

8th September, 1922

THE

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

VOLUME III  
PART. I

---

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1922



SIMLA  
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS  
1922

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<p><b>TUESDAY, 5TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Oaths. His Excellency the Viceroy's Speech.</p>	1-9
<p><b>WEDNESDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Death of Sir Vithaldas Thackersey. Statement laid on the Table. Questions and Answers. Unstarred Questions and Answers. Governor General's Assent to Bills. Panel of Chairmen. Member to serve on House Committee. The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill. The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill. The Indian Official Secrets Bill. The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill. The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill. The Parsi Marriage and Divorce Bill. The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill. The Indian Boilers Bill. The Official Trustees and Administrator General's Acts (Amendment) Bill. The Indian Transfer of Ships Restriction (Repealing) Bill.</p>	11-138
<p><b>THURSDAY, 7TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Questions and Answers. Message from the Council of State. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill. Statement of Government Business. Resolution <i>re</i> : Votes of the Landholders' Constituencies. Resolution <i>re</i> : Revision of the Railway Act of 1890. Resolution <i>re</i> : Travelling Facilities for Third Class Railway Passengers. Resolution <i>re</i> : Restrictions on the Export of Wheat, Pulses and Oil-seeds.</p>	139-248
<p><b>FRIDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Member Sworn. Questions and Answers. Unstarred Questions and Answers. Conflicts in Asia Minor between the Greeks and Turks. Motion for Adjournment of the House. The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill. Resolution <i>re</i> : Grant of Full Dominion Self-Government to India.</p>	249-344

	PAGE
<b>MONDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 1922.</b>	<b>345-406</b>
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : The Weekly Rest Day in Commercial Establishments.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Hours of Work in Inland Navigation.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Employment of Young Persons as Trimmers and Stokers.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Emigration for the Purpose of Unskilled Work to Malaya and Ceylon.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Recruitment to Indian Forest Service.	
<b>TUESDAY, 12TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	<b>407-466</b>
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.	
The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.	
The Adoption (Registration) Bill.	
The Exclusion from Inheritance Bill.	
The Indian Contract (Amendment) Bill.	
The Married Women's Property (Amendment) Bill.	
The Illegitimate Sons Rights Bill.	
The Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill.	
<b>WEDNESDAY, 13TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	<b>467-499</b>
The Indian Boilers Bill.	
The Workmen's Compensation Bill.	
The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill.	
The Parsi Marriage and Divorce Bill.	
The Official Trustees and Administrator Generals' Acts (Amendment) Bill.	
Election for Standing Committees.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Committee on Electoral Rules.	
Message from the Council of State.	
<b>THURSDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	<b>501-566</b>
Petition from Madras Voters <i>re</i> : Provincial Contributions.	
Riots at Multan.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Propaganda in Chamber.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Provincial Contributions to the Central Exchequer.	

FRIDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 . . . . .

PAGE  
567-655

The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.  
Messages from the Council of State.  
Questions and Answers.  
Unstarred Questions and Answers.  
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill.  
The Indian Mines Bill.  
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.  
The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.

MONDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 . . . . .

657-689

Bills passed by the Council of State.  
Questions and Answers.  
Unstarred Questions and Answers.  
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.  
The Indian Boilers Bill.  
The Workmen's Compensation Bill.  
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.  
Election of Standing Committees.  
Conduct of Business.

WEDNESDAY, 20TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 . . . . .

691-734

Questions and Answers.  
Sittings of the Assembly.  
The Indian Mines Bill.  
The Indian Extradition (Amendment) Bill.  
The Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill.  
The Indian Transfer of Ships Restriction (Repealing) Bill.  
Election of Panels for Standing Committees.  
The Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill.  
The Supreme Court of British India Bill.  
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.  
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill.

FRIDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 1922 . . . . .

735-794

Questions and Answers.  
Unstarred Questions and Answers.  
Panels of Standing Committees for Departments of Education and Health and Revenue and Agriculture.  
The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.  
Resolution *re*: Moplah Train Tragedy and Disturbances.  
Resolution *re*: Establishment for Work of Legislative Assembly.  
Date for Discussion of Supreme Court Resolution.

	PAGE
<b>SATURDAY, 23RD SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	<b>795-846</b>
Questions and Answers.	
The Cotton Transport Bill.	
The Abolition of Transportation Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Bill.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Imperial Medical Research Institute.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Supreme Court for British India.	
Messages from the Council of State.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Supreme Court for British India.	
 <b>MONDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	 <b>847-919</b>
Statement laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
Sittings of the Legislature.	
The Indian Mines Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Naval (Armament) Bill.	
The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.	
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
Message from the Council of State.	
The Cotton Transport Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants.	
 <b>TUESDAY, 26TH SEPTEMBER, 1922</b> . . . . .	 <b>921-951</b>
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
The Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Bill.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants.	
Message from the Council of State.	
Adjournment of the Assembly.	
 <b>APPENDICES</b> . . . . .	 <b>1-12</b>
Vernacular Speeches and Translations.	
 <b>INDEX</b> . . . . .	 <b>I-85</b>
 <b>SGPI-21-I-137-31-1-23-145.</b>	

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 8th September, 1922.

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

## MEMBER SWORN.

Rai Bahadur Sham Narain Singh, M.L.A. (Bihar and Orissa : Nominated Official).

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### INCREASE IN RAILWAY FARES.

937. \*Mr. Darcy Lindsay : (a) Will Government state the amount of the First and Third Class Railway fares from Calcutta, Madras and Bombay to Delhi in 1912 and the increases that have since been imposed ?

(b) Is it proposed to revise the scale of travelling allowances to Members of the Legislature more on the basis of former rates or arrange for Members to recover actual expenditure only ?

(c) Has Government considered the issue of Railway Warrants as a convenience to Members of the Legislature journeying to and from Delhi and Simla ?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : (a) A statement showing the increase of fares since 1912 is laid on the table.

(b) No proposal to revise the scale of travelling allowance permissible to Members of the Indian Legislature is under consideration.

(c) The issue of Railway Warrants to Members of the Indian Legislature has not been considered but, if it will be for the convenience of Members, Government are prepared to examine the feasibility of the proposal.

*Statement showing the amount of First and Third Class Mail fares between the places named in 1912 and increases that have since been imposed.*

Name of Railways.	From To	FARES.				EXCESS OF PRESENT FARES OVER THOSE OF 1912.				REMARKS.
		FIRST CLASS.		THIRD CLASS.		FIRST CLASS.		THIRD CLASS.		
		1912.	1922.	1912.	1922.	Amount.	Percentage.	Amount.	Percentage.	
		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.		
E. I. S.	Calcutta—Delhi	65 13 6	103 7 0	8 2 0	21 15 0	37 9 6	57	13 13 9	171	
M. & S. M.	Madras—Delhi	116 13 0	184 10 0	23 2 3	36 8 0	67 13 0	58	15 5 9	66	
G. I. P.	Bombay—Delhi	66 4 0	105 8 0	11 1 0	17 5 0	36 4 0	55	6 4 0	56	
B. R. & C. I.	Bombay—Delhi	66 4 0	105 8 0	8 12 0	17 5 0	36 4 0	55	9 9 0	56	

\* Fares quoted include six pios per passenger as Calcutta Improvement Tax.

**Mr. Darcy Lindsay :** Does Government realise that every increase in the first class fares means personal gain to Members of the Indian Legislature ?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey :** We are aware of that, Sir.

#### APPREHENSIONS OF INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE AND OTHER SERVICES.

238. **\*Mr. K. C. Neogy :** (a) With reference to the statement made by Mr. Lloyd George in course of his speech in the Indian Civil Service debate, to the effect that there is a good deal of uneasiness among the British Civil Servants and other British officials in India with regard to the future, and that there is apprehension that the constitutional changes will affect their position prejudicially, and further that they want reassurances, will Government be pleased to state whether these apprehensions were made known to the Government of India by the officials concerned before being represented to the authorities in England ; and if so, did Government express any opinion thereon and make any recommendations as to the reassurances required ?

(b) Will Government be pleased to publish any correspondence that may have passed between them and the authorities in England with regard to the apprehensions and reassurances referred to above, since 1921 ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** (a) The apprehensions felt by the officers in question were made known to the Government of India in memorials which these officers submitted and in representations received from various Associations. These memorials and representations were transmitted by the Government of India with an expression of their own views thereon, to the Secretary of State.

(b) The Government of India are not prepared to publish the correspondence that has passed ; but the Honourable Member's attention is invited to a copy of the Secretary of State's Despatch No. 5-Public, dated the 9th February 1922, which was published last April.

#### RECRUITMENT FOR INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.

239. **\*Mr. K. C. Neogy :** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a Reuter's cable, dated London August 13th last, wherein, after declaring as unwarranted the allegations of the *Morning Post* regarding the Government of India's suggestion for abandonment of European recruitment for the I.C.S., it was stated that "the Government of India are closely corresponding with the authorities in Whitehall regarding the means of meeting the grievances of the Civil Service and encouraging a good supply of the right class of British recruits ?"

(b) If the statement made in the said cable be substantially correct, will Government lay on the table copy of the correspondence referred to therein ?

(c) Will Government be pleased to give this Assembly an opportunity to pronounce its views on any proposals that may be formulated, or assented to, by the Government of India in this behalf, before communicating such proposals, or the Government's final opinion thereon, to the authorities in England ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** (a) The Government of India have seen the cable.

(b) The Government of India have for some time past been in correspondence with the Secretary of State on the subject of memorials received from various associations and members of the Indian Civil Service. They do not propose to lay the correspondence on the table.

(c) The views of the Government of India on the more important questions raised in the memorials have been communicated to the Secretary of State.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** To what extent is the financial burden on India likely to be increased if these proposals are accepted ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** I am afraid I must have notice of that question.

INDIANISATION OF IMPERIAL SERVICES.

240. **\*Mr. K. C. Neogy :** (a) Are Government aware that their circular letter to the Local Governments on the question of Indianisation of the Imperial Services, dated Simla, May 30th, 1922, has been published in full in certain newspapers in India ?

(b) Was the permission of Government previously obtained to its publication ? If so, by whom and when was it obtained ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** (a) Yes.

(b) The answer to the first part of this question is in the negative, in so far as the first publication is concerned. The second part does not arise.

MINISTERIAL AND OTHER ESTABLISHMENTS.

241. **\*Mr. K. Ahmed :** (a) Are the Government aware that among the officers and clerks both ministerial and otherwise, acting in all the departments of the Government of India, both at Simla and Delhi, there are almost none appointed from the Mahomedan Community of Bengal Presidency ?

(b) Do Government propose to appoint immediately some qualified Mahomedans of the Bengal Presidency in the above departments whenever vacancies will arise and make it a rule from now so that in future the claims of the Mahomedans of Bengal to the aforesaid offices may not be disregarded ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given on the 10th September 1921 to Mr. J. R. Pantulu Garu's question\* (No. 72) regarding the representation of different parts of India on the staff of the Government of India Secretariat. It has also been ascertained that the Staff Selection Board have never had on its list of passed candidates any Muhammadans belonging to the Bengal Presidency. The results of the last examination are, however, not yet known.

**Mr. K. Ahmed :** Was it notified sufficiently for the Muhammadans of Bengal to know that there will be examinations held at the instance of the Staff Selection Board ?

**Mr. President :** If the Honourable Member wishes to have his questions answered, he had better address them to the Chair and not to his chair.

\* Vide page 160 of Volume II, Part I.



**Mr. K. Ahmed :** I am sorry, Sir.

Did the Government sufficiently notify in the Press or otherwise, so that the Bengal Muhammadans might know that there would be examinations held at the instance of the Staff Selection Board ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** There were 4,000 candidates, so I think it may be assumed that there was pretty wide advertisement of the proposal to hold this examination. How far it came to the notice of the Bengal Muhammadans I do not know, but if the Honourable Member can suggest any special method by which it can be brought to their notice, I shall be glad to consider it.

**Mr. K. Ahmed :** I shall be pleased to do so, Sir. Will the Government be pleased to notify in the local newspapers just before an examination is held, so that the local people of all the provinces might know that, at the instance of the Staff Selection Board, there will be an examination held publicly somewhere on certain fixed dates ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** My contention is that this information is already widely published ; but I am quite prepared to consider any method which the Honourable Member may suggest to me, by which we may secure greater publicity.

#### ALLOWANCES TO INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE AND OTHER SERVICES.

242. \***Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** Will the Government be pleased to state how much more has been paid annually :—

(a) To the members of the Indian Civil Service since overseas allowances, new leave allowances and the new system of promotion on a time-scale came into force ?

(b) To members of other All-India Services ?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey :** I am afraid that it is impossible to collect materials for an accurate reply to the Honourable Member's question without imposing upon audit officers an amount of labour which would certainly not be justified by the results of the investigation. I can, however, tell the Honourable Member, as regards pay and overseas pay, that the additional annual expenditure due to their increase in the case of members of the Indian Civil Service and other all-India services is in the neighbourhood of 50 lakhs of rupees. The majority of this is, of course, paid by Provincial Governments and not by the Government of India. The new method of calculating leave-salary has been in force for less than a year, and it would be impossible to say how much more leave-salary officers have received under the new rules without entering into a most elaborate calculation as to the amount which each would have received, had the rules in the Civil Service Regulations remained in force. This could only be undertaken in audit offices, and in present circumstances I am afraid that I am not prepared to ask audit officers to undertake that task.

#### PUBLIC HOLIDAYS.

243. \***Mr. K. Ahmed :** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state how many Public Holidays are in all prescribed by the Local Government under Section 25 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (XXVI of 1881) and by the High Court, under Section 15 of Act XII of 1887, including those holidays declared by the Local Governments by notification under that

section to be Public Holidays, and that class of holidays announced by the Local Governments to take effect in Government offices either in respect of all classes of Government servants or in respect of the class who observe the fast or festival on account of which the holiday is announced and those that are Local or Special holidays or the last Saturday of the month ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state how many days of these holidays are allotted as Mahomedan, Hindu and as Christian respectively ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** Government have not got the information and are not prepared to collect it.

#### MUHAMMADAN HOLIDAYS.

244. \*Mr. K. Ahmed : (a) Are the Government aware that the number of holidays allotted for Mahomedan festivals, is the smallest of all and that there has been a great agitation and protest by the Mahomedan Community on the Public platform, in the Press, and in the Provincial Councils, as well as in the Indian Legislatures ?

(b) Are the Government aware that during the last Ramzan (the Moslem fasting month) under the scorching sun and stormy weather, the Mahomedans, both the general public and the Government officers and servants, had great difficulties and they suffered most, to attend courts, Government offices, and many other Public functions ?

(c) Do Government propose equitable distribution of Public Holidays for the benefit of all the classes of people according to their requirements from the point of view of their respective religions ?

(d) Do Government propose to grant half-holidays to Mahomedans during the month of Ramzan and on Fridays from 12 to 2 P.M. to enable them to attend their religious prayer (unavoidable according to their religion) ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** The declaration of days as Public Holidays is a matter for Local Governments, and the Government of India do not propose to interfere with their discretion.

245. \*Mr. K. Ahmed : (a) With reference to the reply given to my question\* No. 234 put in last Delhi Session on 28th February 1922, will the Government be pleased to state whether they have procured the German and Belgian Railway Acts ?

(b) If the answer be in the affirmative, will they be pleased to place a copy of each with their translation as promised ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** Inquiries were made and it was found that English translations of the German and Belgian Railway Acts were not procurable in India.

The India Office has been asked whether English translations of these Acts are obtainable in England.

#### INDIANS IN SERVICES.

246. \*Mr. J. Chaudhuri : Will the Government be pleased to state the percentage of Indians in the Indian Civil Services and other All-India Services ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** A statement containing the information required by the Honourable Member is laid on the table.

## Statement showing the percentage, etc., of Indians in certain Public Services.

Service or Department.	Percentage of Indians to the total strength.	Maximum percentage of posts intended to be given to Indians.	Ratio at which the appointments are at present being filled by Indians to the total number of appointments filled.	Number of years that will be necessary for Indians to attain the maximum percentage of posts open to them.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Indian Civil Service.	15.7 per cent.	48 per cent.	86 per cent.	...	Cannot be definitely stated.
Indian Police Service.	9 per cent.	88 per cent. generally. (For North-West Frontier Province not higher than 10 per cent. In Burma the percentage of local recruits has been fixed at 22, of which at least 15 should be Burmans.)	Recruitment is based on the principle that 22 per cent. of the superior posts on each provincial cadre will be held by Indians appointed by means of examination and 11 per cent. by means of promotion from the lower ranks. Annual recruitment is regulated accordingly.		In view of what is stated in column (4) it is not possible to give this information. It will depend on the conditions obtaining in the Police cadre in each province.
Indian Forest Service.	Indians, 6 per cent. Statutory Indians, 9 per cent. Total 15%.	12½ per cent. of the Imperial Forest Service posts are reserved for the promotion of officers of the Provincial Forest Service. These will always be Indians or statutory natives of India. Further 40 per cent. of each year direct recruitment requirements is to be obtained in India from Indians and Statutory Indians. For Burma the figure is 25 per cent.	In 1920 four Indians were selected for appointment in India as probationers. The number of appointments made in England was 25. In 1921 twenty Indians were recruited in India and two in England. The number of Europeans selected as probationers in India under special regulations that year was ten, while fifteen were recruited in England. <i>Recruitment during 1922.</i> Eight Indians in India under ordinary regulations. One Indian (subject to medical fitness) and one Burman in England. Eight Europeans in India under special regulations and probably seven (subject to medical fitness) in England under ordinary regulations.		This will depend upon the rate at which the Europeans already in the Imperial Forest Service disappear and upon the number of suitable Indians forthcoming annually. There is no maximum number of posts fixed as open to Indians, but a percentage of annual recruitment is reserved for them. This percentage is liable to reconsideration.
Indian Agricultural Service.	20.4 per cent.	50 per cent. when adequate training facilities are provided for the training of qualified candidates in India.	Since 15th September 1921, five Europeans and eleven Indians were appointed, i.e., 68.7 per cent. of the total number of vacancies were given to Indians. Excluding Burma, the percentage of new appointments given to Indians is 91.6.		Cannot be gauged but the percentage of 50 will be worked up as soon as qualified Indians are available.
Imperial Branch of the Civil Veterinary Department.	4 per cent.	50 for the present	In addition to five Indian scholars who were sent to England for training last year with a view to their appointment to the Indian Civil Veterinary Department, six Provincial Service Officers are undergoing post-graduate training at Muktesar.		Impossible to say.

