loaned out to merchants for a return of only 2½ per cent. or about that. I submit this wrong has lasted too long now and it ought to be ended. We feel that, while we may have sometimes very clever Finance Members from England, they come here only for a short time. In the first place they have to look about and undo the wrongs and mistakes committed by their predecessors. When they have done so, they sometimes feel so alarmed at the situation, that they wish to place Indian finances on a scientifically sound footing, and in that effort they become, probably unconsciously, somewhat callous to the sufferings of the people. They may be concerned, as the Finance Member has been concerned, to put the system on a sound footing, as he believes it, but they may care less for reducing taxation and relieving the sufferings of the people. I feel, I may be wrong; if I am wrong I shall be very sorry to know it, but at present I feel that the finances could be better managed, better administered than they have been, that the high taxation imposed for many years ought to have been reduced, that the surpluses we have received ought to have led the Honourable the Finance Member to reduce taxation. The disposal of the surplus of last year and of the surplus of this year would show that the Finance Member does not feel as deep a sympathy with the people as he ought to. I am very sorry to say so, and if I am wrong I will most sincerely apologise to him, but I must say what I honestly feel, and I feel that with these surpluses there should have been greater relief brought to the people than has been done. In the circumstances it seems to me that we Indians should have a chance now. Ever since the English Government took up the administration of this country, we have always had an Englishman or Britisher as a Finance Member. May I ask that the Government of India should now seriously think of finding from among the many Indians who are capable men and who can deal with Indian finance, a successor to Sir Basil Blackett, so that this long-standing complaint may be removed? Of course I hope, that before the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett leaves his present office, he will have done a great deal more than he has done to satisfy the reasonable, the legitimate claims of the people. I feel a great deal more can be done, and I earnestly hope that he will do so before he lays down the reins of his office. Even in the present year there is much room for improvement. My Honourable friend Mr. Willson wants me to mention where it is; I will mention it at once. I think that when the Honourable Finance Member presented the Budget last year to this Assembly, he must either have known that there would be a surplus in the military Budget or he should have known it. Either his Department informed him when he presented his Budget last year in this Assembly that he should expect a surplus of about 3½ crores or 3 crores, or they did not inform him or he did not test the figures given him. If he did not do so, it would be regrettable. If he had the information, I cannot understand why he should not have informed this House that this surplus would be available. He knows the revised estimates of army expenditure have been nearly uniform for the last three years, and the revised estimates of last year were presented just a little before the Budget was presented. He could certainly at the end of February have obtained information regarding the expenditure which had been

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

incurred for 11 months. And when there was only one month of the year left he might have left 50 crores as a margin to adjust any differences that might arise during the month; but he certainly should have known that there would be a surplus of about 3 crores last year. If that surplus had been indicated to this Assembly last year, if it had been availed of by the Finance Member last year, the reduction in the provincial contributions proposed this year should have been proposed last year and the sufferings of the people should have been remedied to that extent. (*Mr. W. S. J. Willson*: "Who threw them out last year?") We threw them out because it was a hopeless case. We wanted to show how disgusted we felt. Having pleaded, asked, remonstrated, we found that nothing availed and we thought we should tell the Government that the responsibility was theirs; they must carry the Finance Bill by certification. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "You did not want to take the responsibility of choosing between salt and provincial contributions.") I beg your pardon; we did not shirk the responsibility of choosing between salt and provincial contributions. The matter is very simple. I have heard some Honourable Members say that what was done last year was a mistake. With due deference to them they have not understood our position. We felt that we were left with no option but to adopt the course we did because for years together we pleaded, and pleaded in vain, to have a voice in reducing the expenditure of Government. What the Government wanted us to do was that while Government should make the dispositions of the revenues which are collected, we should vote the taxes. The Assembly will remember in how many instances the Government refused to accede to the request of the Assembly in the matter of the reduction of expenditure. When we found that the Government were adamant, were immovable, we felt that it was only right that we should throw the responsibility of raising the taxes on the Government which had the power to spend the taxes. That was the reason why we threw out the Finance Bill. Now I submit the Finance Member should certainly have known that there was to be a surplus of 3 crores last year. And I take it that he knows there will be a larger surplus this year than he has budgeted for. In a way he has said so. He has told us in his speech that he expects confidently a reduction next year in the military Budget. I thought when I read that passage in his speech that he had a further surplus at his disposal. The military estimates were going to be reduced and the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett knew they were going to be reduced. My complaint is that he did not put together all these items and with the whole real surplus, which was available give more to the provinces, wipe off the cotton excise duty, and reduce the postal rates. (*Mr. W. S. J. Willson*: "And third-class fares?") My Honourable friend Mr. Willson says "And reduce third-class fares." I am surprised that a shrewd, calm, business man like him should throw out a twit like that. My Honourable friend knows we agreed that there should be money kept in the railway reserve on the distinct promise made by the Honourable the Commerce Member in the presence of all of us that the money so reserved would be spent according to the wishes of this Assembly. I still hope that reserve will be used for reducing third-class fares. I hope in this matter the Government will follow the wishes of the Assembly. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "What about opium?") I will leave it to my Honourable friend to discuss opium.

I think, Sir, that for all these reasons, without any personal disrespect to the Honourable the Finance Member, the time has come when an Indian Member should be placed in the responsible position of managing

the finances of India, that that duty should be placed on the shoulders of an Indian member; and I submit, Sir, that for that object among others we ought to have a thorough revision of the constitution under the Government of India Act, so that these matters may be provided for by Statute, so that the Executive Council of India may become responsible to this Assembly, more capable of promoting the good of the people of this country and more capable of preventing wrongs being done to the people of this country than the present Executive Council is. Without any personal disrespect to the present Members of the Council, I submit that these are some of the reasons which induce me to support this motion that the Demand for the Executive Council should be omitted. It will be asked why do we suggest its omission when a Rs. 100 cut would suffice? Ordinarily a Rs. 100 cut would suffice or a cut of Re. 1. And even without a cut of Re. 1 the opinions we express might be considered by Government. But we have found by experience that unfortunately they do not. It is not a matter of any ordinary grievance against the existing constitution. The matter relates to a complaint against the present constitution of the Executive Council. We know that we have before us the report of the majority of the Reforms Inquiry Committee over which my friend, the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman, presided; we know that the English press and a portion of the press in India is supporting it; we know also that the Indian press is entirely opposed to it or mostly opposed to it; and there is a vast body of opinion in this House which is opposed to the recommendations of the majority. We also know that there is a very large body of opinion, if not a perfect unanimity of opinion, in support of the recommendations of the minority. We know that His Excellency the Viceroy is going to England; and at this juncture we feel that it is the duty of this Assembly to make it plain in the clearest possible terms to the Cabinet in England and to all statesmen there and to the members of Parliament that this Assembly is thoroughly dissatisfied with the present constitution of the Government of India; that this Assembly feels that it is a wrong to the people of India to continue the present constitution as it is; that this Assembly feels that the time has come when Englishmen, if they will rise to a sense of their duty to the people of this country, their own fellow-subjects, ought to stand up and demand a revision of the Statute of 1919 with a view to give Indians a fair voice in the administration of their own country's affairs and a fair chance of serving their fellow-men and their King-Emperor also. We feel that this is the time when our voice should be heard, and it is in order that this voice should be heard that we have proposed this motion. I hope the House will carry it without any dissentient voice in order that the Government in England may feel that even the official Members of the House felt that the occasion was so solemn, that the matters raised were so important (Laughter) that they felt that, if they could not join their voices to the voices of the rest of us who are pleading for right, for justice and for freedom, they did not raise their voices against us.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qayyum (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-official): Sir, I wish I had the command of language like the Honourable Pundit, who has just spoken, to explain my object more clearly; but unfortunately I am handicapped in my power of exposition. Further when the affairs of the Frontier Province come into this House for debate, I am sorry to say it is only like the mention of the conduct of a bad child. It never comes in for anything better. My friends Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya have both referred to the

[Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

Kohat affair in the North-West Frontier Province. I really regret that those incidents should have happened; we had been leading a very quiet and happy life and it was very unfortunate that a case like that should happen in the North-West Frontier Province. But I think it was inevitable from the way in which the Sangathan movement was started in that province and the great bulk of down-country literature was imported there. When the Mahasabha or Hindu Sabha was held in Kohat for the purpose it was inevitable (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "And who is the originator of Sangathan and the Hindu Sabha?") that things like that should happen and that the feelings of the people should be stirred up. I wish the well-wishers of the Hindu community of Kohat had thought of the results of these things going on there. When they are reminded that the frontier is full of explosive material and it is not a good thing to play with it, they will never believe it. But I hope that this one unfortunate incident that has taken place will suffice to assure them that that is a part of the country where these ordinary playthings of publications and holding of Sabhas and marshalling of school boys and Sangathans and *tanzims* will not be of much use towards preserving the tranquillity and peace of the country. The people in the Frontier Province, Sir, have already got enough of martial spirit in them, and as the Persian proverb says, "to remind a mad man of music makes him dance more", any movement of that sort will in that country only result in the people being exasperated more and more. But I would rather like to congratulate those who wanted to start those movements in the Frontier province on the early fruits of their labours. Why should they be ashamed of the early success of their movement in that country? The crop has borne very early fruit, and I think those who wanted to start those movements ought to be proud of their achievements. (*A Voice*: "Have you in any way contributed to it?") But what really surprised me was that when similar cases were happening all over India and when people were in some cases burnt alive and in other cases ransacked and whole districts were depopulated, so far as I know, no question was ever raised in this House by the leaders of the communities, who now ask for an inquiry. I do not believe

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: May I interrupt the Honourable Member for a moment, Sir? That was because in those cases the Government had started prosecutions against the men who had been guilty of outrages and a very large number of men were sentenced to long-term imprisonments. If the same thing had been done in Kohat, probably it would not have been necessary to raise our voice here.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: The Pandit Sahib is quite correct in what he says, but I wish he had allowed the local authorities to make an inquiry into the matter and issue a report, before he had suggested the setting up of an inquiry into this matter. I think it was on the third day of the occurrence, or at the most on the fourth day of the occurrence, that Hindu representatives from Kohat were found in the Assembly Chamber approaching some of the leaders, holding meetings with them in the Chamber rooms and discussing the affairs. Our friends in this House, who suggested a Resolution, did not give any opportunity to the local authorities to inquire into the matter and to take proper action. Could not they refer their visitors to the local authorities? If I remember rightly, I saw most of them closetted in one of the Chamber rooms, discussing the affairs with the leaders of

their community in this House, and before I came to know what had happened, I heard that the Foreign Secretary was running up to Kohat like an arrow from the bow, with the force of the whole Assembly behind him. Perhaps he only went there to bring early and authentic information of what was happening in Kohat, to satisfy the Honourable Members here. But I have got my own suspicions and doubts, and I think that the only object of his visit to Kohat, before the thing was inquired into, was to produce some effect on the local officers. At least those officers must have guessed from his visit that there was a very strong force somewhere behind and that the Government were very anxious to get early news of the affairs. Perhaps he simply went there as I say to get early news. But it was not only that: he was followed by another Member of the Executive Council, I heard to help the Chief Commissioner. I do not know what sort of help was rendered to the poor Chief Commissioner. He is quite an old and experienced man holding charge of a province and I do not know what kind of help he wanted. So far as I know he never asked for any assistance from any Member of the Council to help him. And the third person who happened to be going there was the Commander-in-Chief. And then our Honourable friend the Finance Member happened to be there and he also visited Kohat and quite by chance the Viceroy was passing Rawalpindi on his way to Kashmir, and he sent for the poor Chief Commissioner to talk to him on this very point, Sir. Do I understand that these visits were all by way of formality and only by chance, or were these visits, discussions and interviews to have an effect on the action of the Local Government? I should think that the Assembly had in this case usurped the power of the executive through the heads of the departments here. That is, the Assembly were using the officers to go and express their point of view to the local authorities and it can never be believed that those constant visits of these high dignitaries had no effect on the inquiry of the local authorities and on the subsequent report of these people. (*Pandit Shamlal Nehru*: "Does my Honourable friend mean, Sir, that the report was not quite what it ought to have been?") I am coming to that. I think the report which we have seen in the press has not given the full facts and the real facts of the case in the way in which they should have been given; inasmuch as the iniquity of the starters of those riots has been minimised to a very great extent by these visits and the threats of the introduction of Resolutions in the Assembly. (*An Honourable Member*: "That is a good case of inquiry.") I will come to that too. I am not in the habit of speaking in public and so these little interruptions do disturb me, but I should like, as I suggested in one of my amendments, that a permanent inquiry committee should be set up in this House, consisting of an equal number of members of the two communities, with one impartial judge, if we can get an impartial judge here, because the rival community, before seeing the report, had already condemned the administration, which shows that they do not look upon any person in the present administration of that province or even in the higher classes up here, as impartial, and I do not know whether we should get an impartial man from New Zealand or from America or where from. But what I will suggest is that an impartial man, with an equal number of Hindus and Mussalmans, should constitute a permanent committee in this House like the permanent Standing Finance Committee to inquire into such cases in future. Whenever any occurrence takes place in any part of the country, and one of the communities wishes that it should be inquired into, that Committee must

[Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

start at once and arrogate the powers of the executive on the spot. That seems to me the only solution, or else, I do not know what you can do. If the leaders of the community here had only waited until that report had been published and then criticised it, I should not have been in a position to raise any strong objection. But what I really object to is this, that the threat of the introduction of Resolutions made not only the officers of the local administration but also the higher officers here, nervous and they have bent to the wishes of the majority here to a great extent. If an inquiry is necessary, I think that can be the only way of starting an inquiry. But I do not think any committee will come to any unanimous verdict. From my little experience of this Assembly and the Committees here, I have not come across any unanimous report. In every committee, there is always a majority report and a minority report. Even in very small matters I have noticed that. Perhaps the same thing will happen in this case also. Even yesterday, on the question of Devanagari script, there was a split in this House. But if there were any committee of inquiry the Pandit Sahib should have been one of its members. I happened to be with the Pandit Sahib at Kohat. We both made our inquiries on the spot and perhaps we were good enough Members of this House, not very much lacking in intelligence at least, and we might have come to a unanimous verdict. When we were parting, the Pandit Sahib will remember, I told him that though we could not come to any unanimous finding, at least the facts should not be contradicted by us when speaking on the floor of the House, and we should not be contradicting one another on the facts, by which I really meant that if there were any doubts in his mind that the principal facts are not as stated by the leaders of my community here, I was prepared then to convince him of the real facts. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "Misrepresentation".) I gave him every opportunity to cross-examine the people whom I had collected for his reception. We had collected several thousands and he gave a long speech to them. Then we had a mid-day discussion over the affair for two or three hours, and when parting, we could not come to any decision although the people had assured us that they would abide by our decision—but I thought I was able to convince the Pandit Sahib that the two principal facts were undoubted and incontrovertible, namely, that the immediate cause of the disturbance was the publication of the pamphlet and that the firing was begun by the Hindus. I thought those two facts were undeniable.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: My Honourable friend will excuse my interrupting him. My Honourable friend will remember that I carefully avoided stating any controversial points such as those mentioned by him.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: Because there was an opportunity of contradicting them.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I am not afraid of any contradiction, but because I still want that there should be an inquiry that I did not go into the question on which my Honourable friend and I differ. I still want a committee. If there be an inquiry by a committee of this House I should be quite willing that those disputed points should be inquired into and then both my Honourable friend and myself can speak on it.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Then there was suppression of true facts and only a sidelight was shown.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: I do not know that at that time there was anything else to be done except to see how the trouble started, how the actual rioting began. Supposing for the sake of argument that the troubles which one community suffered were greater than those suffered by the other, I do not think that that can be a measure of the guilt of the parties. If you take the number of houses and shops burnt, as I have already informed the Pandit Sahib in private, the number of Mussalman shops burnt is not less than that of the Hindus. On the other hand, I am prepared to admit that perhaps the Hindu shops had more property than the Mussalman shops and that some of the shops owned by the Mussalmans had been rented by Hindus and they had their property there. Perhaps there may be some such difference, but when you come to blows you do not measure the weight of your blow at the time of the fight, and perhaps some excesses may have happened. There is no doubt, however, that on the first day all the casualties were among Mussalmans and Mussalman children, and though all the eloquence of this House may be employed to prove to the contrary, I shall not be convinced in my mind that I am wrong and that this firing was not started by the Hindus.