Statement showing the percentage, etc., of Indians in certain Public Services—contd.

Service or Department.	Percentage of Indians to the total strength.	Maximum percentage of posts intended to be given to Indians.	Ratio at which the appointments are at present being filled by Indians to the total number of appointments filled.	Number of years that will be necessary for Indians to attain the maximum percentage of posts open to them.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Meteorological Department.	54·5 per cent. ...	No percentage of posts is reserved for either Europeans or Indians. The intention is to fill as many appointments as possible by Indians.	Since March 1927, four Indians (3 permanent and 1 temporary) and no Europeans have been appointed.	Same remarks as in column 3.	
Survey of India	There are no Indians of pure Asiatic descent in class I but see column 3.	16 per cent. of class I appointments are reserved for and held by officers promoted from Class II who must on appointment to Class II be Indians of pure Asiatic descent or Statutory Indians. Indians holding Commissions in the Indian Army are also eligible for appointment.			
Indian Educational Service.	50·1 per cent excluding Burma. 36·6 per cent. including Burma.	50 per cent. ...	50 per cent. of the annual recruitment is to be Indian, exclusive (until 5·1 per cent. of the total is reached) of Indians who may be transferred in posts transferred from the Provincial Educational Service to the Indian Educational Service.	Nothing definite can be stated, but it is hoped that the 50 per cent. will soon be reached.	
Indian Service of Engineers.	40 per cent. ...	50 per cent. in the provinces in India and 83 per cent. in Burma.	19 out of 2 <sup>2</sup> , or 1 : 1·47	As soon as possible.	
*Imperial Customs Service.	About 33 per cent. (excluding Anglo-Indians).	50 per cent. according to existing orders.	According to existing orders, every other vacancy must be filled by a statutory native of India.	This depends on the number of vacancies occurring annually.	*Excluding posts reserved for the I.C.S.
Mint and Assay Department.	<i>Mint Side.</i> —No Indian out of a total sanctioned strength of 3. <i>Assay Side.</i> —The total sanctioned strength is 4 appointments, but of these, 2 are held by Indians, one of whom, however, is on probation—this gives a percentage of 50.	No fixed percentage is reserved, or is intended to be reserved for Indians.	<i>Mint Side.</i> —Appointments are, as a rule, made from the Corps of Royal Engineers as being, <i>prima facie</i> , the most suitable incumbents for the posts; but the Government are not precluded from selecting for a vacancy any candidate, whether European or Indian, who possesses the necessary qualifications. <i>Assay Side.</i> —Vacancies in this Department are now filled by direct appointment, either in India or in England, of qualified metallurgical chemists. Recourse is had to recruitment in England only if no qualified person is available in India. Vacancies are advertised in the press.	Vide columns 3 and 4.	

Statement showing the percentage, etc., of Indians in certain Public Services—concl'd.

Service or Department.	Percentage of Indians to the total strength.	Maximum percentage of posts intended to be given to Indians.	Ratio at which the appointments are at present being filled by Indians to the total number of appointments filled.	Number of years that will be necessary for Indians to attain the maximum percentage of posts open to them.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Indian Medical Service.	22 per cent. ...	No maximum percentage has yet been laid down but the question of fixing a proportion is still under consideration.	The percentage of Indians appointed to the total number of appointments made during 1921 and 1922 to date is 46 per cent. and 88 per cent., respectively.	Vide column 3.	
Royal Indian Marine.	Nil.	Nil. The question of affording facilities to Indians to qualify themselves for admission to the Royal Indian Marine as commissioned officers is under consideration.	Vide columns 2 and 3...	Vide columns 2 and 3.	

#### RECRUITMENT OF INDIANS.

247. \*Mr. J. Chaudhuri : (a) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table or state the views of the Local Governments on the questions discussed in Mr. O'Donnell's circular letter regarding increased recruitment of Indians for the All-India Services ?

(b) Was the circular letter forwarded to the Secretary of State for India and have the views of the Secretary of State and his Council and of the Prime Minister been ascertained on the question ? If so, will the Government be pleased to make a statement with regard to their views for the information of the Assembly ?

(c) Before the India Government and the Home Government come to any final decision on the subject matters of the circular letter, do the Government propose to give the Indian Legislatures and the public at large sufficient time for discussion of the proposals ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : (a) The replies are not complete : the Government of India are not prepared to lay the correspondence on the table. It is not in the public interest that confidential correspondence of this character should be published.

(b) This circular letter was forwarded to the Secretary of State. The decision of His Majesty's Government will presumably be reached after consideration of the views of the Government of India and the Local Governments which have not yet been formulated.

(c) The views of the Chamber have already been expressed in February last.

#### BRITISH ELEMENT IN ALL-INDIA SERVICES.

248. \*Mr. J. Chaudhuri : Is it a fact as stated in the *Englishman* newspaper of Calcutta that " a full agreement has been arrived at between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for maintaining a large British element in the All-India Services " ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** This question is closely connected with the Resolution on the Prime Minister's speech and I hope to be able to explain the views of Government in the course of that discussion to-day.

MILL GRINDING AND FOOD GRAIN PURCHASING CONTRACTS.

249. **\*Rai Bahadur Bakhshi Sohan Lal :** Will the Government be pleased to state, whether the flour Mill grinding and grain purchasing agency contracts recently given by the Controller of Contracts were fully advertised, whether quotations were received from approved contractors and whether the contracts were given to the persons, quoting the lowest rates ?

(b) If the answer to the last portion of the above question be in the negative, then will the Government be pleased to state what were the guiding considerations in the grant of these contracts and whether any lower rates were quoted in this connection, by the approved contractors of the Government ? If so, why were the contracts not given to those contractors, who quoted lower rates ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** I will answer the Honourable Member's question in regard to each of the contracts, separately.

(a) *Grinding Contract.*—Tenders were only invited from those mills in the north of India which, from their geographical situation, could be economically employed. Quotations were received from several of these. The contract was distributed among a number of mills—the mills selected being those which had quoted the lowest rates.

(b) In view of the answer given to (a), this question in respect of the grinding contract does not arise.

(a) *Contract for the purchase of grain.*—Recognised commercial bodies, both Indian and European, throughout India were addressed on the subject, and tenders were invited from such members of these bodies as were considered financially and otherwise fitted to take up so important a contract involving as it does an extensive purchasing and supply organization all over India. Tenders were received from a number of firms, but the contract was not given to the firm which quoted the lowest rate.

(b) It is not understood what the Honourable Member means by the phrase "approved contractors." Of the firms tendering, only one, viz., Messrs. Ralli Brothers, had previously held this particular contract. In giving a contract of this nature and magnitude, it is necessary for Government to be satisfied that the firm selected is one of substance, has an established reputation in the grain trade, and already possesses or is capable of forming the requisite working organization. In certain instances it was known that the rate of commission tendered could not be sufficient to cover the cost of the supervision required, together with a reasonable margin of profit. In accepting a tender of this description, Government would expose themselves to the risk of the supply breaking down, or of obtaining their supplies at manipulated prices.

STATISTICS OF POST CARDS, MONEY ORDERS, ETC.

250. **\*Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** (a) Is it a fact that the number of inland letters and post cards posted and the money orders and V. P. packets sent since the enhanced minimum rates of one anna for ordinary letters

and half an anna for post cards and the minimum money order fee have come into operation, have gone down considerably, so much so, that there is not sufficient work for the staff employed in the Post Offices throughout the country as also for the delivery peons in rural areas ?

(b) Will the Government state how many inland letters and post cards were posted and money orders and V. P. packets sent during the last quarter since enhanced rates came into operation and those posted during the corresponding period of the last year ?

(c) Have the increased postal rates increased or decreased the postal revenue during the period and to what extent ?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank :** I regret that I have not had sufficient time to collect all the information required on this somewhat far-reaching question, but I will supply it to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

#### PASSENGER TRAFFIC.

251. \***Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if the passenger traffic in the Indian Railways has increased or gone down since the Railway fares have been increased ? In either case, by how much numerically and in traffic receipts ?

(b) What is the extent of increase or decrease, in the traffic receipts from 1st, 2nd, inter and 3rd class passengers, respectively, since increase in the fares in the State and other Railways has come into operation ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** A statement containing the information asked for by the Honourable Member is being sent to him direct.

#### CALCUTTA MAIDAN.

252. \***Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** (a) How much have the Government of India to spend annually for the up-keep of the Calcutta Maidan and the roads running through it ?

(b) Is the Government contemplating making them over to the Calcutta Corporation for relieving the Central Government of their maintenance charges ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) The Government of India incur no expenditure on the upkeep of the Maidan. As to roads, with the exception of those leading to the fort, the annual expenditure on which amounts to Rs. 4,000 approximately, no roads are maintained from Central revenues.

(b) There is no proposal under consideration to hand these roads over to the Calcutta Corporation.

#### ARMY CANTEN BOARD.

253. \***Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** (a) Is it a fact that the newly organised Army Canteen Board has been working at a loss ?

(b) What is the amount of loss incurred by the Army Canteen Board since its organisation ?

(c) How much have the Government paid as guarantors to cover the losses and what are their unpaid liabilities on this account ?

(d) How much have the Government spent for organising the Board including Lieutenant-Colonel Morten's salary, his establishment, travelling and other incidental charges ?

(e) Is it a fact that the charges of the Board's Canteens for provision, etc., are higher than what used to be charged by Indian Army Contractors ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) and (b). The Army Canteen Board is a public company incorporated under the Indian Companies Act (of 1913). The Government of India are in a position to see the company's audited balance sheet, just as the general public do, but they have no official access to its accounts. The first balance sheet of the Board has not yet been published, and Government are not therefore in a position to answer these parts of the question.

(c) Government have so far paid nothing as guarantors, and no claim has been made upon Government by the Board. The amount of Government's contingent liability at the present moment is not known.

(d) *Nil*. I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 26th September last, to parts (b) and (c) of his Question\* No. 58.

(e) The Government of India have no information that the fact is as stated.

BALIGUNJE MAIDAN.

254. \***Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** (a) Is the up-keep of the Baligunje Maidan in Calcutta, which was formerly reserved for the Viceroy's Body-Guard Lines, debited to His Excellency's establishment or to the Military Department who use it for most part of the year as Cavalry Lines, or to both, and if the latter, in what proportion ?

(b) Is it a fact that when the Baligunje Maidan was used chiefly as the Viceroy's Body-Guard Lines, public were always allowed to cross the Maidan in their carriages and also on foot and the roads used to be closed only one day in the year for assertion of the Government's private rights ?

(c) Is the Government aware that since last year the Military authorities have stopped all traffic along these roads much to the inconvenience of people living in its neighbourhood ? If so, do the Government propose to ask the Military authorities to restore the former practice ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) to (c). The Government of India are making inquiries on the subject from Calcutta, the results of which I will communicate to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

**Mr. J. Chaudhuri :** Is the Honourable Member aware that the Baligunje Maidan is in a very insanitary condition at present. There is no proper drainage, and during the rains it gets water-logged and becomes a swamp. Will the Honourable Member inquire about this and keep the Maidan in a sanitary condition.

**Mr. E. Burdon :** The Government of India have no information on the subject, but I shall be glad to make inquiries from Calcutta regarding the matter.

ADDRESSES OF MILITARY OFFICERS.

255. \***Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur :** Are Government aware of the hardships felt by Trades Associations in the Punjab and the Deccan on account of the refusal of the Army Headquarters to give them the addresses of Military Officers, and if so, do they propose to follow the

\* *Vide* page 1002 of Volume II, Part I.



practice of the War Office in London who do not maintain any secrecy in such matters ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** As regards the first part of the question, certain representations on the subject, have been received at Army Headquarters from the Punjab Trades Association, which have been complied with.

As regards the second part of the question, the procedure followed by Army Headquarters is the same as that followed by the War Office.

#### STATISTICS OF VARIOUS RACES IN SERVICES.

256. **\*Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur :** Will Government be pleased to state the percentage of increase during the last quinquennium (ending 1920-21), as compared with the previous quinquennium (ending 1915-16) in the employment of (a) Hindus, (b) Mussalmans, (c) Indian Christians, (d) Anglo-Indians, and (e) Europeans in (1) the Indian Civil Service, (2) the Indian Educational Service, (3) the Indian Medical Service, and (4) the Indian Judicial Service, both higher and lower grades ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** The information asked for is not available, and could not be collected without the expenditure of a great deal of labour by both the Central and Provincial Governments.

#### PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH IN INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE DEBATE

257. **\*Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur :** Are Government aware of the public disapproval, as expressed by recognised public bodies and in public meetings of Indian citizens all over the country, of the Prime Minister's recent utterance in the House of Commons during what is known as the Indian Civil Service debate, and if so, whether they propose to communicate such disapproval to the Premier as well to the British Cabinet ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** Government have nothing to add to the statement made by His Excellency the Viceroy on the subject in reply to the deputation which waited on him on the 19th August 1922, and in his opening speech on the 5th September.

#### MADRAS LOCAL OPTION BILL.

258. **\*Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur :** Is it a fact that the Government of India sought to interfere with the introduction by M. R. Ry. Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu, M.L.C., of the Madras Local Option Bill in the Madras Legislative Council, and if so, will they be pleased to state clearly the grounds of their objection to the introduction of the measure ?

**The Honourable Dr. T. B. Saprú :** The Government of India requested the Government of Madras to inform the member concerned that the Bill which he proposed to introduce required the previous sanction of the Governor General under Section 80A (3) (b) of the Government of India Act. No application for sanction has been received.

#### INDIAN ELECTORATE.

259. **\*Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur :** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing province by province the present total strength of the Indian electorate, enfranchised under the reformed

constitution, for election to the Central Legislature, under the heads of (a) Hindus, (b) Mussalmans, (c) Indian Christians, (d) Anglo-Indians (e) Europeans, and (f) all others ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** The information asked for by the Honourable Member is not available, but I lay on the table two statements showing the strength of the electorates in the various classes of constituencies in the two Chambers in the first electoral rolls.

*I.—Statement arranged by provinces showing the total number of electors in each class of constituency for the Legislative Assembly in the first Electoral Rolls.*

Province.	Non-Muhammadian.	Muhammadian.	European.	Landholders.	Commerce.	Sikhs.	REMARKS.
Madras ...	2,46,697	16,112	1,153	556	2,06	...	
Bombay ...	1,08,538	21,751	1,375	983	5-1	...	
Bengal ...	1,28,004	53,935	803	517	147	...	
United Provinces ...	1,41,677	28,468	2,513	692	...	...	
Punjab ...	17,016	20,635	...	826	...	14,539	
Bihar and Orissa ...	58,569	8,331	...	122	...	...	
C. P. and Berar ...	23,289	1,010	...	217	...	...	
Assam ...	13,463	4,989	1,052	...	...	...	
Burma ...				1,550*			*European and Non-European. †Delhi Constituency.
Delhi ...				2,307†			

*II.—Statement arranged by provinces showing the total number of Electors in each class of constituency for the Council of State in the first Electoral Rolls.*

Province.	Non-Muhammadian.	Muhammadian.	Sikhs.	Commerce.	REMARKS.
Madras ...	2,169	121	...	...	
Bombay ...	2,048	829	...	70	
Bengal ...	1,332	678	...	216	
United Provinces ...	2,508	404	...	...	
Punjab ...	880	685	365	...	
Bihar and Orissa ...	1,390	276	...	...	
C. P. and Berar ...	*910				*Central Provinces and Berar (General) Constituency.
Assam ...	301	...	...	...	
Burma ...	2,392†			72	†Burma (General) Constituency.

MILITARY WORKS DEPARTMENT, KOHAT.

260. **\*Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that on a petition from the temporary clerks, Military Works Department, Kohat, dated 6th May 1922, asking for the payment of their revised pay the Deputy Assistant Director, Military Works, Kohat, wrote the following order :—

“Please read King’s Regulation. Your action is malignant. You should all be shot at dawn. Please save up all your money and buy King’s Regulation and if you get more money buy the Manual of Military Law. When I reorganise Military Works all Babus must know these two books by

heart and then there will be no more Babu-Writing. How much was the typist paid for this waste of time? Make sure you send this to the Legislative Council or Mr. Gandhi."

(Sd.) " F. H. W. ARCHBOLD,  
Major, R.E.,  
D.A.D.M.W., Kohat."

Dated 15th May 1922.

(b) If so, what action do the Government propose to take against the officer?

(c) Have the clerks been paid their revised pay?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The officer has been removed from his appointment and reverted to a lower one in a different part of India. Government do not propose to take any further action.

(c) All the temporary clerks referred to have either received their increments or are drawing the full pay to which they are entitled.