Now, Sir, I hold no brief for the Government, and I honestly tell you that I do not admire Government for their too much leniency and regard for the feelings of a number of politicians here. If they show such weakness over there, perhaps there may be some other assembly higher up in the hills of Tirah, who will pass a resolution and send it down to Government, saying "You have not treated us well, we must have an inquiry". They will suggest the names of the Mullah of Karbogha and Mullah Saiyid Akbar, and perhaps the Pandit Sahib will have to meet those members. They being near the spot might possibly have better proof of what they say than the majority of Members in this House who have not been to the spot at all. I do not want to go into the details of this affair. I have a memorandum but it was not for this debate and as a matter of fact I was not prepared for the subject of Kohat on this motion. I submit that if the Government did not take any extraordinary measures—and I can say there is no proof of that—perhaps they did a wise thing. They have saved a lot of trouble which would otherwise have been more ruinous and more wrecking to the people who blame them now for it. They had their difficulties and a good many other reasons too. I need not go into the details of the whole affair, but one thing I will say and that is that this mischief was started by the publication of the pamphlet and the firing was started by the Hindus. Why should the whole law be kept in abeyance for the sake of a few: why? I have nothing to do with the question as to why it was done and why so much regard was paid to the usual cry—it is the Government's look out, but I shall certainly ask my friends here to advise the Kohat Hindus—such of them as are still at Rawalpindi—to give up their self-imposed exile and return to their houses which are still standing almost intact, and assure them that they will receive on their return the same protection as their co-religionists are now enjoying in the tribal territory and in the isolated villages of the settled Districts, at the hands of the Government, and their Muslim brethren.

Mr. Denys Bray (Foreign Secretary): Like my Honourable friend Sir Abdul Qaiyum, I did not come prepared to discuss Kohat on this motion. And I confess, Sir, that I think it a thousand pities, if only for the sake of those co-religionists of the Honourable Pandit who are now gradually finding their way back to their homes, who are gradually rebuilding th

[Mr. Denys Bray.]

shops and houses which have been destroyed, and who are endeavouring to encourage others still in Rawalpindi to pluck up their courage and return to the homes they have loved so well, that he has dragged this matter forward. I think the Honourable Pandit's speech has done a great disservice both to his co-religionists of Kohat and to the country at large.

I propose, Sir, to speak with great brevity. The subject that the Pandit has raised would take me a very long time to discuss in full; but I feel very strongly that this is not the occasion. Indeed I should refrain from speaking altogether, were it not that he has made violent attacks on men who are not here present to defend themselves, and I should hold my manhood cheap if I remained silent.

The Honourable Pandit professes to be anxious for an impartial inquiry by impartial men drawn from every sect in the country. I know enough about this most unhappy case to be able to say, and to say with sincerity and certitude, that there would be as many findings as there would be sects represented on that inquiry. Does my Honourable friend the Pandit really live such a cloistered and fugitive life that he does not know the white-heat intensity of communal feeling which this Kohat tragedy has stirred? It is not confined to the North-West Frontier nor even to the northern Punjab. Does he really live so sheltered from the communal miasma that hangs heavy over India that he should wish such a committee of inquiry to go abroad?

He asks what we have done. We have, Sir, set out the facts of this ghastly tragedy in the pitiless light of truth. We have brought about a settlement, a compromise, not an ideal—for Hindus have complained against it and Moslems have complained against it—but a settlement leading to a reconciliation. My Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar, who permitted himself, if he will allow me to say so, to indulge in a travesty of what our local officers had done, said that we ought to have insisted that these unfortunate Hindus should return to Kohat with unconditional guarantees or securities. He used some such phrase. . . . (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: "Unconditional protection."*) My Honourable friend has been to Kohat and must have picked up some little knowledge of the conditions. How much wiser was Mr. Gandhi

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: What I mean is that British arms are so powerful that I do expect them to give protection to a community which is forced to flee from their homes.

Mr. Denys Bray: I still ask Mr. Rangachariar to listen to the wiser words of Mr. Gandhi:

"The Hindus are to-day" (*Mr. Gandhi was writing some months ago*) "refugees at Rawalpindi and are in fear of their very existence in Kohat should they return without a full guarantee from the Mussalman residents." (*There is no question here of the British arms*) "I count no assurance that might be given by the Government as of any consequence if the Mussalmans are unwilling to receive the Hindus as their friends. They are in an overwhelming majority, with Mussalman tribes within a stone's throw."

(*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: "Where is the Pax Britannica then?"*) Those are the facts. The Pax Britannica is built up on the top of those facts. Sir, what else have we done?

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I am sorry, Sir. . . .

Mr. Denys Bray: I listened with great reluctance to the Honourable Pandit. I beg that he will listen with a similar reluctance to me.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: May I ask, Sir
(On the Foreign Secretary refusing to give way.)

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member knows that the customary rule of debate is that when an Honourable Member has been called to speak and anyone wishes to interrupt him, unless the original Member gives way, he has no right to interrupt him.

Mr. Denys Bray: We have endeavoured, so far as it lay in our power, to provide in a safe manner that which my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar is really seeking after. 30 per cent. of the Police in the Kohat city and cantonments are now Hindu or Sikh. The two sub-inspectors are Hindus. We have endeavoured further, as was foreshadowed at the end of the Resolution, to make the return of the refugees more easy by providing loans. Five lakhs have so far been sanctioned, of which one lakh is without interest. (*An Honourable Member:* "Why not all without interest?") Because we are endeavouring to help those also who, though they are not actually destitute or indigent, are very much in need of temporary assistance. But that is not all, Sir. In passing these orders we made it perfectly plain that if further money were really needed and a case made out, further money would be forthcoming.

Now, who have done all this? Those local officers whom the Pandit has impugned in this House. He referred specifically to Mr. Bolton, the Chief Commissioner—one of the kindest-hearted men who ever served on the frontier, respected from one end of the frontier to another, by Hindu, Mussalman and the rest (Hear, hear). And he referred to the Deputy Commissioner, whose courage (*A Voice:* "Inaction") and action he impugned—Major Reilly, an officer, Sir, on whom fell the task of controlling a very difficult and dangerous situation in Chitral during the Afghan War, for which he was awarded, civilian officer as he was, that high military distinction for valour, the Distinguished Service Order. That is not the sort of man to impugn for inaction or whose courage can be called into account. And what are the charges which the Honourable Pandit dared to level? I am not able, Sir, to retail them all. But this at least I noted down, so monstrous was it. The Honourable Pandit referred to the horrible happenings in Kohat, the horrible deeds, the firing on innocent boys, the terrible arson, the ghastly murders, and the rest of the crimes perpetuated in this awful tragedy by citizens of Kohat. And then he proceeded to say that *their* crimes fade into the background beside the callousness of the Government officers. Sir, in the face of a statement so monstrous, are any more words of mine needed?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): After the excitement, Sir, over this unfortunate question of Kohat, I wish to take the House back to something different. Sir, if we were to discuss the various actions on the part of the Government in the various departments, if we were to write a history of their wrongs and if we were to write a story of our grievances, it might take us months and months. This is not the place for that purpose, but, Sir, I wish to point out to this House to start with that here we are entering our protest against and our condemnation of the constitution in the first instance; in the second place, we are condemning the policy of the Government of India generally.

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

It may be that this vote is going to be recorded on the Executive Council grant. That is purely a question of procedure and nothing else. Therefore, we on the floor of this House to-day for the purpose of this debate must make out a case against the Government of India. It does not matter what are the component parts, whether it is the Governor General who has got some power, whether the Executive Council has got some other powers or the Secretary of State or the three combined together, or on the top of it whether you put the Parliament of Great Britain or not. We are concerned with the Government of India as such and, Sir, I shall confine myself to the major heads of the policy of the Government of India which deserve censure.

Now, Sir, to take first of all our protest against the present constitution, it was said—I think it was Colonel Crawford, who sometimes even tries to understand constitutional question, I think he said after the prompting which came from the commercial magnate of Bengal and after that prompting he said—it introduces a convention of certification. I think I took him down correctly. Now, Sir, let us examine this position. Under the Parliamentary procedure what will happen? If you are going to move a vote of censure on a policy of the Government, you discuss the policy of the Government generally and if that vote is recorded against the Government, what follows? The Government goes, it is defeated. Sir, is this Government going to be defeated by our vote? (*Honourable Members*: "Never, never.") After we have carried this motion, which I have no doubt this House will carry, the very next moment Honourable Members will be sitting there and continuing in their office as Ministers of the Crown. Then, what is the substitute that you can find under this anomalous, extraordinary, constitution, for which there is no parallel in the history of the world? My friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal

4 P.M. in his happy way tried to describe this constitution and the House I think enjoyed the description because it was so true. Now, Sir, what is the nearest thing that we can get to? The nearest thing that we can get to is this that the only way in which we can record not only before the people of this country but before the world that this Government stand defeated is to compel the Viceroy to certify. Otherwise there is an alternative procedure, a cut of Rs. 100. My friend will say, that is all right, why not follow that? Because that will not necessarily, I feel, constitute a clear and unequivocal defeat of the Government. It leaves a doubt and we do not in this case propose to leave any room for doubt. You will find, Sir, that this is not the only country which resorts to a procedure of that kind. Now, Sir, let us see whether we have a real case of protest against this constitution. And for that purpose, Sir, I see that my Honourable friend the Home Member agrees with me because he says "Yes". Now, Sir, you will find that in Australia as far back as 8th April 1851:

"the Legislative Council of New South Wales under the leadership of Mr. W. C. Wentworth, adopted a report of its Select Committee which protested against the new constitution Act on the grounds that it did not place the control of all revenue and taxation entirely in the hands of the Colonial Legislature; that all officers of trust and emoluments should be filled by the Governor and Executive Council unfettered by instructions from the Secretary of State for the Colonies; and that plenary powers of legislation should be conferred on the Colonial Legislature. It concluded by solemnly protesting against these wrongs and declaring and insisting on these our undoubted rights. We leave the redress of the one and the assertion of the other to the people whom we represent and the Legislature which shall follow us."

Sir, I may remind the gallant Colonel (Colonel Crawford) that we are not taking an unusual or an unheard of course. Now, Sir, let us get to our protest. Colonel Crawford represents the European community and he talked about his interests. He was very pleased that a recent convention was established at the Raisina Western Hostel, namely, the dinner. Then he said that we may establish a few more conventions of that character and he thought we might happily go on as we were going on. Why? Because there is the commercial interest at stake. There is a civil service. They have got a right to express their opinion. Therefore he wants stability and the continuance of this constitution. And for how long? When will that commercial European community cease to have its interest in this country? When will it disappear in order to give us a further constitution? Does Colonel Crawford guarantee that? Sir, I am really surprised that an argument of this kind, which is futile and puerile, should be advanced by a responsible representative in this Assembly. Sir, everybody knows in this House—and I do not wish to enter into ancient history—what the issue is. I ask the Honourable Members in this House if there is a single Honourable Member of this House who does not understand what the issue is. The issue is this. Is this constitution to be revised now at once, or are we to wait until 1929? Is not that the issue? Now, why should it not be revised at once? Are we absolutely committed to 1929? Can any Honourable Member say that to me? No. The predecessors of my friend the Honourable the Home Member, Sir William Vincent and Sir Malcolm Hailey, themselves agreed to a formula which was adopted by this very Assembly in 1921 admitting that the examination and the revision of the constitution should be undertaken before 1929. Now, Sir, why should it not be undertaken at once? We were told that really we must examine the working of this Reform Act of 1919; we must thoroughly go into this matter as to what are the defects and difficulties that have come to light in the working of the Government of India Act of 1919. My friend Pandit Motilal Nehru said that we all knew it was a foregone conclusion; we did not want any further information. Well, Sir, it may be that he was right. I can tell him that it was my own opinion also, and I had said it more than once publicly. Other people have said so, that it was not possible to work this constitution with any real fruitful results, any real advantage, but said the Government, the Government must proceed systematically, the Government must proceed on certain definite principles and certain lines. Then what happened? We came last year with a definite demand that this constitution must be revised. I am not concerned, Sir, at the present moment with what should be the agency through which this constitution should be revised. But what was the answer? The answer was, as we all know, the terms of reference and a statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government made in the House here by Sir Malcolm Hailey representing the Government of India. What did he say? He said if our inquiry shows that advance is not possible within the structure and policy of this Act, then the question whether the constitution should be amended or not is a separate issue upon which the Government are not at present committed. Now, Sir, it was therefore part and parcel of the terms of reference to this Committee. This Committee had to answer whether our inquiry showed that the constitution should be amended or not, and we were bound to give an answer to that question. If we had not done so, we would not have done our duty. That answer is given by

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

the minority. The majority feel that they are not called upon to go into those questions having regard to the terms of reference. Now I ask this House, are the Government justified in delaying any further in giving us, on the floor of this House, their declaration that they are prepared to revise this constitution? I see the Home Member sitting there silently, not moving a single muscle of his body.

An Honourable Member: He is not rude enough to interrupt?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: No, I did not want him to interrupt, I wanted him to move a little, but he is adamant. Not only that, but we asked him to give us a day to enable us to place our humble views before him and present him with our verdict on the Mukkiman Report in this House. No, says the Honourable the Home Member, we have taken no decisions on the policy and we have not formulated any proposals; we cannot yet discuss the report—the debate will be infructuous and useless. And yet he was driven to this position when he was asked, then what is the use of His Excellency the Viceroy going to London? Why is it that he is called there to confer with the Secretary of State for India, Lord Birkenhead? He had to admit it and undoubtedly this will be one of the outstanding questions. Now, Sir, I do think this. Of course I know what the Honourable Member will say. He will say, "How can we take up this question when we have not made up our minds as to what we should say". But I really have a grievance. It seems the Treasury Bench, Sir, when it suits them treat this House as if it was a full-fledged Parliament, but when it does not suit them they say, "Oh no, the responsibility is ours; you are merely here to influence the Government". Now I would really ask the Treasury Bench once for all please make up your mind whether you will treat us as if we were a full-fledged Parliament. Mind you, I should not be flattered by that, because I know we are not a full-fledged Parliament and it is no use assuming something that you are not. But do tell this Assembly what it is really; at any rate, let us have it quite clear. Of course really this Assembly is an advisory body (*Mr. D. V. Belvi*: "It is a debating club!") It is a little more than that. Now, Sir, I say therefore it was really due to this Assembly; and remember the promise was given to us, that this report will be placed before this Assembly and this Assembly will be given the opportunity to discuss and express its opinion on the report. I therefore submit that it was due to this Assembly that the Government ought to have said "Before we even proceed with any serious discussion of this report, before even we come to any provisional conclusions, we would like to have the assistance of your verdict as to this Reforms Inquiry Committee's Report". I say that is a serious grievance we have.

Now, Sir, the next question that we want to place before this House is this. In the course of this one year we have worked and we naturally at this time, although the Finance Member comes before us with this Budget full of figures and the total amount of expenditure and the revenue he is going to recover and how he is going to spend it and so on, we on this side of the House besides examining his figures and his Budget have also got to do something else, and that is to prepare our annual balance sheet. Our annual balance sheet and stock-taking is this, that we have to see what during the whole year has been the policy of the Government apart from

finance on all important questions. Well, Sir, I have already talked about the constitutional position and what we feel about it. I really feel this and I do assure you, Sir, and the Treasury Bench, that you will be making the greatest possible mistake if you do not decide upon amending and revising this constitution at once. I am not committing myself as to the agency but I do ask the Government to declare their policy and decision and the sooner they declare it the better for the peace and good government of this country. Declare it without hesitation that you are prepared to revise the constitution at once.