#### CERTIFICATES IN KOHAT.

261. \***Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that the following certificate of personal responsibility, viz., " I hereby certify that any work put in hand by me without a detailed estimate and allotment of funds will be paid for with my wages, or failing that I understand I am to go to prison," has been prescribed by the Deputy Assistant Director, Military Works, Kohat?

(b) If so, was it prescribed with the approval of Government of India or the Local Government?

(c) What action do Government propose to take in the matter?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) No.

(c) As the order in question has been withdrawn and was never acted upon, Government do not propose to take any further action in the matter. In their opinion, such an incident is unlikely to recur.

#### POST OFFICES IN TOCHI VALLEY.

262. \***Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that there are only 6 sub-post offices in the Tochi Valley under a Deputy Assistant Director, Postal Service, and none of these offices was inspected by him during the years 1920 and 1921?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the amount of pay plus monthly travelling allowance drawn by the officer mentioned in (a), during the years 1920 and 1921, and

(c) The purpose of each journey undertaken by him?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank :** The information asked for by the Honourable Member is being collected and a reply will be sent to him as soon as possible.

#### RELEASE OF PRISONERS IN FRONTIER JAILS.

263. \***Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that between December 1921 and March 1922, 110 prisoners were released from the Frontier Jails?

- (b) If so, will Government be pleased to state—  
 (i) The offences under which these prisoners were convicted,  
 (ii) Period of sentences awarded in each case,  
 (iii) Period passed by each in Jail ?  
 (c) Is it also a fact that some of these prisoners were convicted of dacoities and other serious offences ?  
 (d) If so, why were they released ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** The information has been called for and will be supplied to the Honourable Member when received.

**MR. ABDUL RAHIM KHAN, INSPECTOR OF POLICE.**

264. \***Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. Abdul Rahim Khan, Inspector of Police, has been stationed at Tank in the District of Dera Ismail Khan, for the last 13 years and in spite of representations from the public and the District Superintendent of Police he has not been transferred as yet ?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state reasons for his retention ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** Government have no information.

**CHURCH MISSION AIDED SCHOOLS.**

265. \***Mr. P. L. Misra :** (a) Is it a fact that Managers of the Church Mission Aided Schools in the Frontier Province are allowed to charge Rs. 400 per mensem in the accounts for purposes of calculating grant-in-aid admissible under the rules, whereas applications from Managers of Aided Institutions, Hindu and Mohamedan, for similar grant-in-aid have been refused ?

(b) If so, do Government propose to direct that all Aided Institutions in the Frontier Province be treated alike ?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler :** The grant allowed in all schools in the North-West Frontier Province is half the difference between the pay of all masters and of their pay by standard scale. No special concession is given to Mission schools, and no grant-in-aid has been refused to Muhammadan and Hindu schools in this respect. In calculating a grant Managers of Mission schools are treated as headmasters and they actually work as such. No complaint whatever has been received from other schools in this matter.

**RAILWAY ACCOUNTS SYSTEMS.**

266. \***Mr. K. O. Neogy :** With reference to the lack of co-relation between the renewal programmes of Railways and the financial accounts, as described in paragraph 6515 of Volume III of the Acworth Committee's report, have any steps been taken to introduce the English railway accounts system under which the auditor would be bound to write down the book value of the Railway plant in accordance with an accepted renewal programme which might be deferred on any account ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given on 6th September 1922 to a similar question by Mr. N. M. Joshi.

## RAILWAY RENEWAL PROGRAMMES.

267. \*Mr. K. C. Neogy : (i) With reference to the statements contained in paragraphs 242 to 250 of Volume II of the Acworth Committee's report, regarding deferred expenditure on renewal programmes of Railways, will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact (a) that some Railway companies made proposals to establish reserve funds with the money required for renewals that had to be deferred, instead of dividing the money as profit, and (b) that the Government of India had been opposed to the idea ?

(ii) Is it a fact that such reserve funds were allowed to be created only in the case of the Bengal and North-Western, and the Rohilkund and Kumaon Railways ; and if so, why were no such funds established in the case of the other Railways ?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : (i) The reply is in the affirmative.

(ii) The reserves in question were established on the Bengal and North-Western and Rohilkund and Kumaon Railways as the major portions of these lines are owned by private Railway Companies. On other Railways the system has been to provide for special renewals by a special allotment in what is known as programme revenue expenditure, but the system has proved unsatisfactory and the question of establishing a proper depreciation fund has now been taken up.

## " RAID " ON RAILWAY RESERVE.

268. \*Mr. K. C. Neogy : With reference to the twenty million reserve created for Railway renewal purposes, during the period of the Finance Membership of Sir William Meyer, will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact, as stated by Sir William Meyer before the Acworth Committee, that the said reserve " got raided " owing to exchange troubles ?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : I cannot say exactly what Sir William Meyer had in mind when he spoke of the special reserve being " raided " owing to exchange troubles. I will give the exact circumstances under which the reserve of £20 millions was constituted, and, the Honourable Member will see that the expression quoted cannot accurately be applied to the operation. At the time in question (1917-18) we were making large disbursements in India on behalf of the Home Government, for which we were being repaid in London. The exchange position was, however, such that it was not possible to retransfer our balances from London to India, and we were accordingly obliged to supplement our resources in this country by the sale of Treasury Bills and by other means. There was thus a large accumulation of balances in London, and out of this a sum of £20 millions was set aside, for reasons which will be apparent from the following remarks made by Sir William Meyer in his Budget speech on March the 1st, 1918 :

" We propose, therefore, as against our temporary borrowings on Treasury Bills here, and in view of the satisfactory financial position of India as a whole, to invest £20 millions in Home Treasury Bills in order to provide for the liabilities which in one way or another will come upon us shortly after the war is over."

The Honourable Member will see therefore that the reserve was not specially ear-marked for railway expenditure ; and at the conclusion of

the war it became part of our ordinary ways and means resources and its existence meant that we had to borrow so much less for our capital requirements.

**RAILWAY MATERIALS FOR WAR PURPOSES.**

269. \***Mr. K. C. Neogy** : (a) With reference to the statements made in paragraph 5798 of Volume III of the Acworth Committee's report, will Government be pleased to state whether the State's share of the money received from the War Office in England, as the value of Railway materials requisitioned for war purposes, was not carried to any reserve but was absorbed in the finances of Government ? If so, what were the reasons for such action ?

(b) What was the total amount thus absorbed, and under what head is it shown in the accounts of any particular year ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : (a) The State's share of the money received from the War Office in England as the value of Railway materials requisitioned for war purposes was absorbed in the finances of Government, the reason for this being that it was intended to replace the material at an early date and the cost of replacement had to be found from the finances of Government.

As regards paragraph (b) of the Honourable Member's question, the Railway Administrations concerned have been asked to furnish the information which will be supplied on receipt.

**AGRA-DELHI CHORD RAILWAY.**

270. \***Mr. K. C. Neogy** : With reference to the re-alignment of the Agra-Delhi Chord Railway, as necessitated by the construction of the New Capital at Delhi, what is the estimated total cost of the same ; and how much thereof is to be charged to the Imperial Delhi Account, and how much to the Railway budget ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : Estimates for the Agra-Delhi Chord Railway diversion are under preparation. Up to date figures are not available. The Imperial Delhi Account will bear the cost of replacing existing facilities on the new alignment.

**POLITICAL PRISONERS.**

271. \***Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri** : (a) Has the Government made any inquiry to find out as to what action the Provincial Governments have taken on the suggestions made by the Central Government about the treatment of political prisoners ?

(b) Is the treatment given to such prisoners uniform in all provinces ? If not, why not ?

(c) What concession or treatment over and above that of ordinary prisoners is given to the political prisoners ?

(d) What authority classifies the prisoners to be political prisoners and assigns them better treatment ?

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent** : (a) Government have been in correspondence with Local Governments on this subject.

(b) The answer is in the negative. Under section 60 of the Prisons Act, Local Governments themselves have power to frame rules in regard to the treatment of prisoners.

(c) The Government of India have recently addressed Local Governments on the subject of the treatment of persons convicted of offences in connection with political movements and have indicated the principles which they desire to see followed in this matter. I hope in connection with a resolution, of which notice has been given, to have an opportunity of explaining in detail the character of the treatment accorded to these prisoners.

(d) The Government of India have expressed a desire that the classification should be made by the Local Government itself, or, if made by District Magistrates or Courts, that the orders passed by these authorities should in every case be subject to confirmation by the Local Government.

#### NOTICE OF ARRIVAL OF GOODS.

272. \***Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri** : Will the Government be pleased to state :

- (a) Whether or not the Railway authorities give to consignees any intimation of the arrival of goods or articles at the destination ?
- (b) Whether the Railway Companies charge demurrage on the goods without having given any intimation of their arrival, and whether the Government is aware of the harassment and trouble caused to the public by this act of the Railway servants ?
- (c) Whether the Government propose to take steps to make it obligatory on the Railway Companies to give to the consignees proper intimation of the arrival of their goods ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : (a) It is the general practice for railways to send consignees notice of the arrival of parcels or goods.

(b) Railways are under no statutory obligation in this matter, and non-receipt of an intimation of arrival does not entitle the consignee to exemption from demurrage charges if delivery is not taken within the free time allowed. Such cases are dealt with on their merits.

(c) As at present advised, Government do not propose to take action in the direction indicated.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : With regard to No. 272(a), I wish to ask a supplementary question, Sir. Would it not be desirable, instead of sending information of the arrival of the goods in question to the consignees, to send the goods direct to the consignees ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : I am afraid I do not really understand the Honourable Member's question.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : Instead of giving notice to the consignees in the case of fresh goods, would it not be desirable for the railway to give delivery of the parcel ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : If the consignees are prepared to pay for delivery I have no objection.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : Is not that the practice in other countries ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : No, Sir, I think not.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : Are you sure about England ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : Yes.

REMOVAL FROM THE AMBALA CANTONMENT COMMITTEE OF TWO OF ITS  
OLD MEMBERS.

273. \* **Mr. W. M. Hussanally** : (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article headed "Saddar Bazar Controversy in Ambala" published in the *Cantonment Advocate* dated the 10th August, 1922 ?

(b) Is the Government aware that Colonel Newnhan, Commandant, Ambala Brigade, a day or two before his retirement made a fresh nomination of the Indian members of the Cantonment Committee on the 24th July, 1922 ?

(c) Is it a fact that by this nomination two old and experienced members of the Cantonment Committee were removed from the Committee simply because they supported the separation of the Saddar Bazar of Ambala against the wishes of the local authorities ?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state the necessity of this nomination ?

(e) Is it a fact that their seats on the Cantonment Committee were filled up by those who opposed the separation ?

(f) Is the Government aware that Lala Mahesh Dass, Honorary Magistrate of Ambala and a non-official member of the Cantonment Committee, has resigned the seat on the Committee as a protest against the principle underlying the new nomination ? Will the Government lay a copy of his resignation on the table ?

(g) Is the Government aware that the nomination was condemned in a public meeting of Ambala and the Government was requested to direct a fresh nomination to be made in consultation with the people's wishes ?

**Mr. E. Burdon** : (a)—(g). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 6th September last to an identical question asked by another Honourable Member of this Assembly, Mr. Peyári Lal, No. 136.

ARTICLES IN THE "CANTONMENT ADVOCATE."

274. \* **Mr. W. M. Hussanally** : (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the article headed "Alleged Activity of a Cantonment Underling. Sensational statement of a Landlord in Ambala," published in the *Cantonment Advocate* dated the 25th July, 1922, and the article headed "Cantonment Corruption Enquiry Committee" published in the *Cantonment Advocate* dated the 10th August, 1922 ?

(b) If so, do the Government propose to appoint such a Committee of Inquiry ?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to make a statement about the cases mentioned in those articles ?

(d) Is the Government aware that one Lala Bahadra Mall of Ambala has made a statement to the General Officer Commanding, Ambala, that the Head Clerk of the Cantonment office, Ambala, demanded from him a sum of Rs. 200 as bribe for getting the construction of the upper storey of his house sanctioned by the Cantonment Magistrate ? If so, what action has the Government taken against this public official ?

(e) Is the Government aware that Rai Sahib Lala Panna Lal, Member of the Cantonment Committee, gave a notice on about 20th July, 1922, of a discussion of Lala Bahadra Mall's case in the next meeting of the Cantonment Committee coming off on the 31st July, 1922 ?



(f) Is it a fact that immediately after his sending this notice he was removed from the Cantonment Committee under cover of a new nomination ?

(g) Will the Government be pleased to state if there is any connection between his sending this notice and his removal from the Cantonment Committee ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a)—(g). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 6th September 1922, to an identical question asked by another Honourable Member of this Assembly, Mr. Peyari Lal.

ACTION OF THE CANTONMENT MAGISTRATE OF AMBALA IN CURTAILING  
THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

275. \***Mr. W. M. Hussanally :** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article headed "An unwarranted interference with the rights of free speech," published in the *Cantonment Advocate* dated the 10th June, 1922 ? If so, will the Government be pleased to state the circumstances under which the Cantonment Magistrate, Ambala, served the notice referred to curtailing the public rights of freedom of speech ?

(b) If the Magistrate's action be supported by no law, do the Government propose to take suitable action to prevent such interference with the freedom of public speech ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) and (b). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 6th September to an identical question asked by Mr. Peyari Lal, No. 138.

"CANTONMENT MANUAL."

276. \***Mr. W. M. Hussanally :** (a) Is it a fact that the Cantonment Manual contains executive directions and instructions for the governance of house property within Cantonments ?

(b) If so, is it a fact that several Landlords within Cantonments in India have applied for a copy of the Cantonment Manual and they have been refused the same on the ground that the Cantonment Manual is meant for departmental military officers only as containing private and confidential instructions ?

(c) Are these executive instructions and directions governing house property published separately which Landlords can have access to for their information and guidance ? If so, where can the literature be had, if not, why not ?

(d) If these executive instructions and directions are of a confidential nature, why are they made so, if it is intended that they should govern properties in Cantonments owned by the public ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) The "Cantonment Manual" which is really a summary of "all Government orders and circulars issued by the Quartermaster General in India on cantonment matters", was compiled for the use and guidance of Commanding Officers of cantonments, Cantonment Magistrates, and other officials connected with the executive municipal side of cantonment administration. Among other subjects, the "Manual" contains instructions for the "governance of house property" if, by this expression, the Honourable Member refers to the question of the tenure of houses in cantonments and their appropriation for military officers, etc.

(b) Applications from certain private individuals for the supply of copies of the "Manual" have been refused on the ground that the book is for official use only and is not for sale to the general public.

(c) The only instructions of the kind which have so far been published separately are those contained in Appendix XIX of the Manual, which is merely a reprint of pages 366—442 of Part V of the *Gazette of India* dated the 5th November 1898.

(d) It has not been considered necessary in the past to publish the instructions in question, since, as I have already stated, they were intended merely for the guidance of officials dealing with their subject matter. If the Bill for the amendment of the Cantonment House-Accommodation Act, which is now before the Legislature, becomes law, the question of publishing all instructions, which affect the rights and interests of houseowners, in the position which they will occupy under the new Act, will be carefully considered.

**REMOVAL OF INTER AND THIRD CLASS RESERVED CARRIAGES FOR EUROPEANS AND ANGLO-INDIANS.**

277. \*Mr. W. M. Hussanally : With reference to my Resolution *re* removal of reserved compartments on Railways in favour of particular communities, published at pages 1215-18 of Volume II of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, will Government be pleased to state if the intermediate and third class reserved carriages for Europeans and Anglo-Indians have been removed from all trains except mail trains ?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given in this Assembly on the 6th September 1922 to a similar question (No. 53) asked by Beohar Raghubir Sinha.

**POST OFFICE INSURANCE FUND RULES.**

278. \*Mr. W. M. Hussanally : (i) Is it a fact that under Post Office Insurance Fund rules as at present promulgated—

(a) A subscriber can only assign a policy once and for valuable consideration ?

(b) A subscriber who has assigned his policy to his wife or particular child or children, has no remedy to revoke that assignment during his life time for any valid reason such as death, unfilial behaviour of a child and so on ?

(ii) Is it a fact that Life Assurance Companies do permit such revocation and re-assignment without valuable consideration, at the option of the Policy-holder, at any time during his life and as many times as he pleases ?

(iii) If the answer to the second question be in the affirmative, will Government state if they propose to revise the rules relating to Postal Insurance with a view to bringing the same in line with the rules of such private companies ? If not, why not ?

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank : The necessary information is being collected and a reply will be sent to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

**SUTLEJ VALLEY SCHEME.**

279. \*Mr. W. M. Hussanally : Will the Government please refer to my Question No. 214 printed at page 231 of Volume I of Debates of the

Legislative Assembly for February 1921 and answer the following questions :

- (a) Is it a fact that the Government have recently sanctioned what is known as the "Sutlej Scheme" for irrigating land in the Punjab from the River Indus ?
- (b) What will that scheme cost ? How much water will that scheme draw from the Indus and what is the area of land it will irrigate ?
- (c) Will the withdrawal of this water for the benefit of the Punjab in any way affect the supply of Sind ?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank :** (a) The Secretary of State has recently sanctioned the Sutlej Valley Canals Project which draws its supplies from the Sutlej, a tributary of the Indus.

(b) The Scheme is estimated to cost Rs. 1,460 lakhs, the full supply capacity at the canal heads is 48,516 cusecs, and the area to be irrigated is 5,107,531 acres in the Punjab and in the States of Bahawalpur and Bikaner.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply to the question by the Honourable Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas regarding the effect of the withdrawals of the Sutlej Valley Canals on agriculture in Sind.