Now, Sir, the next important thing, a most vital thing to which I attach no less importance than to the question of constitutional advance, is the military policy of the Government of India. I do not wish to take up the time of the House on this question, as we have had two debates recently this session. Unfortunately, Sir, owing to other items being discussed this year, I am deprived of the opportunity of raising a debate on the military policy on the notice which I had already given to discuss the grant of the Army Department. But I again repeat what I said on that debate on the motion of the Honourable Mr. Venkatapatiraju, which asked the Government to take steps to establish an Indian Sandhurst. Sir, I regret the tone and the language and the announcement which was made by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief during the course of the general discussion on the Budget. But I did not mind the tone so much, I did not mind the language so much; I looked to the substance and the substance was more disappointing and objectionable than anything else. I dare say that Lord Rawlinson means well; I dare say he has made some efforts and I recognise that he has made certain efforts; but there again the issue, as I conceive it, is not that you have tried to create eight units; the issue is not that you are trying to send ten boys to England to qualify for King's Commissions; the issue is not that you have got a college at Dehra Dun and you will probably put up some other institution for training boys. That is not the real issue and you know it. It is no use saying, as the Commander-in-Chief said, that we are not a nation, that we are not a homogeneous people, that there are great difficulties and that you are trying to weld India together and it will take a long time before India is fit for her defence. Now, Sir, that is not an answer really to my proposal. If there were no difficulties, if India did not require welding together, if India was not ill-organised, I venture to say that the Commander-in-Chief would not be standing there at all and talking to us as he did the other day. On the contrary I would have been standing there and ordering the Commander-in-Chief to obey my orders. What is the good of putting forward this argument? Of course India has difficulties. Of course India requires welding; otherwise I do ask my Honourable friends on the Treasury Bench, do you think that three hundred thousand men of your race could rule this country for a moment even with all your machine guns? Therefore, what is the good of meeting a straightforward and reasonable proposal with this kind of argument? What is my proposal? What did I say? I shall repeat it. I recognise the difficulties; but I say, do you mean in spite of these difficulties really to help India? Do you want to show your honest intentions? Give us an opportunity to examine this question thoroughly. Did you consult us when you started the Indianisation of eight units? You now say that Indian officers do not care to serve in those units and that they prefer others where they have got British officers. Did you consult us? No. Did you consult us when you decided upon sending ten boys? No. Did you consult us when you laid down your method of securing those ten

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

boys? You have laid down a method which I assure you will never give you the right kind of boys. Did you get any responsible men in this country and say to them "Come along; we are determined, we are anxious to see that Indians are enabled to take up the defence of their own country within a reasonable time; we will sit with you; let us examine the whole situation thoroughly." You have appointed so many committees on trifling matters, on petty matters. Have you appointed a single committee composed of men as I suggested in my proposal a few days ago—your Commander-in-Chief, your military experts, your politicians, your Civil Service and Sir Campbell Rhodes? Why not? Of course for he has a stake here and we must remove his nervousness. The Honourable the Home Member moved an amendment in the course of the last debate. I was not allowed an opportunity to speak; somehow I was not fortunate enough to catch your eye, though I merely wanted to explain why that amendment was not acceptable; and really that amendment was not acceptable to us because, as I say, the crux of the entire military policy of the Government of India is this. First of all, determine what is the number of men that you are prepared to recruit every year from amongst the Indian people. You cannot fix that number unless you make a thorough inquiry. When you fix that number, then the question arises, how are you going to provide the requisite facilities for their training and education? You may have to start an Indian Sandhurst, or you may not have to start one. Well, all that is really putting the cart before the horse. The first and foremost question, to my mind, is this. Have a committee with terms of reference to find out what is the total number of men that you are prepared to recruit every year from amongst the people of India to rapidly Indianise the army and whether the requisite number would be available or forthcoming. The other questions as to machinery or methods to secure requisite facilities for their training and education will have to be considered in the light of the answer to the main question.

Then, Sir, I come to the next point. Again I say that I do not wish to go into minute details. The next question is with reference to your educational policy. Sir, a well known American came to India some years ago, a man called Mr. Bryant,—I think he contested the Presidency of the United States of America,—and a very able Englishman, for whom I have the greatest respect, was trying in my presence to persuade Mr. Bryant to uphold British rule in India and told him: "What can we do here? What reforms can we give to the people? Look at the state of these people in this country; hardly 5 or 6 per cent. of the population can read and write." So Mr. Bryant turned round and asked him the question, "How long have you been in this country? Who is responsible for the fact that only 5 or 6 per cent. of the population can read or write?" Well, Sir, this happened 15 or 20 years ago. But what is the condition to-day? Since then we have had reformed Governments, the Act of 1909-1910, and we have got an Education Member sitting here under the Act of 1919, the present constitution. What have you done? I say it is the greatest stigma on the Government of any country in the world to show that after your 150 years of rule, as is the case in this country, you have not given knowledge and light, nay even the three R's to more than 6 or 7 per cent. of the population of this country. Is that going to be your policy? Is that the way you are going to advance India constitutionally and make her fit for self-government and for self-defence?

Then, Sir, I come to your commercial policy. Sir, I must confess at once that I am not in a position to speak with any authority on this question. But there again vital differences exist as to the policy of the Government of India. There is the question of currency, there is the question of exchange and the excise duty and protection to home industries. There are very vital differences on these questions. My Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas on this side, Sir, is our Finance Member; he is our Financial Adviser. (*A Voice*: "Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.") Well, I am not at present prepared to accept him as such, but he might in course of time rise to that position. Now Sir, these questions of currency and exchange are really matters on which some of my friends on this side can speak with greater authority than I can do.

And last, but not the least, is the policy of the Government of India which I shall characterise for want of any better name as the repressive policy. Now, Sir, we have had debates on the Ordinance. We have had debates on Mr. Patel's Bill to repeal certain regulations and I do not want to weary this House and repeat anything more. I only say this that that Ordinance has done an enormous amount of harm and if you wish to justify that policy of yours and if you really think that and want to convince the people that your real object was to maintain law and order but at the same time you are prepared to come forward to advance India—mind you, before it is too late—come forward and say so to the people and do it without delay. Actions are the only and real proof and test of your intentions and policy. Remember that the action of these young men who have taken to bombs is due, it seems to me, Sir, to a question of degree of patience. I have a certain amount of patience. Perhaps my friend across there, Pandit Motilal Nehru, has a smaller degree of patience than I have. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "I have no patience: I am very impatient.") Pandit Motilal says that he has got no patience. Well, Sir, I do not agree with him. I am going to express my opinion. The man who throws the bomb has got still less patience than Pandit Motilal Nehru—I think he will admit that. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "If it can be less.") Quite. Now, Sir, it has not reached the limit yet when you have got to the bomb thrower, because it may go further than that even. I want the Government to appreciate that. And I hope that you will not only reverse your policy but you will satisfy the people of this country and justify your pledges and promises which you have repeatedly given and not exasperate the people of India to resort to something which will be disastrous both for you and for the people of this country.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Sir, the demand before the House is Demand No. 28 which deals with one of the most important of the Demands, the tour expenses of the Governor General's Council. That, Sir, has been made, certainly with the connivance, if not with the consent, of Government, the ground for the general examination of the policy of Government. I have been told that the vote that has been moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru, is a vote of censure on the Government and that it has been taken up as such on all sides of the House. The House has arraigned at its bar, under the name of the travelling expenses of the Governor General's Council, the general policy of that body. Sir, I should like to make one point as a preliminary, not in connection with the actual vote which the House may pass, which I will deal with later, but in regard to the constitution of the

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

Government of India. The Government of India is neither the Governor General nor the Council of the Governor General. It is the Governor General in Council. And I make that remark with reference to certain observations that have been directed at my Indian colleagues. I wish to deal with the matter at once in the very inception of my remarks. It has been suggested that, when an Indian joins the Government as a Member of the Executive Council he forfeits all his self-respect; he ceases to operate as a free individual and is, to put it quite straightly, a bought man. If any Englishman, Sir, had stood up in this House and ventured such a suggestion, the whole of India would have rung with it. The other day the Commander-in-Chief said something about India not being a nation, that has been distorted into an insult to India, but what is that in comparison with the derogatory remark I am dealing with? I trust the whole of India will repudiate this baseless insinuation. I have worked with my Indian colleagues and I am well aware that they are as open-minded, as firm and as determined in expressing their opinion and endeavouring to have their own way as any other Member of the Governor General's Council.

Mr. V. J. Patel: That is why they gave sanction to the Bengal Ordinance.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: If they thought it was their duty to do so, they were right in doing so. Does my Honourable friend think that they did it against their conscience?

Mr. V. J. Patel: Certainly.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: My Honourable friend is probably singular in that view in this House.

Mr. V. J. Patel: From the Indian point of view.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: If the House is not prepared to repudiate this groundless attack on its own people, its own race, all I can say is that I am greatly surprised. At any rate, I have done my duty in repudiating what I regard as a gross charge that should not have been made, and which should have been repudiated at once.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: We make no distinctions of race.

Mr. Jannadas M. Mehta: We are not guided by racial considerations.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I have spoken with some heat on this point, because of the support and help I have always received from my Indian colleagues in the short space of time I have been in the Council, and because I feel they have been most unjustifiably attacked.

I will now pass on to matters which I hope will generate less heat. My Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru in his observations referred to certain matters which I must take up very briefly. He referred to the Bengal Ordinance and he again repeated, though not in very definite terms, a charge in respect of the Kona case. It has been a matter of some comment that I did not repudiate the suggestion of the Honourable Pandit regarding this case in his speech on the Bengal Ordinance. Sir, it is impossible for any member of the Government to be absolutely aware of the whole of the record of a trial which occurred some time ago. I have now however obtained a copy of the charge to the jury in regard

to this matter. It was suggested that the approver in the case was proved to be a liar because he was unable to drive a motor car. I will read to the House what the judge said in his charge to the jury. I wish to be perfectly fair with the House. They will see that it was a matter on which the jury took a certain view, but it was by no means suggested to them by the judge that the allegation that the approver could not drive a car was correct.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I remind my Honourable friend that it was the jury who requested the judge.—it may be after the charge, I do not know,—to go and put the approver to a practical test in driving, and he failed.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: My Honourable friend will find, when I read the extract which I hold in my hand, that the trial of driving a car was made before the charge to the jury. This is what the judge said:

“A question has arisen as to whether the approver could really drive a car. At the request of the jury, the approver was asked to drive the car No. T 879 within the court compound. This he did on the 1st February, 1924, with the result that the car collided with a tree and was damaged. The jury were present and saw the incident. They should remember, however, that the approver had been in custody since the 7th August, 1923, that is for more than five months before the demonstration with the car. On the other hand, after the Kona case, he obtained a driver's licence dated the 21st June, 1923.”

He was a qualified driver, because you cannot get a licence in Calcutta unless you pass the test. (*A Voice:* “Question”) I do not desire to waste the time of the Assembly at great length on this point. But it has been put to me that some contradiction ought to be given of the bold assertion that was made on the previous occasion, and I therefore desire to give it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: For what it is worth.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: For what it is worth. To me it seems to be worth a good deal; apparently not so to my Honourable friend.

Sir, the next point that was taken up was in connection with the Reforms Inquiry Report. On this matter I am obviously in a very difficult position. I was Chairman of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and I am also now speaking as a Member of Government. I have already informed the House that Government are not ready with their conclusions on the report and therefore it is not open to me to discuss the conclusions reached in that report. But I do feel as Chairman of that Committee that I should say a few words to defend my colleagues both of the majority and the minority reports against the charges that have been made against them. In the first place, let me make it perfectly clear to the House that no one desires to sit on a committee of this kind. In the case of non-officials, especially those who are professional men, it means loss of much time, and time to them is money. In the case of those who are not required to earn their own living—I mean the wealthier Indians—it meant the loss of ease and sacrifice of well-earned rest after a period of long service under the Crown. In the case of the officials, after all, it is one more burden on their already overburdened shoulders and I will say nothing about that. The House I know has little sympathy to spare for them. But I will say this that when a committee of this kind takes up an investigation it should not be charged against its members that they are necessarily

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

either incompetent or dishonest because they come to conclusions which do not chime with those of persons who attack them. I think, Sir, that the non-official part of the Committee deserve great praise for their self-sacrifice in taking part in the inquiry, and I desire to say here quite openly that the Government, whatever their conclusions may be on the report, acknowledge with gratitude the assistance they have received from the Maharaja of Burdwan, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jinnah and the other non-official members of the Committee. Now, I will not conceal from the House that I had very much hoped that it would have been possible to discuss the conclusions of this Committee during the current session. I sympathise with the feeling of the House in that respect. That it is not possible has arisen from facts, from occurrences which were quite unexpected and over which we have no control, and the best answer why we are not in a position to discuss this report has been supplied by my Honourable friend the Pandit himself. He drew the attention of the House to the fact that His Excellency the Viceroy is visiting England. He pointed out, as indeed might have been gathered from the statement I made in the House myself, that one of the matters that must necessarily come under consideration of the Secretary of State during His Excellency the Viceroy's visit, would be the report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee which is obviously one of the more important outstanding matters with the Government of India. I ought to make it quite clear, as I think I have stated it a little inaccurately, that His Excellency the Viceroy is visiting England at the request of the Secretary of State. I may have slipped into an inaccuracy in stating that earlier, but I desire to make the position in this respect very clear to the House. As I have said, that obviously changes the position. The Government of India is the Governor General in Council, not the Governor General nor the Council. The conclusion is obvious and I do not wish to pursue that point any further. (*Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar*: "It is very cryptic.") I have no doubt that the Honourable Member will be able to disentangle it.

Now, there have been a large number of points raised in the course of this debate. It is obvious that in the time remaining I cannot deal with them all or indeed go at great length into any of them. Various charges have been brought against the Government. It has been said that we have gagged the House by not giving a day for discussion of the report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee. I have shown that that is not so. The House has attempted to discuss it freely, but the debate which has taken place to-day shows how very infructuous a discussion must be if the Government are not in a position to take part in it.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Because the report is actually worthless.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I was waiting for that remark of my Honourable friend. A long time before the report was published and before he could have received it my Honourable friend said that it was a whitewashing report. I had a very lively suspicion that as soon as my Honourable friend knew of the date of publication of the report he went to his stationer to order a new waste paper basket.

Mr. V. J. Patel: That is the place for it.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: That I expected from my Honourable friend. That I thoroughly expected. I am glad to have it

from the Honourable Member. There is one other matter in connection with my friend the Pandit's speech to which I should like to refer. When he discussed the Bengal Ordinance there was no suggestion whatsoever that the Ordinance had been employed against Swarajists *qua* Swarajists. The Honourable Member did not make that suggestion in his speech and I in my reply particularly commented on his not doing so. To-day there seemed to be a slight suggestion of such a charge in that among the persons arrested there were said to be 60 Swarajists. My friend did not make that charge and I trust he disavows it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: If my friend will permit me, I will say that that was a well known fact. It was published in the press that the Bengal Ordinance was directed mainly, if not wholly, against the Swarajists and I think that point was made in this House in the course of the debate.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Does my friend claim that the Ordinance was directed against the Swarajists as such. I should like to be clear on that point. If my Honourable friend does not make that charge, it is unnecessary for me to repudiate it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I do most solemnly make that charge.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: It is a curious thing that I should not have been interrupted when I was speaking on the last occasion on the 5th February. I then made this observation:

"There is, however, one point which I wish to mention and it is this, that I did not hear my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru suggest—and I am very glad that I did not hear him suggest—that this Ordinance was made and promulgated for the purpose of suppressing any political party. I do not think that it is part of his argument."

(Cries of "No, no.")

Then I have been under a misapprehension.

Mr. Chaman Lall: There were numerous interruptions then which have not been taken down by the reporter.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I do not think that, if I heard those remarks, I should have allowed them to pass unnoticed and unchallenged. I was in a back seat then. It is only by the courtesy of my friend Mr. Hans Raj that I am sitting here, so that I can follow the Honourable Member better.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Very well, Sir. Then I shall not touch on that any more. This is what Sir Hugh Stephenson said in the Bengal Council. . . .