#### SIND SAGAR SCHEME.

280. **\*Mr. W. M. Hussanally :** (a) Have the Government heard of another big canal project in the Punjab, known as the "Sind Sagar Scheme ?"

(b) Why has the name Sind been given to that scheme ?

(c) Does that scheme contemplate irrigating lands within the Province of Sind ?

(d) What is that scheme going to cost ?

(e) How much land will that scheme irrigate ?

(f) Is that scheme likely to affect the water-supply of Sind ?

(g) Has that scheme been sent up to the Government for sanction ?

(h) Do the Government propose to sanction that scheme ?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank :** (a) Yes.

(b) Because it will irrigate the Sind Sagar Doab, also known as the Thal, the tract of country situated between the Indus on the west and the Jhelum and Chenab on the east.

(c) No.

(d) About 9½ crores of rupees.

(e) About 1½ million acres.

(f) Yes.

(g) No.

(h) The project when received from the Local Government will be considered on its merits with due regard to the probable effects on Sind irrigation.

#### PRECAUTIONS TO OBIVIATE SHORTAGE OF WATER IN SIND.

281. **\*Mr. W. M. Hussanally :** What precautions do the Government propose to take in order that the Province of Sind may not be starved of its supply ?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank :** The Honourable Member is referred to the reply to the question put by the Honourable Mr.

Harchandrai Vishindas at this Session regarding the effect of withdrawals of the Sutlej Valley Canals on agriculture in Sind.

WITHDRAWAL OF WATER SUPPLIES FROM THE INDUS.

282. \*Mr. W. M. Hussanally : (a) Do the Government propose to take steps to prevent the Punjab on account of its favourable situation drawing larger water supply from the Indus, to the prejudice of the Province of Sind which is lower down the river ?

(b) Did the " Sind Mahomedan Association " make any representation in their Address to His Excellency the Viceroy in 1917 upon this subject ? If so, what was the reply vouchsafed by His Excellency to them on that occasion ?

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank : (a) Further projects in the Punjab will be considered in connection with the discharge observations which have been instituted in the Province and in Sind in accordance with the orders of the Government of India and in regulating the programme of construction of canals due care will be taken to ensure that the interests of both provinces are safeguarded.

(b) Yes. An extract from the Address presented by the Sind Mahomedan Association to His Excellency Lord Chelmsford in October 1917 and of the reply thereto are laid on the table.

---

EXTRACT FROM AN ADDRESS PRESENTED BY THE SIND MUHAMMADAN ASSOCIATION, ON THE 30TH OCTOBER 1917, TO HIS EXCELLENCY LORD CHELMSFORD.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. With regard to the Sukkur Barrage Project we beg respectfully to state that works of such magnitude are the only satisfactory ways of profitably utilising the water of the Indus, which on account of its low level in the lower reaches is practically wasted in some places, as it cannot adequately supply the canals. We are aware of the history of the Sukkur Barrage Project and of the various technical difficulties that are in the way. We also realize that Government cannot be expected to undertake such huge works during the war. Nevertheless we beg to suggest that preliminary investigations in the nature of survey and other matters in which we are glad to find Government is at present engaged be pushed with all possible speed, so that after the conclusion of the war no time be lost in further preliminary matters and the work started without delay. Without going into the technical side of the question, we venture to state that the Sukkur Barrage Project is at once the surest way of increasing and regulating the supply of water and bringing under cultivation large tracts of otherwise waste land.

---

EXTRACT FROM HIS EXCELLENCY LORD CHELMSFORD'S SPEECH IN REPLY TO AN ADDRESS PRESENTED BY THE SIND MUHAMMADAN ASSOCIATION, ON THE 30TH OCTOBER 1917.

\* \* \* \* \*

I will now deal with the first important point to which you invite my attention, namely, the effect of the opening of canals in the Punjab in the interests of the Zamindars in Sind. I cannot help thinking that you draw too gloomy a picture of the state of agriculture here, and I am assured that the condition of the landholders in recent years would compare favourably with any previous period. In any case I cannot accept the conclusion that your province has suffered from the action of Government in regulating the distribution of the water from the rivers of the Punjab. The question of the effect of the Punjab canal system on the supply of water in the River Indus in Sind is one which has been a subject of much study on the part of irrigation engineers. From the researches that have been made there is no

indication that this supply has as yet been adversely affected by the opening of new canals in the Punjab, but you may rest assured that this matter, which is of such vital importance to your Province, will be fully considered before any further irrigation schemes in the Punjab dependent on the waters of the Indus system are put in hand. I can also assure you that the investigation into the project for the Sukkur barrage and its dependent canals will be pursued with the utmost possible vigour.

#### SUKKUR BARRAGE SCHEME.

283. \***Mr. W. M. Hussanally** : Are the Government aware of the strong agitation in Sind against the rumoured postponement of the Sukkur Barrage scheme by the Bombay Government on account of financial stringency, if so, do the Government propose to take such action as is necessary so that the construction be proceeded with forthwith during the current year?

**Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank** : The reply to the first part of the inquiry is in the affirmative. The Secretary of State has approved the project both administratively and technically but has withheld his final sanction pending receipt of the detailed proposals of the Government of Bombay as to how the scheme will be financed.

Further action in the matter of obtaining the Secretary of State's final sanction to the project and the financing of the scheme are matters which rest entirely with the Government of Bombay.

### UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

#### INDUSTRIAL UNDERTAKINGS.

154. **Rai Bahadur P. V. Srinivasa Rao** : (a) Will the Government be pleased to furnish a list of Industrial undertakings in India to which special concessions (by way of low rates or rebates) have been granted by the Railway Administrations of State lines, in respect of the carriage of raw materials and finished products? What are the conditions subject to which these concessions have been granted, and how do the special rates in these cases compare with the rates ordinarily charged by the Railway concerned for similar traffic, and with the minimum class rates authorised by the Railway Board?

(b) Are the Government prepared to recommend to the Railway Administrations that such concession rates be more freely granted with a view to foster Indian industry?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : (a) Special low rates, which the Honourable Member will find in the published tariffs of railways, are quoted for the raw materials and finished products of various Indian industries on different railways. These rates are not confined in their application to individual industrial undertakings, but are available for all traffic satisfying their conditions.

The East Indian and Bengal-Nagpur Railways quote special concession rates to certain Iron and Steel Companies in India.

(b) The Railway Board have already impressed upon Railway Administrations the desirability of fostering local industries by the quotation of favourable rates for the carriage of raw materials required in manufacture, and of the finished product.

## INTERMEDIATE CLASS ACCOMMODATION.

155. **Rai Bahadur P. V. Srinivasa Rao** : Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons (1) for not introducing the Intermediate class on the Branch line between Guntur and Tenali on the M. S. M. Railway (broad gauge), and (2) for the introduction of the Intermediate class for only a short distance between Bezbada and Narasaraipet stations on the Bezbada-Guntakal section (metre gauge) of the same Railway ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : (1) No demand has been received from the District Board or the public for the provision of Intermediate class accommodation on this branch line.

(2) Inter Class accommodation beyond Narasaraipet has not been introduced owing to the limited number of such stock on the metre gauge and the fact that the Intermediate class traffic west of Narasaraipet is small.

## INTERMEDIATE CLASS ACCOMMODATION.

156. **Rai Bahadur P. V. Srinivasa Rao** : (a) Is the Government aware of the hardship felt by the travelling public on account of the absence of the Intermediate class on some of the Railways since the recent enhancement of the second class fares ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to take early steps for the introduction of the Intermediate class on all the Railways ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given in this Assembly on 16th January 1922 to a similar question (No. 189) asked by Rai Bahadur Pandit Jawahar Lal Bhargava.

The Bombay, Baroda and Central India and South Indian Railways have since introduced Inter class accommodation on certain trains.

## RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURES.

157. **Rai Bahadur P. V. Srinivasa Rao** : (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a notification of the Railway Board prohibiting Railway employees from approaching Honourable Members of the Indian Legislatures with a view to the ventilation of individual and public grievances ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state whether it has either approved or disapproved of the same ?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the notification of the Railway Board and the ' Conduct rules ' laid down for the Railway employees ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn** : (a) and (b). The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by me to a similar question put by Mr. K. Ahmed.

(c) A copy of the letter to the Railway officials will be sent to the Honourable Member. A copy of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules (which are applicable to railway employees) is available in the library of this Assembly.

## IMPORT DUTY ON MOTOR CARS.

158. **Rai Bahadur P. V. Srinivasa Rao** : Will the Government be pleased to state whether the raising of the import duty on motor cars to

30 per cent. since April last has resulted so far in greater or less income to the Government ?

**The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes :** The import duty on motor cars is not shown separately in our monthly accounts. The import duty on motor cars, motor cycles, motor scooters, bicycles, tricycles and the like during the first four months of the current year is slightly in excess of the amount received in the first four months of last year.

#### PURCHASE OF RAILWAYS.

159. **Mr. N. M. Joshi :** Will Government kindly state the total amount spent up to 31st March 1922, from the general revenues of India in connection with the construction or purchase of railways including among others the cost of lands provided free to the existing railway companies as well as to the old guaranteed railway companies, and payments made in discharge of capital liabilities by means of annuities and sinking funds ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** The Honourable Member will kindly refer to Account No. 74 of the Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for the year 1920-21, which gives the total amount spent up to 31st March 1921, in connection with the construction or purchase of railways including the payments made in discharge of Capital liabilities by means of annuities and sinking funds. The cost of lands provided free to the old Guaranteed Railway Companies is not available separately, but it is assumed to have been one of the factors taken into account in determining the capital at charge at the time of purchase. It is then included in the Capital outlay to date shown in column 5 of statement.

The cost of lands provided free by Government to Branch Line Companies mentioned in Statement No. 55, page 155 of the Finance and Revenue Accounts for the year 1920-21, to end of 31st March 1921 amounts to Rs. 2,33,32,601 and is not included in Account No. 74 referred to above.

Similar information to end of 1921-22 is not available at present.

#### WAGES OF UNSKILLED LABOURERS.

160. **Mr. N. M. Joshi :** Will Government kindly lay on the table when available a statement shewing the average wages calculated in cents (American) of an unskilled labourer in the countries mentioned in the concluding portion of Chapter VI of the Railway Administration Report for 1920-21 ?

**Mr. A. C. Chatterjee :** It is not possible to give a single figure of the type desired by the Honourable Member for the countries specified. The wages of unskilled labour are not uniform for different industries, they vary widely from place to place, and in some cases from season to season. Statistics relating to wages in the majority of the countries specified are kept in the Labour Bureau, and I shall be glad to show them to the Honourable Member if he will come to my office.

#### DRINKING WATER AT RAILWAY STATIONS.

161. **Bhai Man Singh :** Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Sewa Samiti people supply water on a good many Railway Stations on the North Western Railway ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** Government have no information on the subject but inquiries will be made.

#### DRINKING WATER AT RAILWAY STATIONS

162. **Bhai Man Singh :** (a) Is it a fact that the Sewa Samti people supplied water on the stations on the D. U. K. Railway and that they were stopped by the authorities ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons that led the Railway authorities to stop them and the difficulty that stands in their way of allowing the Sewa Samti people to so supply water ?

(c) Is it a fact that very great trouble to the passengers for want of any arrangement worth the name for water supply to them has been brought to the notice of the Railway authorities and that repeated requests have been made to them to allow the Sewa Samti people to supply water on the D. U. K. Railway ?

(d) If so, is the Government considering to allow Sewa Samti people to do their work on the D. U. K. Railway ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to his previous question.

#### INQUIRY INTO WATER SUPPLY ON RAILWAYS.

163. **Bhai Man Singh :** (a) Is it a fact that the matter of the water supply was the subject of a careful and comprehensive inquiry by the senior Government Inspectors of the Railways who had been asked to submit their report to the Railway Board ?

(b) If so, will the Government be pleased to lay before the House the report or the suggestions made by them and what steps have been taken to put the same into practice ?

(c) If no report is yet made by them, will the Government be pleased to state since when this inquiry is going on and by what time it is expected to be completed ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) and (c). The Railway Board hope to publish shortly a statement on this, and other matters, connected with the comforts and conveniences of third class passengers.

#### MILITARY DAIRIES.

164. **Bhai Man Singh :** (a) Is it a fact that in a good many Military Dairies most of the calves are killed just after their birth ?

(b) Is the Government considering to put a stop to this practice ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) No.

(b) The question does not arise.

#### MILITARY DAIRIES.

165. **Bhai Man Singh :** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state how much net expenditure is incurred over the Military Dairies every year from 1918 after deducting the income from them ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state how much land altogether is given to these dairies ?

(c) Is it a fact that these dairies mostly supply milk and butter to English soldiers and officers in the Army ?



(d) Is the Government considering any scheme to make these dairies self-supporting as far as possible ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** (a) The financial results of the working of the dairies in the period stated were as follows :

Profit.			Loss.	REMARKS.
1918-19	...	Rs. Nil	Rs. 10,66,136	} Produce was sold at less than cost price, as prices were not enhanced during the war.
1919-20	...	Rs. Nil	Rs. 15,90,020	
1920-21	...	Rs. 4,77,983	Rs. Nil	} Loss due to badness of the season and consequent rise in prices of feeding stuffs.
1921-22	...	Rs. Nil	Rs. 6,74,803	

(b) The total area of land occupied by the Military dairies is approximately 22,500 acres, for which they pay rent.

(c) Military dairies supply their produce to :

- (i) Military hospitals, both European and Indian,
- (ii) British soldiers and their families,
- (iii) British officers of the Army in India.

(d) The policy in regard to these dairies is that they must, as far as possible, be self-supporting and that all expenditure should be covered by receipts.

#### RESERVED ACCOMMODATION ON RAILWAYS.

166. **Mr. K. C. Neogy :** Will Government be pleased to make a statement giving the names of railway trains, of the different railway systems, in which reserved compartments are provided for Europeans, indicating the classes in which such reserved accommodation is provided ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** I shall be pleased to furnish the Honourable Member with the information he requires in respect of the principal railways. In this connection I would refer to the answer given to Beohar Raghbir Sinha in this Assembly on the 6th September 1922 to Question No. 53 on the subject of the reservation of Inter and Third class compartments for Europeans and Anglo-Indians.

#### WAITING ROOMS.

167. **Mr. K. C. Neogy :** Will Government be pleased to state the names of the Railway stations, in the different Railway systems, in which separate waiting rooms are provided for European passengers ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** The information asked for will be obtained and supplied to the Honourable Member in due course.

#### INCIDENT IN AKHAURA WAITING ROOM.

168. **Mr. K. C. Neogy :** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a letter signed by "a mere Native" which appeared in the *Anrita Bazar Patrika*, dated the 9th July last, in which it is stated that

an Indian gentleman was ordered out of a waiting room at the Akhaura station on the Assam-Bengal railway, by a European railway official, on the ground that it was reserved exclusively for Europeans, though it was unoccupied at the time ?

(b) Have Government made any inquiry into the circumstances alleged in the said letter ? If so, will Government make a statement on the subject ?

(c) At what stations on the Assam-Bengal Railway are waiting rooms provided for the male and the female passengers of the Intermediate and Third class, respectively ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. It is a fact that the complainant was requested to vacate the waiting room labelled European and to move into another marked for Indians. The latter was unfortunately occupied by Mahomedan ladies at the time although the Indian ladies' waiting room was vacant and the Station Master refrained from asking the ladies to move to the proper room. In the circumstances the Station Master should not have asked the complainant to vacate.

(c) Separate waiting rooms for male and female passengers of the Intermediate and Third class are provided at 38 stations on the Assam-Bengal Railway.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF RAILWAY TRAINS.

169. **Mr. K. C. Neogy :** What are the criteria governing the classification of railway trains as Mail, Express, Mixed and Passengers, respectively ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** The criteria governing the classification of railway trains, as mail, express, mixed and passenger, are the varying needs and conditions of traffic which each description of train is intended to meet.

#### PROPOSED DACCA-ARICHA RAILWAY.

170. **Mr. K. C. Neogy :** (a) Have Government received any communication from the Government of Bengal forwarding the report of a Committee that was appointed to consider the question of the proposed Dacca-Aricha railway ?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to publish the report and all connected papers ?

(c) What are the present proposals of Government with regard to the Dacca-Aricha railway ?

**Colonel W. D. Waghorn :** The Government of Bengal have been in communication with the Railway Board on the subject. The Committee was appointed by the Government of Bengal and it is for that Government to decide whether the report and the connected papers should be published.

#### LAC ASSOCIATION.

171. **Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas :** Will Government be pleased to state :

(a) In what Districts and Provinces outside Assam, Bengal and Bihar the Lac Association have worked for this year ?

(b) Whether the Lac Association have given any assistance to the already established Lac Cultivation of Sind and, if not, when they may be expected to give assistance there ?

**The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes :** (a) The Indian Lac Association for Research has only been in existence for a year and has not yet published a report on its operations for the year. It is not known in what areas its investigations are being conducted.

(b) It is open to any member of the Association to approach the Association direct with suggestions for the extension of its activities ; but it will be a matter for the Association to decide whether the extension suggested is in the general interest of the lac industry.

---

### CONFLICTS IN ASIA MINOR BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND TURKS.

**Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan** (North-West Frontier Province : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, may I ask if the Honourable the Home Member will kindly give us information about the recent action which has taken place between the Greeks and Turks.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent** (Home Member) : I have received the following information from the General Staff :

“ According to the information received up to date, the Greeks have sustained defeats which may have far-reaching results. In fact it is within the bounds of possibility that it may result in the Greek evacuation of Anatolia under Turkish pressure.”