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: We have read it.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I cannot trace it at the moment. It is familiar to the House. The purport of the speech was this. The Honourable Sir Hugh Stephenson there pointed out that the 60 men who were arrested under the Ordinance had previously been convicted or interned. Therefore he pointed out that they had been in trouble before they became Swarajists. I need not pursue that point any further. I think the House is against my Honourable friend. Then, Sir, I next

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

notice that my Honourable friend, I am glad to say, takes a more favourable view of the British Cabinet than he has been doing for some time. He recognised that if there is nobody on these bureaucratic and sun-dried benches who could take a broad view, the members of the British Cabinet might. Well, Sir, there is hope in that and I am glad my Honourable friend is not altogether adamant to his idea that the British Government, as they have done in the past, may take a statesmanlike view of any situation that may arise. Sir, I now come to the main argument raised by my Honourable friend's speech. The indictment of the policy of the Government of India which he has made out is not such, in my judgment, as to justify this House in cutting even the tour allowances of its members. In the course of the future debate the question of Kohat has been raised. That has been dealt with very thoroughly by my Honourable friend Mr. Bray and I am glad to see that the House showed no sign of pursuing it further. I take it that the answer that was given by my Honourable friend has been accepted as satisfactory. (A Voice: "Not necessarily.") Then, Sir, it was a pity that the subject should not have been discussed more fully if the Honourable Members felt that the action of the Government ought to be challenged in connection with this affair.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Unfortunately the Governor General does not allot more days.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: My Honourable friend knows perfectly well that he could have discussed this question if he had wanted to much earlier in the session. I suggest that he did not do so because he knew that the state of communal tension was so high that, if he had done so, he would have provoked more trouble. Now is not that the fact? (Voices: "No, no.") Then, Sir, I should like, since the House has not been convinced, to associate myself with the observations which have been made by Mr. Bray in connection with the action of the officers in Kohat. They have been charged with lack of courage, they have been charged with failing in their duty. All I can say is that I have seen the papers: and I am surprised that anyone who knows the circumstances can charge them with lack of courage, whatever you can charge them with.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Why not have an independent inquiry and settle the matter?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Now if the Honourable Member really thinks that that would be in the interests of Indians generally or Kohat in particular, I really feel very great doubt whether he is in as close a touch with the present situation in India as he ought to be. I do not think there is anybody in this House who really believes that to re-open the sore which at any rate for the present has been temporarily healed would be in the best interests either of Kohat or of the general peace of India. I only trust that the general peace may not be disturbed even by the discussion we have had in this House on the subject.

Now, Sir, the next point that was raised was in connection with the Sikhs, and my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, referred to the great services the Sikhs have rendered to the British nation—and

I may add to his own nation, Sir. I yield to no man in admiration for the courage of the race which has supplied India with soldiers who have helped to keep the frontiers intact; who under British leadership have distinguished themselves on every battlefield in India and even in Europe; and whose deeds of bravery are commemorated not only in history but in monuments. Those who have seen the memorial at Saraghari know what the Sikhs can do and have done for the Empire. Sir, when the Government have recognized that, is it likely that we should desire to live in anger, to live in a struggle, with people to whom we recognize we owe a debt of gratitude, people who have eaten our salt. No, Sir, and the hand of friendship which has been offered on many occasions is still the hand of friendship. (Hear, hear.) Let them come forward and show the way, and they will not find the British Government reluctant in dealing with the situation. But at the same time I must emphatically repudiate the suggestion that His Excellency Sir Malcolm Hailey, who is carrying on with his well known ability the administration of the Punjab under circumstances of the greatest difficulty, is to be attacked for rallying round him those loyal elements of the community who desire to keep and maintain peace, who recognize that peace is a need of the countryside and who hope not for a triumph that would not bring peace but to attain it by mutual concession and conciliation. Nor is it to be supposed that the Government or the Government of the Punjab will be intimidated into any surrender of the rights of others, will be intimidated into anything that is not fair and just to other communities, that is not right in the interests of peace and justice. Let me make that clear; but let me at the same time emphasise the point that we recognize as much as my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya does that the claims of this particular class of British subjects are great, and we desire most earnestly to live in peace and amity with them, as we have done in the past, and as I hope we shall do in the future.

Now, Sir, the Pandit referred to the desirability of having more Indian Members and he particularly drew attention to the desirability of an Indian Finance Member. Well, Sir, when Sir Basil Blackett leaves the shores of this country on a well-earned holiday, a holiday to which I should think after last night's discussion he is anxiously looking forward, his place will be filled at least temporarily by one who is an Indian and the first Indian to hold that appointment. I take this opportunity of expressing my gratification that we have as our colleague one who I know is proud of the fact that he has risen through the ranks to one of the highest posts in India. Sir, there is some justification, I think, for my contention that the Government of India, bureaucratic, hopeless as it may be, does give a career to Indians which may lead to the highest appointments it has in its gift. You may ask what is one man among 320 millions. What are 7 posts among 320 millions? (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "What about Governorships?") It reminds me of a story. I will not vouch for its veracity. A General, after the war, came to the War Office and said "Is there nothing for me? I also have served in the war." The reply was "Though the parrots are many, the perches are few." And that I think is the answer to my Honourable friend.

There is one observation I intended to make in connection with the Reforms Inquiry Report. I think I ought to mention it. I notice that there is a great tendency to describe whatever opinions are set forward in a report not absolutely in consonance with the opinions of those who read

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

it by various opprobrious terms. I myself have been amused by the range of epithets applied to the Majority Report. Perhaps the range is not so wide in connection with the Minority Report. I see on the one hand the Majority Report is described as a collection of bootless platitudes, while on the other hand it is described as one more step down the road of destruction of Government. Sir, it is some consolation to me to find that so varying views may be held on the document.

Now, Sir, another point that was raised was in connection with the Army. That was raised by my Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar and again by my friend Mr. Jinnah. Sir, I quite agree that one of the problems we have to solve in this country is the question of the Army and I sympathise very greatly when I hear Members on the other side pressing their views on Government. They are bound to do it and I hope they will continue . . . (Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: "But not for eternity.") Still, before you get an army you have got to get the material for the Army, you have got to find out the right men. You have got to see what sources you can draw on. I understand that one of the charges that is always brought against Government in this respect is that we do not try and get hold of people but if we really did try we could get men who would make suitable material for recruitment as officers. In that connection I should like to say that the Government are quite prepared to carry out the offer which I made on behalf of the Government in the recent debate on the Indian Sandhurst question. I do not know whether the House intended to reject it or not, but I do not think they accepted it. The Government of India consider that the time has come when we could with advantage appoint a Committee to consider the means of attracting Indian youths of good educational qualifications to a military career as King's commissioned officers and to consider also the best means of giving them military education. Now, that, Sir, appears to me an offer which is an earnest of the good faith on the part of Government in dealing with this very important question; a question on the solution of which, I quite agree, the future of India largely and necessarily depends. That, Sir, I hope the House at any rate will regard as some satisfaction on the point that is raised in connection with the Army.

There are many other points I should like to have dealt with but the clock is moving on. Now, Sir, where have we got to on this motion? What is the House going to do? The actual motion before the House is to reduce the tour expenses of the Governor General's Council. That is what you will actually vote on. But what the House desires to vote on is something quite different. It desires to record a vote of censure on the Government of India. At least it desired to do so before I spoke—I have no doubt it has now changed its views. (Laughter.) I am one of those who really very much desire that the House should follow correct procedure. Let me say at once that by rejecting a demand of this kind for Rs. 66,000 you are really forcing the Governor General to restore it. That sort of a thing you have done before. If you use the big club every time, you corrupt both parties. You will get used to forcing the Governor General to restore by rejecting votes wholesale for reasons not connected with the votes and certification will be regarded as a normal and necessary procedure. The skin on both sides, if I may use the expression, will become hard—will become indurated—surely this is the last position that the House

should desire to create. Well, Sir, supposing, on the other hand, the Governor General does not restore this vote. That is a very attractive proposition to me for two reasons. The first is that I dislike railway journey exceedingly and the second is that it may lead to some curious situations. Supposing there is the chronic ailment in Bombay regarding the rupee or the coal trouble in Bengal became a little acute and the various communities concerned desire the immediate presence of the learned doctors of those diseases, my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett and my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. The interested persons wire up "Come over to Macedonia and help us". The reply might come back "Please send travelling expenses". (Laughter.) That, Sir, I think will be a pity. Another point that drives me to the view that the Governor General should not certify this demand is this. We shall be shortly having to go to Simla and to me it would be a great pleasure if it is done by a walking tour. (Laughter.) We have recently had much sedentary work in this House and I cannot but believe that it would be good for the health of my Honourable colleagues and myself if we took our staves in our hands and like pilgrims started on a walk up the hills. Of course, some of my colleagues are men of a certain age broken by long service. Therefore you would not expect us to go very fast. We should have the joys of the open road in the early mornings and in the noon day heat we should rest by some shady well. Possibly we might walk a mile or two in the evenings (Mr. M. A. Jinnah: "It might do you good.") As Mr. Jinnah says, there would be many advantages. We shall get into touch with the country and we should be able to recruit our health. But still I do recognize that in an age like our own, however attractive those methods may be, they are a little slow. And as we shall not be able to walk very fast, perhaps the Government business might suffer. Well, Sir, I am therefore

5 P.M. compelled to reject the view that at any rate I can advise the Governor General not to restore. I am forced almost to the position that I shall have to advise His Excellency to restore it. If that is so we are creating a position that really I honestly think this House should try to avoid. This debate stands on the book: it is here. What do you gain by forcing the Governor General to restore? I really ask you to consider that. I have never really been able to see the point. I dare say it is extremely stupid of me, but I cannot see it. If you content yourselves with a hundred rupee cut, which has been advised on several occasions by my Honourable friends Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal and Mr. Jinnah, that seems to be the correct constitutional procedure

An Honourable Member: It has no effect.