The General Staff have asked me to say that they will be glad to show to any Honourable Member of this Assembly who cares to see it, the position on the map so that he may fully understand what the situation is.

---

### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

**Bhai Man Singh** (East Punjab : Sikh) : Sir, I beg leave of the Assembly to move the adjournment of the business of this House to discuss a matter of public importance, that is, the situation in Guru-ka-bagh. Am I allowed, Sir, to say anything more than making the motion ?

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member asks leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the present situation in Guru-ka-bagh in the Amritsar district.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent** (Home Member) : Sir, I submit to the House that this is really a provincial matter and not an All-India one. There is another objection to this motion in that a certain number of persons are at present, I believe, under trial before a court of justice in connection with this affair.

At the same time, I realise that the Honourable Member is much exercised over this matter, and if he will wait till Monday, I will endeavour to place before the Assembly, with your leave, Sir, as full a statement as I can secure from the Local Government on the present position and what is being done,

**Mr. President :** In view of the fact that certain questions, arising out of the matter which the Honourable Member proposes to discuss, are now under adjudication in a court of justice, this House cannot take it up. The Honourable Member's request is not in order.

---

**THE CANTONMENTS (HOUSE-ACCOMMODATION) AMENDMENT BILL.**

**Mr. E. Burdon (Army Secretary) :** Sir, I beg to move :

“ That the following five Members of the Legislative Assembly be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill further to amend the Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Act, 1902, namely :

Haji Wajihuddin,  
Mr. Hussanally,  
Mr. Cotelingam,  
Mr. Peyari Lal, and  
myself.”

I may mention that all these gentlemen have signified their willingness to serve on the Committee.

The motion was adopted.

---

**RESOLUTION RE GRANT OF FULL DOMINION SELF-GOVERNMENT TO INDIA.**

**Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan) :** Sir, I beg leave to move the following Resolution :

“ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to request the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India to make a specific declaration ratifying the declaration of August 1917, and repudiating the statement made by Mr. Lloyd George on the 2nd August 1922, characterising the Reforms as an experiment and also to take necessary steps for an early grant of full Dominion Self-Government to this country.”

Sir, the indiscreet speech of Mr. Lloyd George on the Indian Civil Service debate in the House of Commons has created a great stir and a great storm of indignation throughout the country. Of late no other speech except that of Mr. Churchill's on the Kenya question, has created such a storm of indignation and resentment in this country, as this speech of Mr. Lloyd George has done. It has created great disappointment and apprehension in the minds of Indians about the fulfilment of the promised goal of full self-government to India. It is regarded as a betrayal of the rights and privileges of Indians ; and it amounts to a breach of promise and the violation of pledges given by the English Parliament and our Gracious Sovereign. It leads to the belief in the minds of many that they cannot place any reliance on the promises of British statesmen and that self-government can only be secured and attained by our own efforts, persistence and endeavour. Sir, the speech delivered by His Excellency the Viceroy on the opening day of the Session as also the reply given to the deputation a few days ago has not allayed the feelings that have been prevalent in this country.

Reading the Premier's speech as a whole, and taking into consideration the circumstances and the occasion on which it was made, it is

[Mr. K. B. I. Agnihotri.]

practically clear that Mr. Lloyd George's speech and the statements contained therein are absolutely inconsistent with the Declarations made in 1917, with the Proclamation made in 1919 and with the Message that His Majesty the King was pleased to convey to this House at the opening of the Indian Legislature on the inauguration of the Reforms. It is a clear indication of a tendency to unsettle the settled reforms. It creates a feeling of perpetual domination of the British Civil Servants in this country and the denial of the capacity of Indians to govern their own country. It is without doubt a serious violation of the pledges that were accorded by the people of Britain and the English Sovereign to us and it is pertinent, in this connection, to point out how the Prime Minister's speech is inconsistent with the promises and declarations made. If the House will permit me to give quotations from the speech of the Prime Minister and the other declarations that have been made, the House will on comparison find the speech to be inconsistent. With your permission, Sir, I will quote what the Premier said in the House of Commons :

" There is an apprehension that the great constitutional changes which have been introduced in the course of the last few months will affect their (i.e., the civil servants') position prejudicially and they want reassurances and possibly they need reassurances with regard to all these questions. . . . These changes were in the nature of an experiment, a great experiment, but still an experiment."

From this it is clear that Mr. Lloyd George wanted to give an assurance and a consolation to the members of the Indian Civil Service and to remove the apprehensions caused to that body on the introduction of the changes and reforms in this country. The Indian Civil Servants thought,—probably owing to the publication of the circular letter which was issued by the Government of India under the signature of Mr. O'Donnell—that their rights and privileges in this country and their conditions and prospects, as compared to what they were before, were liable to be curtailed in future as the reforms progressed. It was for that purpose and in order to console them, that Mr. Lloyd George said that these changes " are in the nature of an experiment, a great experiment, but still an experiment." By this word " experiment " he clearly connotes that they are liable to be scrapped and withdrawn at the whim and caprice of the present or any future Prime Minister or Parliament. I am sure that this is not the promise, this is not the pledge that was given to us. On the contrary the promise was that these reforms will not be taken away from us. If one were to refer to the Declaration that was made in 1917, one would find :

" That the policy of His Majesty's Government is that of increasing association of Indians. . . . and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that *substantial steps* should be taken as soon as possible."

This declaration gives in the clearest possible terms the policy of conceding full responsible Government to India. Now look at the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. It says :

" Englishmen believe in responsible Government as the best form of Government that they know ; and now in response to requests from India they have promised to extend it to India also under the conditions set out in the announcement."

This shows that this was a step of Reforms given to the Indians towards the goal of full responsible Government. The Joint Committee Report says :

“ In the declaration made by His Majesty's Government on the 20th August, 1917, there is enunciated the problem for which the Bill endeavours to provide a solution. It is to design the *first stage* in a measured progress towards responsible self-government.”

Now, looking to the preamble of the Government of India Act we find : “ whereas progress in giving effect to this policy can only be achieved by successive stages, and it is expedient that *substantial steps* in this direction should now be taken.” Mr. Montagu, the then Secretary of State for India, during the debate on the Government of India Bill said :

“ I have kept before me one ambition and that was to have the privilege of commending to Parliament what I believe to be the only justification of the Empire—a *step* of self-government for India.”

Now coming to the King's Proclamation we find that His Majesty the King was graciously pleased to say :

“ It was therefore with a *wise judgment* that the beginnings of representative institutions were laid many years ago. Their scope has been extended stage by stage until there now lies before us a *definite step* on the road to Responsible Government.”

And

“ The Act which has now become law entrusts the elected representatives of the people with a definite share in the Government and points the way to full Responsible Government hereafter.”

Lord Chelmsford at the time of the opening of the Indian Legislature said as follows :

“ The conception of the British Government as a benevolent despotism was finally renounced ; and in its place was substituted that of a guiding authority whose role it would be to assist the steps of India along the road that in the fulness of time would lead to complete Self-Government within the Empire.”

Then, again, His Majesty's Message contains the following :

“ To-day you have beginnings of Swaraj within my Empire, and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy.”

One of the recent circulars that has been issued by the Government of India *re* : the Indianisation of Services, says :

“ India has taken only the first steps on the road that leads to full Self-Government.”

All these clearly go to show that the Reforms, or the instalment of Reforms, given to us are not a mere experiment liable to be whittled down or scrapped at the sweet will and pleasure of those in authority in England, but, on the contrary, show that a step was taken towards the goal that was promised to us, *i.e.*, towards the full responsible Government within the Empire. Can any person even now say that the statement made by Mr. Lloyd George is consistent with the declarations, proclamations, assurances, promises and pledges that have been given to us from time to time ? We find from these pledges that the goal is assured, and the present instalment has been given to us as a first step towards the promised goal and also that the Reforms are not a mere experiment. Therefore, we find, taking all the facts into consideration, that the speech of Mr. Lloyd George and the statement contained therein characterising the Reforms as an experiment are a direct violation of the pledges and promises, declarations

[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

and proclamations ; and I venture to say, that no man, except perhaps the inconsistent and vacillating Prime Minister of England would have been bold enough to make such a statement.

Sir, it has been said that the Reforms that have been given to us are a free gift and they have been given to us by England of her free will. In that case too I think that the Reforms can not be scrapped at the whim and caprice of those in authority in England or of those that may have been annoyed with a certain section of our community for certain acts.

The tentative nature of the Reforms is further asserted when Mr. Lloyd George says :

“ India has never been governed on these principles before ; the Native States are not governed now and it remains to be seen whether a system of this kind adapted to western needs and perfected by centuries of experiment and marked at many stages—in fact at every stage, with repeated failures, is suitable for India.”

Barely three years since the inauguration of the Reforms have passed and His Majesty's Prime Minister's angle of vision changes and now he wants to see whether the promised goal of full Responsible Government is suitable or will be suitable for this country ! If one were to refer to His Majesty's gracious Message and the Proclamation one will find that it was a wise step that has been taken, after careful deliberation. The statement also further shows His Majesty's Prime Minister's colossal ignorance of the history and ancient civilization of Indians, Hindus and Muham-madans alike. I venture to question his statement that India in the past had no representative institutions. But apart from that is it not too late now for the Prime Minister to say so when the Reforms have been given to us, when the goal has been put before us, after very careful deliberation ?

The Joint Committee says :

“ It marks a great step in the path of Self-Government and it is a proof of the confidence reposed by His Majesty's Government in the loyalty, wisdom and capacity of our Indian fellow-subjects.”

In face of this statement, does it now lie in the mouth of Mr. Lloyd George to-day that full responsible Government will not or cannot be suitable to us ? This statement as well as other statements in his speech cause very great apprehension and fear in our minds about the fulfilment of the promises made. He says “ We must not have precipitate judgment on these statements ” and “ that the most serious and testing time has not yet reached.” This also confirms our fear that whatever little has been given to us is liable to be whittled down or scrapped.

Mr. Lloyd George goes a little further when he says :

“ One thing we must make clear—the Britain will in no circumstances relinquish her responsibility to India.....It is important that that should be known, not so much in this country but in India.”

This can also be said to be a distinct violation of the pledges that have been given before. He further goes on to say :

“ I can see no period when they (Indians) can dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British civil servants. They number only 1,200. They are the steel-frame of the whole structure. I do not care what you build into it. If you take that steel-frame out, the structure will collapse. Their every word is command, every sentence a decree accepted by the people willingly.”

Does Mr. Lloyd George or does the British Parliament want to perpetuate this domination of the British civil servants over this country ? Does he want that India should be under their tutelage and guidance for all time to come ? It is well known that, until the inauguration of the Reforms, India was governed absolutely through the Services, and now a change has come about, and Indians have been given a share in the administration of their country. The Indian Civil Servants have been habituated to seeing that their word is command, their every sentence a decree, in other words they have been autocratic rulers of this country so far. Now when autocracy is dead, as was said by Lord Chelmsford, at the opening of the Indian Legislatures, and by the Duke of Connaught, would Mr. Lloyd George still want to perpetuate that autocracy in this country which has trampled us in the past ? If he does, it will not be consistent with the promises and pledges that have been given to us. It will not be compatible with the goal of Dominion Self-Government that has been put before us. Could any person, knowing the constitution of the Dominion Self-Government, say that in the Dominion Self-Government any service, whether for internal management or for any other purpose, could be forced on them against their wishes by an authority outside their country ? I venture to assert that no Dominion would tolerate such a state of affairs. Could Mr. Lloyd George say the same thing to and force the Civil Service on, the Dominions like Canada or Australia ? He could only advise those Dominions to keep a particular class of servants which he may think proper ; and so in a similar way the Prime Minister and experienced administrators in this country can give advice to us, to keep us in the right path. So far it will be welcome, but it will be at our choice, provided full responsible Self-Government is given to us as has been pledged and promised by the English Parliament,—to accept that advice or not.

The statement made by Mr. Lloyd George further goes to show that the Indians will not have the capacity to govern their country for all time to come. What a brilliant prophecy that His Majesty's Prime Minister has been pleased to make, with respect to this country, in face of the messages, and statements made by himself and by Lord Chelmsford, by the Joint Committee Report and by Mr. Montagu ! After all these authoritative pronouncements have been made and after the British Government has found that we are in every way capable of governing our country, and carry out the reforms in spirit and in the manner expected from us, is it now fair to say that we are incapable ? Like the particular section of our community who never had any faith in the pledges and promises of the British Government, we may also be led to believe and say that, after all, the promised goal is nothing but a chimera and camouflage to keep us in perpetual domination.

If this statement is allowed to remain and is acted on to the letter, then it is certain that India can not have the Dominion Self-Government that has been promised to her. Now compare this speech with the Montagu-Chelmsford Report which says : " We are no longer seeking to govern a subject race by means of Services. We are seeking to make the Indian people self-governing." Is the speech made by Mr. Lloyd George wherein he says that this small nucleus of 1,200 Britishers will be necessary for India for all time to come, compatible with this or is it even consistent with " increasing association of Indians in all branches



[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

of administration" ? All the higher posts of the administration have been assigned to them and if the Civil Service is not Indianised, then how will Indians gain experience in administrative work ? A condition has been laid down that we should have an administrative experience before we can claim full responsible Self-Government. Mr. Lloyd George further on desires the co-operation of Indians. May I know for what he wants our co-operation ? Does he want our co-operation so that we might go on perpetuating the domination of the Civil Services ? Does he want our co-operation so that we may go on obeying the words of the Civil Servants as commands, that we should go on taking their sentences as decrees for all time to come ? Does he mean that we should not have the popular wishes and the popular will carried out through our own executive and through our own public servants ? If he wants our co-operation in the sense that we should work on equal rights and on terms of equality with the British Civil Servants, or with other Europeans who might be employed in the administration of this country, and that this arrangement should continue only for a particular time till we attain Dominion Self-Government, we will be willing to give such co-operation. Otherwise, I may assure him that we shall take all the means possible—of course the constitutional means—to wrest the full responsible Self-Government that has been promised to us. We cannot any more tolerate the supremacy and the retention of the British Civil Service like that in the past. Pray do not misunderstand me. We do not want that the Civil Service should go away. We do not wish that Indians should drive away the British Civil Servants. We know that we do stand in need of their assistance and advice ; but we do not want an outside authority to force this Service on us, or to compel us to accept them and keep them against our wishes. We want the British Civil Servants to remain in India, but like other Englishmen who serve in the Native States, or like those in the private services, or like other Indian public servants. I for one will be very glad to seek their help and advice in the development and administration of the country. Moreover, Sir, it is also financially doubtful for how long we shall be in a position to pay the high salaries to the European public servants and the British Civil Servants in the future. I think, Sir, I have now made my point clear as to why the phrase " the steel frame " as applied to the Indian Civil Service is objectionable. If their privileges are not diminished, then our privileges cannot be increased. Because the privileges which they enjoy at present are an obstacle, to some extent, in the way of our acquiring and in getting the Dominion Self-Government. Mr. Lloyd George has given the brand of incapacity to Indians for all time to come, and we very strongly resent and protest against that. The whole spirit and tone of his statement are very offensive and have caused irritation and resentment, especially when the speech comes from the Prime Minister who is the accredited spokesman of the British Empire, who is the presiding head of the British Parliament which passed and gave us the Reforms Act ; and especially when he showered encomiums and praises on us during the war. And now, when all the stress and strain is over, he brands us with incapacity.

Sir, I come to the Viceroy's speech and the reply that he gave to the deputation the other day. His Excellency said that there should be no

such feeling of doubt after the Prime Minister had authorised him to say that nothing in his statement was intended to conflict with, or indicate a departure from, the policy announced in former declarations and in His Majesty's Proclamation; I regret to have to say that this is not convincing. The statement of the Prime Minister was made in the House of Commons. I wish that the retraction of that statement be also, if possible, made in the House of Commons. Moreover, I would have accepted this assurance from the head of the Government of India, if I had not known that the Government of India is considered to be a subordinate branch of the British Government. Under these circumstances, it becomes difficult for us to accept the assurance that has been given to us by His Excellency the Viceroy. His Excellency the Viceroy was pleased to reply to the Deputation that, when Earl Winterton replied to that criticism of Colonel Wedgwood, the Prime Minister nodded his head as an endorsement of what he was saying. I am very sorry to say, Sir, that this statement is amusing rather than convincing. Could such a thing form part of any debate? Could we be certain as to the correctness of the Reuter's messages or could we know for certain the reason of his nods—His Excellency the Viceroy was also pleased to say that it was a warning given to that section of the people who were non-co-operating with the British Government. My humble submission is that this in itself corroborates and supports the theory that the Reforms may be whittled down and scrapped at the sweet will and mercy of those who preside over the destinies of this country. Further, Sir, I think His Excellency's reply could not allay the feelings that exist in the country.

Now, what were the feeling in India when the Reforms of 1919 were announced? Everyone in the House is well aware that the Reforms were regarded as inadequate and, were also regarded by some persons as unworthy of Britain. The people who accepted these Reforms accepted them in the hope that by working out the Reforms they would secure the promised goal. The assurances and the noble words of the sovereign encouraged them and disarmed the apprehensions they might have had about the future of their country. But this speech of Mr. Lloyd George has shattered the faith even of those people who were co-operating with the Government. There was another and a bigger section of the community—which regarded these Reforms as absolutely unsatisfactory—which did not put any faith in these Reforms or the promises made and that section has not yet accepted them.