(It being Five of the Clock, Mr. President proceeded to put the questions.)

The President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Executive Council'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be omitted."

The question I have to put is that that Demand be omitted.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—65.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Datta, Dr. C. K.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam
 Maulvi Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.

Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuzá Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarada, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Syamacharan, Mr.
 Tok Kyi, Maung.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NQES—48.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur
 Muhammad.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir
 Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Mr. Denis.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur
 Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.

Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Makan, Mr. M. E.
 Marr, Mr. A.
 McCallum, Mr. J. L.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir
 Bhupendra Nath.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Muddiman, The Honourable
 Sir Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdum Syed.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
 Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
 Visvanatha.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Wilson, Mr. R. A.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I rise to a point of order. Are Members who are pecuniarily interested in the division entitled to vote? I want a ruling because another motion is coming.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member suggest that any Member is more interested than he is himself!

Mr. V. J. Patel: My point is that those who have a pecuniary interest in the result of the vote should not be entitled to vote.

Mr. President: In the technical sense, "pecuniary interest" does not here arise. On the broader issue of the advisability of interested Members voting on such an issue, I think I may appeal from Mr. Patel, M.L.A., to Mr. Patel, Chairman of the Bombay Corporation. (Hear, hear, and Laughter.)

DEMAND NO. 26—INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 27—STAFF, HOUSEHOLD AND ALLOWANCES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General'."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—65.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur Muhammad.	Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.	Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur, Mr.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.	Makan, Mr. M. E.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.	Marr, Mr. A.
Ahmed, Mr. K.	McCallum, Mr. J. L.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.	Mitra, The Honourable Sir
Ajab Khan, Captain.	Bhupendra Nath.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.	Moir, Mr. T. E.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.	Muddiman, The Honourable
Ashworth, Mr. E. H.	Sir Alexander.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.	Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
Bhore, Mr. J. W.	Saiyid.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.	Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
Bray, Mr. Denys.	Naidu, Mr. M. C.
Burdon, Mr. E.	Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
Colvert, Mr. H.	Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.	Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
Cocke, Mr. H. G.	Mukhdum Syed.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.	Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.	Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.	Rau, Mr. P. R.
Fleming, Mr. E. G.	Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Fraser, Sir Gordon.	Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.	Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.	Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.	Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
Graham, Mr. L.	Viswanatha
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur	Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Captain.	Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Husainally, Khan Bahadur W. M.	Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Hyder, Dr. L. K.	Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.	Webb, Mr. M.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.	Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.	Wilson, Mr. R. A.
	Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—51.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam
 Maulvi Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.

Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Syamacharan, Mr.
 Tok Kyi, Maung.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 29—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,39,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Legislative Bodies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 30—FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Foreign and Political Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 31—HOME DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,04,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 32—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,49,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 33—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 34—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 35—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 36—ARMY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,64,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—62.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur Muhammad.	Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzade	Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur, Mr.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.	Makan, Mr. M. E.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.	Marr, Mr. A.
Ahmed, Mr. K.	McCallum, Mr. J. L.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.	Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
Ajab Khan, Captain.	Moir, Mr. T. E.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.	Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.	Mubammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
Ashworth, Mr. E. H.	Naidu, Mr. M. C.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.	Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.	Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhдум Syed.
Bray, Mr. Denys.	Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
Burdon, Mr. E.	Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M. Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T. Rau, Mr. P. R.
Calvert, Mr. H.	Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.	Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.	Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.	Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.	Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V. Visvanatha.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.	Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Fleming, Mr. E. G.	Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Fraser, Sir Gordon.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.	Tonkirkson, Mr. H.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.	Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Graham, Mr. L.	Webb, Mr. M.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Captain.	Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.	Wilson, Mr. R. A.
Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.	
Hyder, Dr. L. K.	
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.	
Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.	
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.	
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.	

NOES—50.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhal, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
 Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Shanbhu Dayal.

Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Syamacharan, Mr.
 Tok Kyi, Maung.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 37—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the ‘Department of Industries and Labour.’”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 38—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of the ‘Central Board of Revenue.’”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 39—PAYMENTS TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,01,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency subjects.’”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 40—AUDIT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 78,87,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 41—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 46,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 42—POLICE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 43—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,43,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 44—SURVEY OF INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 24,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 45—METEOROLOGY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 46—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,71,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 47—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 48—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 49—ARCHÆOLOGY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,16,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50—MINES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 51—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,03,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 52—EDUCATION.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,37,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53—MEDICAL SERVICES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 54—PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 55—AGRICULTURE.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Agriculture’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 56—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Civil Veterinary Services’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 57—INDUSTRIES.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,46,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Industries’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 58—AVIATION.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Aviation’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 59—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,37,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Commercial Intelligence and Statistics’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 60—CENSUS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Census’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 61—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Emigration—Internal’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 62—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 63—JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,29,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Joint Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 64—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 65—CURRENCY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,40,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Currency'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 66—MINT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,81,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 67—CIVIL WORKS—INCLUDING EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,38,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Civil Works—including Expenditure in England'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 68—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS—INCLUDING EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions—including Expenditure in England'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 69—STATIONERY AND PRINTING—INCLUDING EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Stationery and Printing—including Expenditure in England’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 70—MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 38,99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 71—ADJUSTMENTS WITH PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,74,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Adjustments with Provincial Governments’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 72—REFUNDS.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 57,26,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Refunds’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 73—NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,12,16,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘North-West Frontier Province’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 74—BALUCHISTAN.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Baluchistan’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 75—DELHI.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,65,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Delhi ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76—AJMER AND MERWARA.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,61,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Ajmer and Merwara ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 77—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 41,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Andamans and Nicobar Islands ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 78—RAJPUTANA.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,65,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Rajputana ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 79—CENTRAL INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Central India ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 80—HYDERABAD.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Hyderabad ’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 81—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,52,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘ Expenditure in England under the Control of the Secretary of State for India ’.”

The Assembly divided :

AYES—53.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur
Muhammad.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Ajab Khan, Captain.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
Badi-uz-Zuman, Maulvi.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Pasil.
Bray, Mr. Denys.
Burdon, Mr. E.
Calvert, Mr. H.
Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Fleming, Mr. E. G.
Fraser, Sir Gordon.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.
Graham, Mr. L.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur
Captain.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.
Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
Hyder, Dr. L. K.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles

Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur,
Mr.
Makan, Mr. M. E.
Marr, Mr. A.
McCallum, Mr. J. L.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
Nath.
Moir, Mr. T. E.
Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
Alexander.
Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
Sayid.
Naidu, Mr. M. C.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
Makhdum Syed.
Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
Rau, Mr. P. R.
Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
Visvanatha.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Webb, Mr. M.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Wilson, Mr. R. A.

NOES—51.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Ariff, Mr. Yacoub C.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhal, Mr. K. Salsava.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hans Raj, Lala.
Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
Kasturbhai Lalbbhai, Mr.
Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
Muhammad.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.

Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
Murbuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayad.
Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
Narain Dass, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Patel, Mr. V. J.
Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Svamacharan, Mr.
Tok Kyi, Maung.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 82—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE
HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,43,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Expenditure in England under the control of the High Commissioner for India'."

The motion was adopted.

Expenditure charged to Capital.

DEMAND No. 83—IRRIGATION WORKS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Irrigation Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 84—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,12,36,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Capital outlay on Indian Posts and Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 85—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDO-EUROPEAN TELEGRAPHS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,17,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Capital outlay on Indo-European Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 86—DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,50,39,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Delhi Capital outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

Disbursements of Loans and Advances.

DEMAND No. 87—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,82,15,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of 'Interest-free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 88—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,41,99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1926, in respect of ‘Loans and Advances bearing interest’.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 16th March, 1925.