I am afraid that no contentment or peace is possible in India unless and until the full Responsible Government is given to Indians. The section of Indians that had declined the Reforms will not co-operate with the Government in spite of repressive measures that the Government might adopt against them. The grant of full Responsible Government to India at an early date is the only proper remedy for restoring peace and contentment in the country. We claim full Responsible Self-Government not only on the ground of our capacity, not only on the basis of the promises and pledges that have been given to us, but we claim it as our birth-right, and we hope that the British nation will no longer disappoint us in granting us full Dominion Self-Government.

With these words, Sir, I move my Resolution.

**Mr. President :** Resolution moved that :

“ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to request the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India, to make a specific declaration ratifying the declaration of August 1917 and repudiating the statement made by Mr. Lloyd George on the 2nd August, 1922, characterising the Reforms as an experiment and also to take necessary steps for an early grant of full Dominion Self-Government to this country.”

Before the debate proceeds I think it will perhaps clear the air if I say something about the eight amendments on the paper. 4 or 5 of them, the Assembly will observe, are attempts to restate the proposition already contained in the original Resolution. What I have to look for is an amendment offering, if possible, a direct alternative to the Resolution moved by the Honourable Member (Mr. Agnihotri).

As far as I can see the amendment standing in the name of Mr. Rangachariar offers that in the best form. As Members will observe, the Resolution which has just been moved asks for certain specific steps to be taken. The amendment which Mr. Rangachariar proposes to move places on record an opinion, and therefore asks the Assembly to take a different action from that proposed by Mr. Agnihotri.

As regards the amendment standing in the name of Munshi Iswar Saran, that in substance is covered by the Resolution in the sense that it does not offer a definite alternative but proposes to restate Mr. Agnihotri's proposition in somewhat different terms. The same applies to the amendment standing in the name of Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary and also to part of the amendment standing in the name of Dr. Gour.

As regards that portion of the amendment standing in Dr. Gour's name which refers to the process of Indianization, I think I must hold that it has already been covered by the debate which took place upon the Resolution in the name of the Honourable Member from Bombay (Mr. Jamnadas Dwarakadas) and the further Resolution which was moved and carried on September 27th last year in this Chamber, and therefore it cannot be moved. The same again applies to the amendment standing in the name of Dr. Nand Lal, that is to say, it is covered by No. 1. As regards the amendment standing in the name of Mr. Subrahmanayam, I consider that inasmuch as it is an invitation to the Governor General in Council to amend an Act of Parliament, it is, in form at all events, *ultra vires*.

The amendment standing in the name of Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas is in order, and also the amendment standing in the name of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar.

(Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar then rose to speak.)

**Mr. President :** Does the Honourable Member wish to move his amendment now ?

**Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar** (Madras City : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : Yes, Sir.

**Mr. President :** I think I will allow the debate to proceed on the original question.

**Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar** (Madras : Nominated Non-Official) : May I suggest, Sir, that the amendments to the original Resolution be first

moved and then proceed with any alternative Resolution that may be put forward in the place of the original Resolution *plus* the amendments ?

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member will realise that it is more important to have, if possible, two contradictory propositions raising questions of principle put against one another before we approach questions of detail. It is obvious that if the Assembly wishes to substitute the amendment standing in Mr. Rangachariar's name for the Resolution of Mr. Agnihotri, they ought to have an opportunity of doing so before they undertake the amendment in detail of the proposition put forward by Mr. Agnihotri.

**Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam** (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I oppose this Resolution, and as I oppose this, and as my attitude is counter to the views of a good many of my friends in this House, I think it necessary to explain briefly my position in this matter. First and foremost, I think that probably I am correct—subject to higher authority correcting me—in saying that there is no link under the Statute between the Prime Minister of England and this Assembly. If this Assembly proceeds to censure or to protest against the speeches or declarations of a higher authority, it should have some link with those who make those speeches or declarations. Now, a Resolution of this House, whatever its moral effect may be, so far as the constitutional position goes, cannot affect the Prime Minister. It is not one of the actions which we could take and which would, in its consequences, affect the position of the person criticised. The Prime Minister made a speech in the House of Commons. We disagree with what he said. Well, would this Resolution by us compel him in any constitutional manner to retract or to modify what he has said ? If that cannot be done by our action, then I consider a Resolution of this House as no better than Resolutions and speeches made at public meetings and platforms or opinions expressed in the press. From that standpoint I think that what we are aiming at is a *brutum fulmen*, i.e., things which cannot have any legal or constitutional consequence. From that standpoint of view I rather think this discussion at this stage is unnecessary. When Government has been so considerate and so good as to give us a whole day for a discussion like this, I had always in mind—I will not say suspicion—my own opinion in the matter that the Leader of the House wanted to have a certain amount of amusement.

**Mr. President :** If the Honourable Member would speak a little louder, he would be consulting his own interest as well as that of the House.

**Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam :** When a full day was granted to us I thought it would be a day spent in talking over a matter without any substantial results. There is another aspect of this same question. I rather think that it is a matter of great impropriety and it is unnecessary to rub against leading men, politicians and statesmen in England. Time and again it is their intervention and their good offices that have helped us to advance in the path of Reform and if we rub in the wrong way for some speeches they made here and there and ask them to retract them which we have not got the power to, the result is

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam.]

that others in lesser places take their cue and become more and more stiff-necked. They are the men to whom we have resorted at critical times and it is no good irritating them because we shall lose that support which has often been of great help to us in the past. Now, we ask by this Resolution—and we are asking in various ways that the Government of India should ask the Secretary of State to persuade the Prime Minister to retract or the Secretary of State to say something in contradiction to what the Prime Minister has said. Is that possible? Could any subordinate go against his chief's words? Is it consistent with discipline, and therefore is it likely that a request like that could ever be complied with, and do we not know as a matter of fact in a discussion like this where the Prime Minister is not present and where only the members of the Government of India are present, they have no other option, whatever their private opinions may be, assuming that they have their own private opinions contrary to what the Prime Minister said, except to defend, to support and to substantiate what the Prime Minister said? Does it not land us in an inconvenient situation by getting the same matter repeated over and over again, confirmed over and over again and got fixed more and more firmly? Now, is it not the case in this matter? The Prime Minister in the debate in the House of Commons spoke certain words. Immediately he spoke, Colonel Wedgwood interpreted it in the manner in which the whole of this country has interpreted. Colonel Wedgwood was followed by two responsible members of the House of Commons who gave a different interpretation and we have it in the reports that the Prime Minister nodded assent. That I think for all purposes, for broad practical purposes, is enough and sufficient to put the matter at rest. (Laughter.) After all, speaking from the constitutional point of view a speech like that will not wipe out the solemn declarations made by Government or the statutory provisions under the law. (*An Honourable Member*: "Hear, hear".) Therefore when a speech had been made and a particular interpretation immediately within a few minutes had been put forward and that was contradicted and the correct interpretation was put and assented to by the speaker, I think any reasonable person ought to think that the matter ended there. Not content with that, some of our colleagues in this House, some of our friends elsewhere could not keep their souls in patience, they went up to His Excellency the Viceroy, to ask "What has the Prime Minister said? What do you say?" We had then a full explanation, a clear interpretation of the speech made by the Prime Minister. Well, the question now arises, do we admit, do we own those gentlemen who approached His Excellency as being a part and parcel of ourselves or in a manner our spokesmen, or do we repudiate their action? We fully accept them as men belonging to our own faith. Then the reply that was given by His Excellency the Viceroy is a sufficient answer to all these queries and to these querulous doubts that have been raised. Now, that was a full, a frank if I may say so, reply, explanation regarding the speech of the Prime Minister. We were not satisfied, that is, we in the press and on the platform. We wanted more and further explanation. The result was we had on the occasion of the opening of this Session again a similar

declaration but the words were more guarded, more emphatic if I may say so, more legal and more constitutional. What is it that we have got? We have got an exposition of our real constitutional position. That is how we stand constitutionally. Our position is simply a position subordinate to the will of the people of England as represented by Parliament. We are not independent states. The will of the people of this country is not the guiding, is not the determining feature of the Government of this country. That is a fact. Why should we ignore it? And the constitution that we are now at present in possession of is one that has been repeatedly said, and my Honourable friend, the Mover of the Resolution, also said, was one *given* to us. It is not a constitution which we have ourselves evolved like other countries. It is one given to us, and the word "given" will ordinarily mean absolute gift. It is not an absolute gift. It is a conditional gift, and the conditions regarding it are embodied in the Government of India Act, 1919. Now, what is the good of quarrelling with the statement of the Prime Minister when he made that speech having regard to certain contingencies which he apprehended might arise. Take those contingencies. The contingencies which he was referring to were an absolute determination of the people of this country to get rid of the British Services in this country. That is one contingency. Another contingency was when the Legislature, for instance, this Assembly, would take up an attitude of complete hostility to the Government, would obstruct the Government tooth and nail and would not allow the ordinary smooth working of the constitution. Those are I understand to be the main contingencies which he had in his mind. Speaking as practical men, supposing those contingencies arise, how could you expect any Government not to take an extreme view and exercise the powers which are vested in it in the most stringent manner? What, after all, does this Act of 1919 say? Read section 84-A of the Act. I will only refer to a few words there:

"At the expiration of ten years after the passing of the Government of India Act, 1919, the Secretary of State with the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament shall submit for the approval of His Majesty the names of persons to act as a Commission for the purposes of this section."

The Commission is not going to be appointed by us. It is not the people of India that are going to appoint it. Then what for?

"To what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government."

It does not exist now.

"Or to extend, modify, or restrict the degree of responsible government, then existing therein, i.e., in 1929."

The Act is clear. So far as that position is concerned the giver has got the power to restrict what he has given. Therefore I consider that there is nothing absolutely unconstitutional or illegal in what the Prime Minister said. Well, there is another aspect of it on a matter of fact, on a matter of good feeling, one may no doubt, fall out with some of the terms used by the Prime Minister. He had taken up a contingency which I consider to be most improbable. He need not have made the assumption that the Legislatures of this country or the elected bodies of this country are going to make a dead set against the Civil Services or that they will be so unreasonably obstructive as to

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam.]

paralyse the Government. Those assumptions he need not have made and probably if he had better information or if it had been supplied to him he could not have made those assumptions. That is one of those inexactitudes which politicians are always guilty of. If you read that part of the speech which says that India was rescued from anarchy it is all very clear. When you talk only of the Civil Services, there you are entirely wrong. There are other Services which have probably helped India, more than the Civil Services, to attain the position it has attained. What about the Engineering Service which has by its work and its endeavour brought the whole of this country together? What about the Medical Services? What about those who have started industries and who have expanded the commerce of this country? Have they not all helped to bring India to the condition in which she is now? Therefore it is one of those inexactitudes which the Prime Minister was guilty of and no doubt we who cannot give our unstinted admiration to the Indian Civil Services probably resent the encomium which the Prime Minister passed upon the Civil Services more than on anything else. It was hardly necessary to have passed those high encomiums. Whatever the Indian Civil Service has done it cannot be said that every member of that Service or every branch of that Service deserves all that has been said.

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member has nearly exhausted his time.

**Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam :** One word more about this Dominion Government. Are we in the same position as the people of the self-governing colonies? Are we prepared to defend our country? Are we sufficiently represented in the military services? Are we sufficiently equal to carry on the scientific branches of the administration? Why talk of immediate grant of Self-Government? Why not give our attention to fitting ourselves in those directions? Is it not a fact that we are at present lop-sided in our advance and in those equipments which go to build up the nation and taking again the condition in the provinces and the manner in which the administration in some of the provinces is carried, are you quite sure now that democracy of an extended type would be welcome? One must consider and ponder on all these things before we attack our critics high or low.

**Mr. B. S. Kamat** (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, before I begin my remarks may I ask if I can speak to Mr. Agnihotri's main Resolution as well as the amendments?

**Mr. President :** Where an amendment has been moved, the debate is open upon it, though Honourable Members may speak on the main question also if they chance to catch the eye of the Chair.

**Mr. B. S. Kamat :** Reading Mr. Agnihotri's Resolution, it seems to me that it suffers from bad drafting; and yet I am in full accord with the sentiments underlying that Resolution, sentiments regarding the character of the Premier's speech and its disastrous effects on Indian aspirations. I think Mr. Agnihotri's Resolution suffers from bad drafting because it asks for a specific declaration ratifying the

Declaration of August 1917. Personally I do not think such ratification is necessary and I do not want any ratification of that famous declaration of 1917, for the simple reason that we have that declaration in the Statute. We have it in His Majesty's Proclamation, and I am confident not one Lloyd George but a dozen Lloyd Georges put, packed and rolled together cannot take away from India the declaration already given by Parliament in 1917 and embodied in the Preamble of the Government of India Act; and even, if in a weak moment, the British public feel inclined to take away that declaration the national conscience of India is so roused at the present moment that we shall refuse to give back the declaration of 1917. Mr. Agnihotri wants the Prime Minister to repudiate the statement made by him characterising the Reforms as an experiment. Here again, I believe that Mr. Agnihotri has drafted the Resolution very badly. It does not matter to me whether Mr. Lloyd George considers this as an experiment or does not consider it so. Even to some of the Indian constitutionalists it is an experiment in the sense that we have diarchy in the constitution. It is an experiment in the sense that we have, for instance, the financial relations in an experimental stage. The basis of the present franchise is again an experiment. The communal seats given is an experiment. I am not, therefore, frightened by the use of the word 'experiment' by the Prime Minister and if some people think that at the back of the mind of the Prime Minister, when he used the word 'experiment' there was an idea of taking back the Reforms, my reply is that India will refuse to give back what is already in her possession. I do not therefore want any repudiation of that word 'experiment.' And yet I do think that there is a great deal that is objectionable in the Premier's speech. The most objectionable part to my mind is the outlook of the Premier on India as shown in the speech. There is not one word of hope for Indian aspirations in his speech. There is totally an atmosphere of despair throughout and it is that to which I object and I think it is necessary that we should convey this feeling of ours in a message from this Assembly to the Prime Minister as Mr. Rangachariar later on proposes to do. Then again, the final part of Mr. Agnihotri's Resolution asks for early steps to be taken for the grant of full Dominion Self-Government. It appears to me in a Resolution of this character, it is rather tall order to mix up that issue and ask for full Dominion status, as an issue arising out of the Premier's speech.

With regard, therefore, to these three points embodied in Mr. Agnihotri's speech, I say it is badly drafted, although I can fully support the sentiment which he has expressed regarding the Premier's speech. Now I shall answer what it is that offends India. Sir, it is the spirit in which Mr. Lloyd George has conceived and expressed his sentiments. First of all, as I say, he shall not be able to take away the Declaration or to undo the constitution, but in the whole speech what is most objectionable from my point of view is the spirit of retarding the whole of the constitution under some excuse or other. Now we have been told that the Reform Act is an experiment, and what the Premier is watching, perhaps, is how a certain section of the Indian public, I mean the non-co-operators, will behave at the next election, or have behaved in the last 18 months. I confess, Sir, that the behaviour of



[Mr. B. S. Kamat.]

non-co-operators during the last 18 months and certain events in India have been undoubtedly deplorable ; we all deplore them, as much as the Viceroy, we all deplore them as much as the Honourable Sir William Vincent. Yet I do feel that the Premier has been looking at the whole of the episodes within the last 18 months not with a proper perspective, but with a perturbed feeling out of all proportion to the necessities of the case. Nearer home to England, may I ask, have not events in Ireland occurred of greater magnitude, has the British public been so much perturbed by these events ? I ask, therefore, that the non-co-operation movement and the foolish episodes and untoward incidents of the last 18 months should not have frightened the Premier so much. And, after all, if we look deeper beneath the surface, deeper into the causes of the non-co-operation movement, can we not also say that the British Premier has himself given some cause for that movement ? I mean is it not the case that a pledge has been broken ? At any rate India feels, almost unanimously, that the Premier has given cause for the non-co-operation movement through one pledge being broken, namely, the matter of Turkey. If it were not so, I do not think there was any necessity for the Government of India to make representations on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to the Premier regarding that. It is unmistakably felt that the Premier has given cause to India to feel that a pledge has been broken, and if it is so he has given cause to the non-co-operation party to create some disturbance during the last 18 months. Under these circumstances, I say the Premier was wrong in over-estimating the situation here and being perturbed by the non-co-operation movement, so as to threaten to retard the further grant of constitutional advance to India, and that is my first objection to the Premier's speech.

The second objection is with regard to the question of Indianization. Now on the question of Indianization, let me draw a line between the behaviour of the Government of India and the sentiments expressed by the Premier. I believe it is due to the Government of India, due in all sense of fairness to say, that so far as the assurances given under the constitution of the Government of India Act are concerned, as Sir William Vincent told us in February last, they are doing their best to faithfully carry on at a fairly rapid pace the Indianization, so as to reach 48 per cent. in 10 years' time. But our contention is not against the Government of India. What the Premier says is that, so far as he can stretch his eye, he sees no prospect of withdrawing the British element of the Indian Civil Service rule from India. I will read his very words. He says, there is one institution, namely the Civil Service in India which he will not allow to be interfered with, which he will allow no privilege thereof to be diminished, and which he shall maintain intact as long as he can stretch his eye. That, I believe, Sir, to my mind is the most objectionable part of the Premier's speech. Now, we do need for a good many number of years the British element in the Indian Civil Service. They are capable men, they have done a great deal for India ; but, on the other hand, if there is a spirit of hostility to them at the present time, they must also recognize that partly, if not wholly, their own behaviour, their own demeanour, their own conduct towards

Indians, I mean the conduct of many of them at least on certain occasions, has been contributory to and responsible for the spirit of hostility which is at present noticeable in the country. I believe the Premier has entirely overlooked this fact. We do not want to make it unattractive for new recruits to come to this country. Certainly, as long as the Indian Civil Service people require, we are prepared to give them our co-operation, and we shall receive their co-operation on certain terms, but, as I say, they are themselves to blame if they have created in a great measure the spirit of hostility which at present is noticeable in the country. After all, they must realize that they cannot exercise the whole of the powers they hitherto have had, in this new era. I do not think many of them have ever realized that yet, although there are a few exceptions who are adapting themselves to the new constitution and to the new regime in this country. But that being the case, the whole of the hostility on which the Premier built up his case is not entirely due to Indian feeling ; it is partly due to the overbearing conduct on many occasions, to the demeanour, of the Indian Civil Service people. So far as their material prospects in this country, Sir, are concerned, I for one shall be prepared to give them some further amenities and a further improvement of prospects, provided they come to terms with us on one consideration, namely they must help us to improve the financial position. I believe the Indian Civil Service, as well as the military people, are obsessed with one idea, about the necessity of the present level of high military expenditure which is swallowing up a great deal of the finances of this country : if, therefore, it complained that there is any tendency on the part of the Indian politician to come in the way of a further improvement of the material position of the Europeans in the Indian Civil Service, it is because our finances are upset by this obsession of the Government of India and the Indian Civil Service people. Here, again, I think that the Indian Civil Service men have themselves to thank if the Indian politician thinks that no further improvement in their prospects is necessary. Let the Premier realize that the Indian mind is not averse to giving them further improvement ; we do not come in the way of bettering the prospects of the Indian Civil Service in order to make them go away from this country, but it is the finances that come in the way, and that is the honest truth of the whole matter. What is it, then, that we want ? We want a more rapid Indianization than the Premier wants to give us. Now I do not want to be indefinite as regards the degree of rapidity. The constitution which we are at present working has, I maintain, given us an indication of how rapid that Indianization should be. We have been told in the constitution that the present percentage will be increased to 48 per cent. in 10 years. That itself, Sir, is an indication that if 48 per cent. is to be the increasing association of Indians in 10 years, the remaining 52 per cent. ought to be reached within a reasonable period of time. You can see from the very constitution which you are working that the full 100 per cent. cannot be delayed for more than, say, 20 or 25 years. Has the Premier realized that ? The whole of India resents and feels indignant that the Premier wants under some excuse or other to put off the day when he will withdraw the British element in the Indian Civil Service rule from India. The Indian mind thinks that if there is any idea of home rule at all, home rule is Indianization, and Indianization is home rule, and as long as there is

[Mr. B. S. Kamat.]

not Indianization to the extent of 100 per cent. sooner or later, there is no home rule in the country, the idea is incompatible with full responsible Government and it is this which the Premier ought to realize. I think we are not going to stand this indefinite prevarication that the Indian Civil Service rule will have to remain in India as long as the Premier could stretch his eye. We think, Sir, that within a measurable period of time, say 20 or 25 years, the Indian Civil Service must be prepared to hand over the trust and the administration, both the routine administration, and the policy of this country to Indians themselves, and must so shape their policy from now that with their assistance and co-operation at the end of 20 or 25 years the British public can say that India is really self-governing, has attained the full responsible Government as promised in the preamble of this Act, and that they can say that she is a partner within the Empire. We want to remain within the Empire, but we do not want any indefinite prolongation of this Indianization question, we do not want to remain under the thumb of the Indian Civil Service as the present institution for all time to come. These are the sentiments of the Indian people, and I think by this Resolution we should convey a message to the Premier that India will have this and nothing else.

**Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas** (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : Sir, perhaps I am in the same difficulty as my Honourable friend, Mr. Kamat was. I accept the sentiments expressed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Agnihotri ; but I am not prepared to accept the Resolution as drafted by him. I would rather, if I had the choice, support the amendment which is to be moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar ; but, accepting the amendments, and accepting the sentiments that have been expressed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Agnihotri, I see no other way except to condemn whole-heartedly the speech made by Mr. Lloyd George.

Sir, I want to remind this House that I will not be held guilty of being overwhelmed with the desire to placate people in order to win their applause. It is not in my line ever to make an effort to placate any one. On occasions when I have found it right to support Government and give a piece of my mind to the people, I have not refrained from doing so. I have done so, because I thought that on those occasions the action of a section of the people was such as was going to imperil the British connection that we all value, not only for the sake of India, not only for the sake of England, but for the sake of the world ; and if I had thought for a moment that my attitude to-day was going to imperil that connection, I would not have taken up this attitude. On the other hand, I believe that looking at Mr. Lloyd George's speech, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that it is a speech which, as much as the activities of the non-co-operators, endangers the British connection which we all value, and it is because I think that a speech from Mr. Lloyd George at this juncture imperils that British connection, that I rise to raise my voice in protest against that speech.

My friend, Mr. Agnihotri, has dealt fully with the points raised by Mr. Lloyd George. Mr. Lloyd George, in the first place, looks upon the Reforms in the nature of an experiment. Now, as Mr. Kamat has pointed

out, while a large section of Indian publicists look upon these Reforms as in the nature of an experiment, still the sense in which they look upon it in the nature of an experiment is entirely different from the sense in which Mr. Lloyd George looks upon it. While we believe that there are certain aspects of the Reforms which, being in an experimental stage, may have to be changed as a result of the experience that we gain, we cannot for a moment imagine that there is anything in the Reforms, which, so far as the principle is concerned, the British Government are entitled to take back. The interpretation that we place on Mr. Lloyd George's speech is this, that Mr. Lloyd George thinks that they are "a great experiment, a unique experiment; but, after all, only an experiment," an experiment which, if Indians do not behave properly in future, will be taken back. I say that it is not in the power of Mr. Lloyd George to take these Reforms back, Reforms which have been given by an Act of the Government of Great Britain, by the word of His Majesty, and confirmed by a policy which has hitherto been pursued by His Majesty's Government. But Mr. Lloyd George goes further and says what amounts to this, "If you behave properly, it is all right, but if the next Council does not behave in the manner I want them to behave, then I am afraid this experiment will be an experiment, and it can be taken back." Now, Sir, I assure you that hardly many people have fought against the non-co-operators as I have fought; but I do say this, that if at the next election the non-co-operators think it proper, as I think they ought to, to send their representatives to these Councils and work through these Councils, then there is no power on earth that can deny the legally representative character of a Council that is made up of men who once belonged to the non-co-operation camp, and neither Mr. Lloyd George nor any power on earth can challenge the right of Indian electorates to send whomsoever they want in the best interests of the people.

Then, Sir, Mr. Lloyd George, while giving us a pat on the back for good behaviour, would lecture to us on the art of government. Now, Mr. Lloyd George is a great man, a man of remarkable achievements, and we all have great admiration for him. I, however, venture to challenge the right of Mr. Lloyd George to lecture to us on the art of government, for, a knowledge of Indian conditions is necessary before such a task is undertaken. We are good speakers, he says. But surely we are yet to learn a good deal of the art of government, especially from the Indian Civil Service. I do not want to learn the art of government from Mr. Lloyd George and I say this, with all the deference that is due to his personality and his position, if, as I fear, the whole policy of Mr. Lloyd George's speech is to placate the "Die-hards" who have come into prominence ever since the unfortunate resignation from office of our beloved friend, Mr. Montagu. The whole speech is an attempt to placate the "Die-hards"; the whole speech is an attempt to keep himself in power by calming the "Die-hards", by giving them an assurance that he stands by them. Well, Sir, if the art of government implies that you should go back on your pledge given while you yourself were Prime Minister, that you should subordinate sacred principles to the need of placating the "Die-hards", then the less we know about that art of government the better for this country and for the world.

Then there is the question of the Indianization of the Services, on which Mr. Lloyd George concentrates a good deal of his speech. Now, I

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

entirely agree with the sentiments expressed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Kamat. If there are any grievances on the part of the Indian Civil Service here with regard to the lack of amenities, with regard to the inadequacy of the salaries they get, then I am at one with Mr. Kamat in saying that we, the Members of this Assembly, at any rate so far as I am concerned, will be only too ready to consider the question of doing my best to give them all those amenities that they require (*Mr. N. M. Samarth* : "That they deserve!") No, that they require. So far as the present incumbents of this Service are concerned, I want to assure Honourable Members of the Government and Mr. Lloyd George that there is absolutely no antagonistic spirit on the part of the Members of this Assembly. No one is more anxious to appreciate the work done by the present incumbents of the Services than we are. In the Resolution that I had the honour to move in February, I made it clear that India owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Indian Civil Service, and we will not be slow to recognise that debt of gratitude. But if, after the Reforms, the Indian Civil Servant insists upon having the same amount of power and control, then I am afraid it is in opposition to the very spirit of Reforms to allow them to retain that power and control. As Colonel Wedgwood rightly pointed out in the House, after the Premier had spoken, the very fact that you have approved the policy of responsible government and have passed the first step towards that responsible government implies that, instead of being masters of the country, as hitherto the Civil Servants used to be, they have got to accustom themselves to wear the character of real servants of the country as they should be. So far as the future of Civil Servants is concerned, the present incumbents have nothing to fear. So far as future recruitment is concerned, I think we are justified in holding this legitimate view that responsible government, which is the recognised goal of British policy, and an administration largely run by men recruited in foreign countries, are ideals which are not consistent or compatible with each other.

Responsible Government must mean that the administration should largely be run by men who belong to this country and for that reason we are anxious that, in future at any rate, the policy of a larger association of Indians should be recognised and recruitment should, as far as possible, be in India and in India alone. I strongly object to the Prime Minister's remarks that, whatever may be the form of Government in this country, the 1,200 men belonging to the Civil Service will always remain there as the steel frame. If we acquiesce with my Honourable friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, in the speech of the Prime Minister and in the policy laid down by him, then the generations yet unborn will level at us the charge of having perpetuated the steel frame which is not in the interests of the policy of responsible Government in this country. I strongly repudiate the claim made by my friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, that this House is not legally justified in expressing any opinion on the Premier's speech. Whether we are legally justified or not, I do not know, but I believe that we have a perfect constitutional right to express our opinion; and I do say that the expression of opinion on the Premier's speech that will go to-day from this House must carry moral weight with Members of Parliament and the British public, and it would be fatal if Members, agreeing with my Honourable friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, would, when this

amendment is moved, throw it out and thus endanger the future of this country. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, I support only the sentiments that have been given utterance to by my Honourable friend, Mr. Agnihotri, and, so far as my actual support is concerned, it goes to the amendment to be moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar.

**Mr. Darcy Lindsay** (Bengal : European) : Sir, I rise at this early period to endeavour to carry on the good work of my Honourable friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, in opposing the Resolution. I realise that there are several big guns trained upon those who are in opposition. We have already experienced one in the speech made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, and it may be bad policy to open out our defences at this early stage ; but my hope is that we may succeed in spiking some of the guns.

Sir, being in full sympathy with the people of India in their aspirations to obtain the goal of Self-Government, I cannot but regret the retrograde step that, in my opinion, the pressing of this Resolution entails. I do not propose to go into the question of what can or cannot be interpreted from the Premier's speech and it may be that India had some justification for the alarm so widely expressed at his recent utterances, (Hear, hear), in the way they were first read. But, after the full explanations and assurances given by His Excellency the Viceroy to the deputation which he recently received on the subject, it is surely flogging a dead horse to pursue the subject any further. (*Mr. N. M. Samarth* : "Is the horse dead ?") Very dead, and all the more so in the face of the speech of His Excellency delivered in this House only three days ago. I believe I voice a somewhat general view when I say that to press the Resolution before the House to a vote is a tactical error on the part of Members and will cause the world at large and especially our sympathisers to have doubts as to whether India is really so ready for Self-Government as some of us fondly hope. It appears to me, Sir, that we are far too prone to take alarm without cause and we are then apt to become intolerant. I refer to the Resolution before me which appears to call upon the Governor General in Council to rebuke the Prime Minister for his unpalatable utterances and to make him, so to speak, eat his words. The Secretary of State is called upon to assist in this task and at the same time make certain declarations of his own accord. I do not know whether it is proposed that he should first approach the British Parliament but without their express authority, are his declarations of any value to us ? Are we not overlooking the fact that it is the British Parliament who, by specific Act, gave India the Reforms and it is in the power of no individual, even be he the Prime Minister of England, to tamper with the Act or to depart in any way from the declaration of 1917 ? Mr. Lloyd George has already explicitly repudiated the interpretation some have placed upon his speech and His Excellency the Viceroy has on two occasions made specific pronouncements to the same effect, which ought surely to satisfy the most captious amongst us. But, apparently, it is not so, for the Resolution is tantamount to a censure on the Prime Minister and I much regret to say a mistrust in the statements made by His Excellency the Viceroy. This may well bring upon our heads a well-deserved rebuke if the Resolution is

[Mr. Darcy Lindsay.]

pressed to a division and adopted. If we are taken at our word and the Secretary of State asks permission of the House of Commons to repudiate the statements made by Mr. Lloyd George characterising the Reforms as an experiment, just imagine the humiliating position in which we will be placed when the House confirm, as they must surely do, the opinion so widely expressed by Members in 1919 that the Reforms were an experiment. Even Colonel Wedgwood, referred to "the wonderful experiment that is being made." Lord Islington said, "It is a great experiment, as had already been said, and it can only succeed if all try to make it a success." Viscount Middleton said: "I would therefore adopt the language of Lord Sinha in his admirable speech. I hope those in India will take the broad view that he took and say that this is a great experiment which will depend on the manner in which those who are to have the working of it will work it out." I could quote many other prominent persons, including Lord Sinha, but will conclude by coming closer home with a reference to a speech made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas in this very House a year ago, when he referred to the reform scheme as an experiment; indeed he called it a unique experiment. (Laughter.) I quote, Sir, from the report of speeches made on a Resolution on Indian Autonomy, page 1231 of Volume II. (Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: "I stick to it.") Mr. Jamnadas said: "Sir, at the time when the reform scheme was being discussed in the mind of the Government of India and in the minds of even some Members of Parliament there was a lurking suspicion that the experiment, which was, I admit, a unique experiment (Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: "That is Diarchy") might not prove successful." (Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: "Diarchy" I mentioned that.") (Voices: "Read on, please.") (Other Voices: "Don't read on.") "There was if I may say so, a want of sufficient confidence in the people of this country, in their ability to manage efficiently a system of representative government." (Voices: "Please read on.")

"Is there any ground for any such apprehension now? What does

1 P.M.

Lord Chelmsford, our late Viceroy, say? He says that the sense of reason and balance that have been displayed by the Members of the Indian Legislature and the Members of the Provincial Councils have been to him a marvel and a revelation."

Then, Sir, again if we come close home, there are the explanations made by His Excellency the Viceroy to the deputation which waited upon him on the 19th August, when he referred to the Reforms as a constitutional experiment. Are we to call upon the Governor General in Council to repudiate the statement made by the Governor General characterising the Reforms as a constitutional experiment? Sir, to further emphasise the position I take up I put it to the House that supposing the Prime Minister had sent a cable through yourself to the Legislative Assembly stating that by his speech he did not in any way intend to go back upon the declaration of the 20th August 1917, or the Reforms Act of 1919, could any one of us with any sense of proportion have suggested that we would not accept the assurance so given? My answer is an emphatic No. What then is the difference between the hypothetical position I am putting to you and what has actually happened? His Excellency the Viceroy, the representative of the Crown, with the express authority of

the Prime Minister, at a joint meeting of the two Houses has given us the assurance that the Prime Minister in his speech did not intend to go back either on the declaration of 1917 or the Reform Act. In face of this, can we, with any dignity to ourselves, pursue this Resolution any farther? Again I say, and even more emphatically, No!

Sir, I leave it to abler hands than mine to deal with the Civil Service issue as referred to by the Mover of the Resolution; but in passing I desire to say that if the principles embodied in the Reforms Act are maintained—and His Excellency the Viceroy read to us the orders conveyed to him by our Beloved Sovereign to the effect that he was to guide our course to our due place among the British Dominions,—the question as to the position and functions of the Civil Service appears to me to solve itself.

One last word, Sir, and I have done. I regret I lack the impassioned eloquence of my friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, to press home the points I have endeavoured to make, but with all earnestness I ask the House to give deep thought to the position in which the Members are placed and suggest to the Honourable Mover of the Resolution that it be withdrawn, thus ending an unsavoury incident.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Two of the Clock.

---

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Two of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

---

**Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan** (Meerut. Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am not going to say anything, as to whether it is opportune or inopportune to move the Resolution after the explanation given by the Viceroy of the Premier's speech. What I am mainly concerned with at present is the remarks made by Mr. Subrahmanayam on certain constitutional matters which, I think, greatly affect India as well as the position of this Assembly. I am not going to minimise the great services rendered by the Indian Civil Service. We all know that India owes a great deal to the civil servants who have played a great part in teaching Indians modern methods of administration. Their effect in educating Indians on the lines of European countries has been immense. The character which an Englishman carries with him is also unquestioned. It is the character of the Englishman that has played a great part in the education of India. Therefore, I am not going to say a word which can minimise the great services rendered by the Indian Civil Service to this country. We all know, Sir, that at present too the Indian Civil Service is still carrying great weight in the administration of India, and will continue to do so for some more time. But nobody can agree that the Indian Civil Service, whether it is mainly composed of Englishmen or whether it is monopolised by Indians, can be kept on always with the same status as it has got to-day. There has been a great advance made in educating Indians in the Indian Civil Service and whatever the Prime Minister may have said about the Indian Civil Service also affects the future Indian candidates who will enter the Service. The only point about which we are concerned is whether we should develop our democratic institutions



[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

on the lines of the British Parliament or not. Leaving aside that matter, Sir, Mr. Subrahmanayam has made a remark to the effect that no effect can be produced on the British Prime Minister by a Resolution passed by this Honourable House. That is a matter on which I totally disagree. If we were to take his advice and keep quiet and not pass any Resolution because a Resolution is after all recommendation, and if we accept his arguments, it will be useless for us to pass any Resolutions whatever, because they are not binding on the Government of India also. He says the Prime Minister will not be bound to take back his words. I quite agree. But does he mean to say that any Resolution which is passed by this House is obligatory upon the Government of India? If the Government of India is at liberty to accept our recommendation or not, then why should the Home Government not be in the same position and why should not the same relation exist between this Honourable House and His Majesty's Government? If we accept Mr. Subrahmanayam's argument, then it means this, that we have got nothing whatever to do with the British Parliament. If we have got no connection with the Home Government, then the Home Government cannot, in that position, guide the destinies of India. But he says this is not so. Then I say this that whatever he has been saying is contradictory in itself. He made another remark that this constitution is a free gift from the English people. I differ from him on this matter also. This is not a free gift. What is the position of India as regards the British Parliament? We have to look into Indian history, and our Indian history tells us that up till 1857 India was governed by the East India Company which acted on behalf of and through the power which it derived from the Mughul Emperor.

We find that the Diwani was granted to the East India Company in the time of Lord Clive by Shah Alum. That shows that all the power which was derived by the East India Company was from the Mughul Emperor and they governed the country in their name. After the Mutiny of 1857, nay even during the Mutiny itself, we find that Indian soldiers had fought side by side with the soldiers of the East India Company against the soldiers who had revolted against their officers. This shows that the people of India had accepted the mandate which had been given to the East India Company to carry on the administration of the country by their Emperor, whether as a nominal figure-head or whatever his position was reduced to at the time. But it was India's will that the East India Company should succeed and put an end to the revolt, because the people of this country did not like any kind of anarchy, they wanted some strong hand, and therefore the whole of India's resources and power were placed at the disposal of the East India Company as is evident from the fact that a lot of soldiers of Rajas and Maharajas fought side by side with the soldiers of the East India Company. After 1858 there took place a change in the Crown. The Crown from the Mughul Emperor was transferred to the Queen of England, which means this, that the Queen of England was placed in the same position as the Mughul Emperor. In Her Proclamation of 1858 she said that she had taken upon herself the Crown of India. That means that India also recognised and consented to her being governed by Queen Victoria through her

Governor General in the same way as the Mughul Emperors had been governing India through the East India Company and their Governor General. So, that is a point on which this Assembly should lay great stress. The Queen of England was placed in an autocratic position, in the same position as was held by the Mughul Emperors. Now, Sir, whatever that position may be, it is quite clear that Indians accepted the guardianship of the British Queen and through her of the East India Company, because they considered themselves unfit at the time to govern their own country. Well, that position remained as long as the Indians accepted it. They are even accepting to-day that they cannot govern their own country with full liberty and full freedom. What they want to-day is that India should be governed as a part and parcel of the British Empire and that Indians should be placed on the same footing as the people in the Dominions are placed. Now, Sir, I have said that Indians accepted the guardianship of the British Queen and of the East India Company because it had been entrusted to them before by the Mughul Emperor. Now something has been given back by the guardians to us saying 'Look here, we have been holding the country for you so long, you have now grown major and you must manage your own affairs.' That is the position existing between this Assembly and the Home Government. Now when we have got back some status, when we have got back certain rights and powers which we had given to the British nation, then no power on earth can take back from us those powers and rights without our consent. That is the position. Whether Mr. Lloyd George makes one speech or twenty speeches, we need not bother about them.

Then Mr. Subrahmanayam pointed out that we should try and improve our army, the all-India services and so forth. Does he mean to say that if we have got one important thing we should leave out the other important things? Is it not an important thing to have a constitution? Is it not necessary that the constitutional position of India at the present time should be clearly explained? I know, Sir, that there is a Statute which explains in its preamble the position of India, and that cannot be taken back except by a Statute, which of course must come from this Assembly, with the consent of the country, and not from Parliament. Once the power is in our hands, that cannot be taken back from us without our consent. If we take the case of the British Parliament, we know who gave them the power. Well, the King granted some power to the people, because the people demanded it. After the power was once given and a constitutional body was organized, then it lay entirely in the hands of that organized body to secure such additional powers as they thought necessary for the government of the country. So, I think it is clearly a constitutional question. If we proceed on the same lines as the Mother of Parliaments did, then it will be open to this Assembly to get more powers by undertaking legislation in their own body. This, Sir, is a very serious question which requires consideration. Whatever Mr. Lloyd George may have said in his speech, I think it would really have been much better to accept the explanation given by the Viceroy in the opening speech which he made at the beginning of this Session. However, as the matter has now come under discussion and the House sticks to the interpretation which they put on the words of the Premier, I think

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

the amendment of Rao Bahadur Rangachariar is the best and I hope every one will agree with it, because, after all, an explanation has come, but it is open to this House to put the interpretation which the words of the Premier do carry. The amendment of my Honourable friend Rao Bahadur Rangachariar is asking for nothing more than a mere expression of opinion of this House that this House interprets the words of Mr. Lloyd George in the manner we do and we deplore it if our interpretation is correct. It will of course be open to Mr. Lloyd George to repudiate his meaning openly in Parliament. Probably I may be told that the explanation given by the Viceroy is as good as a repudiation by Mr. Lloyd George in Parliament.

But I disagree with that. It has not got the same force. That is an interpretation put by the Government of India and we want an assurance from His Majesty's Government and from Mr. Lloyd George himself that he did not mean that. And, of course, if he says that in the House of Commons, this House will be absolutely satisfied. Because we do not want that there should be any ill-feeling between the Members of this House and the Home Government. When we are co-operating, we have come here to co-operate with the Government of India and, through the Government of India, with the Home Government, then we expect that there should exist the best feeling and there should not be any misapprehension about the intentions of one party over the other. To clear the misapprehension, the best thing is that he must publicly denounce what he said. With these words I would give all my support to Mr. Rangachariar's amendment.

**Dr. H. S. Gour** (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadian) : Sir, I have listened to the speeches of the Honourable Members sometimes with considerable amusement and at times with a certain degree of amazement. I wish to make it clear that there are four points and four points only in the Prime Minister's speech which need trouble this House. His first point was that the constitutional changes introduced in this country were in the nature of an experiment. And his second point was that a further step must depend upon the character of the Legislature at the next election. His third point was that the 1,200 members of the Civil Service constitute the steel frame of the structure of the Indian constitution. And in his fervid peroration, he allowed himself to say that this steel frame shall not be deprived of all its rights and privileges at all time to come. These are the four categorical statements with which Members of this House are confronted. Now, Sir, so far as regards the first statement, namely, that the Reforms are in the nature of an experiment, we have been assured on the authority of the Prime Minister himself that he did not intend to go back upon the Reforms. I deprecate what my friend, the Honourable Mover of this Resolution, and what my Honourable friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, said that he is not prepared to accept the assurance given to this House by His Excellency the Viceroy. Do my Honourable friends, who are lawyers by profession, forget the well-known principle of law "*Qui facit per alium facit per se.*" Has not the Prime Minister deputed the Viceroy of India to assure this House that, so far as the Reforms are concerned, there is no intention or

desire to go back upon them. I for one am prepared to accept the statement in the same sense as if the Prime Minister had come to this House and made it himself. That chapter must close. And I do not think any Member of this House can go on saying "I do not accept your assurance. I do not accept the agency through which this message has been conveyed." He, as a gentleman, has repudiated, perhaps some will say recanted: perhaps he is penitent, perhaps he has explained away the statement which he made, spurred on, it may be as my friend Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas has said, by the exigencies of the situation with which he found himself confronted on the floor of the House of the Commons. So far, Sir, as that part of the statement is concerned upon which the criticisms of the public and the press have been pivoted for the last month or so, I think that that chapter must close.

There remain three other statements. The second statement of the Prime Minister was: "This Assembly has done well, but what guarantee is there that Members of another school may not dominate the Indian Legislature at the next election? If such a situation arises, it will be open to the Home Government to reconsider the whole question of the Reforms." That is a point upon which we are at issue. We say that the Reforms which have been placed upon the Statute Book are not conditional upon or conditioned by the vicissitudes of the elections in this country. On the other hand, the constitutional position attained by this country is that, whoever come to power, whether moderates, independents or extremists, they shall work the constitutional institution in the manner laid down by the law. Could the Right Honourable the Prime Minister say, "I will not dissolve this Parliament because I am afraid that the Labour Party or the Die-Hards or the Conservatives will dominate the situation at the next election?" Could he suspend the operation of the Parliament Act on the ground that he stood to lose his seat? And I submit, Sir, by parity of reasoning, it is not open to the Prime Minister to say "I shall not make any attempts, I shall pause and consider as to what will be the situation at the next general election in this country. If Members of the non-co-operation party dominate the Councils, a new situation will arise and will have to be reconsidered." I wish to emphasise the fact, Sir, that it does not matter one jot whether in this House or in the other House every Member is a non-co-operator. The Reform Act shall stand where it stands to-day and that, I submit, is the situation which must be realised by the Members of this House.

Thirdly and fourthly, he adverted to the Indian Civil Service. Now, I have absolutely nothing to say against the Members of the Indian Civil Service. We all recognise the value and work of the Members of the Indian Civil Service. But let me point out to you, Sir, what they themselves said about themselves and what the Prime Minister has allowed himself to say.

In their demand they said:

"The objective, as is now clear from the recent speech of the Secretary of State, is an autonomous India on a Dominion basis. In such an India there can be no place for any Imperial Service appointed and controlled by the Secretary of State; all Services must necessarily pass under the complete control either of the central autonomous Indian Government or of Local Governments. Officers are therefore asked....."

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey** (Finance Member) : Might I ask the Honourable Member the source of his quotation ?

**Dr. H. S. Gour** : I am, Sir, quoting from a memorandum drawn up by the Indian Civil Service Central Association, which I believe initiated this debate in the House of Commons :

“ Officers are therefore asked to work for their own abolition and for the realisation of a state of things under which they will be either unemployed or in a completely different position from that which they accepted when they signed their covenant with the Secretary of State.”

Now mark the words :

“ It is wholly and absolutely impossible for them to do this with any enthusiasm unless their position is fully secured.”

I echo the sentiments. Members of the Indian Civil Service are entitled to every consideration because they say they are working for their own abolition, and this is all that they wanted. This is all that they asked their champions in the House of Commons to assure them. But this debate took a much wider turn and the Prime Minister of England, who was asked by Sir William Joynson-Hicks in his speech to say a word of kindness and cheer for these men, wound up by making a statement which was wholly wide of the mark. The Mover of the Resolution pointed out to the House of Commons that he merely desired a guarantee that the existing members of the Indian Civil Service shall not be prejudiced by any constitutional changes made in this country. The seconder asked the Prime Minister of England to give them, as I have quoted to you, some kindness and cheer—not any increase of emoluments, by the way. The Prime Minister of England in his peroration permitted himself to say things which neither the mover nor the seconder of the Resolution nor indeed their clients, the Indian Civil Service, had ever asked for,—and that is to the credit of the Indian Civil Service. They certainly never asked that for all time to come they should constitute the “ steel frame ” in the Indian fabric, or that for all time to come their rights and privileges should be safeguarded. Again and again, in their memorandum, they have pointed out that the sooner autonomous Government was established in India, the better it would be for the popularity of the Home Government. Let me quote to you their *ipsissima verba* from the same documents. It says :

“ Democracy is inevitably an expensive form of Government. It invites the early expression of needs : the popularity of the Government depends on an early fulfilment of promises. To engraft this system of Government on an already expensive form of administration must entail such expenditure, that demands for the curtailment of ‘ foreign ’ establishment charges will be insistent. If it be deemed right to substitute for an expensive foreign agency cheaper indigenous administrative machinery, those who entered the service because of the attractive appointments they might hope to hold towards the end of their career can fairly demand, when those appointments are closed to them, compensation.”

These are demands which fully recognise the political condition in this country and of its future. The Members of the Indian Civil Service did not claim the right of governing this country for all time, and neither did their spokesman in the House of Commons ask of the Prime Minister any assurance as to the future recruitment to the Service. But it is a well known fact, Sir, that about that time, the newspapers in England were agitating about the paucity of candidates for the Indian Civil Service, and it seems to me that it was more or less a recruiting speech

which the Prime Minister of England delivered for the benefit of prospective candidates for the Indian Civil Service. If our words will go to those people let them remember that we entirely and wholly repudiate any suggestion implied in the Prime Minister's speech that we recognise the Indian Civil Service as the "steel frame" of the Indian constitution, or that for all time to come that Service will be the predominant partner in the administration of this country. We repudiate, Sir, these words of the Prime Minister—and that, I think, is a point upon which this House feels strongly :

"It is essential that that should be strengthened, but, whatever you do in the way of strengthening it, there is one institution we will not interfere with, there is one institution we will not cripple, there is one institution we will not deprive of its functions or of its privileges—(I hope Mr. Lindsay hears me) and that is that institution which built up the British Raj—the British Civil Service in India."

Is there any Member in this House who will endorse these sentiments? I say, "No." It is, I contend, Sir, these sentiments which we desire from the floor of this House to repudiate. We have no grievance against the Indian Civil Service, nor against any of its members. We desire that that system which was brought into existence at the initial stage of the British Raj in this country shall, in course of time, and as speedily as possible be terminated and that the indigenous agency employed for the purpose of looking after its own affairs. That, I submit, Sir, has been the considered opinion of this House.

Adverting now, Sir, to His Excellency the Viceroy's speech delivered in this House, while we have been told that there is no intention of going back upon the Reforms, its conditions have been brought into conspicuous prominence. It has been said that advance is to be by stages and that the time and manner of advance are to be judged by the British Parliament. Members of this House will agree with me when I say that if we are to leave the destiny of India in the hands of the British Parliament alone I cannot forecast a day when India shall attain Dominion status :

"Where lies the land to which the ship would go?  
Far, far ahead—is all her seamen know."

That is the situation which the preamble to the Government of India Act produces. We desire, and we have reiterated our desire, that we are ready to submit to the examination which the Parliament contemplates. We are ready, and the Prime Minister of England has told us in this very speech, that we will certainly pass the test, if it has to be passed.

Has he not told the British Parliament that the experiment has met with considerable success? If, I say, the experiment has met with considerable success, what stands in the way of a further advance in this country? That is a position which you must emphasise and that, I submit, is a position which we must reiterate till we attain the fulfilment of our object, namely, a further advance in the Central and Provincial Governments. Then, Sir, I will very briefly turn to my Honourable Colleagues . . . .

**Mr. President :** I must ask the Honourable Member to bring his remarks to a close.

**Dr. H. S. Gour :** I shall very briefly refer to one or two remarks that have fallen from my friends in this House. My Honourable friend Mr. Subrahmanayam, I hope, is not qualifying to be a member of the Diplomatic Service. He has told us that you must not rub a man in the wrong way. But I beg to remind him that if truth is truth, it does not matter which way you rub it. Truth must be spoken however unpalatable. My Honourable friend, Mr. Darcy Lindsay, threatened to spite our guns big and small. Instead of spiting or silencing our guns I have not the slightest hesitation in believing that he has enrolled himself as a recruit on our side after hearing me. (Laughter.) He referred to the Honourable Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas's previous speech torn from its context. But he has forgotten that Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas was probably speaking of a time which preceded the enactment of the Parliament Act and all the previous speakers who have referred to the Indian constitutional problems as an experiment were dealing with it at the time when the constitutional questions in this country were the subject of consideration. Once the Reform Act is placed on the Statute Book it ceases to be an experiment, it becomes a Statute of the land and as a Statute of the land it can no longer be tampered with. My Honourable friend, Mr. Kamat, is perfectly right in saying that no declaration made or prevarication made by any person, however exalted his rank and position, can alter the law which remains on the Statute Book. I am perfectly certain that the Prime Minister of England never intended to go behind the Reforms and the assurance given by the Viceroy will be accepted by the Honourable Mover. If he accepts it the only course open to him is to withdraw his Resolution. (Hear, hear.)

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent** (Home Member) : I feel that I ought to address the Assembly immediately after Dr. Gour in view of his attempts to secure the support of possible adherents of Government by his eloquence. It is true as many members of the Assembly are aware Dr. Gour is not lacking in confidence in his powers of eloquence and persuasion but at the same time I will take no risks in the matter.

I said yesterday when I was speaking in another place on a somewhat similar Resolution that I was surprised that the Resolution was moved. I cannot say the same thing to-day bearing in mind the character of the Mover. I must at the same time congratulate him on the moderation of the speech in which he moved the Resolution before us. There were, however, some expressions to which I think exception will be taken by the House and which have in fact been rightly criticized by the last speaker. I take for instance the words "We refuse to accept the assurance of His Excellency." Now, I do not think that this House will identify themselves with that statement ; in fact, I am quite sure that they will not. May I also deprecate the use of some of the language which I heard from another side of the House. Is it right for this Assembly, itself the creation of an Act of Parliament, a recent creation, to say that whatever the Parliament does, whatever His Majesty's Government may say, we will not give effect to it ? I wonder whether the Honourable Member who said that realized the gravity of what he was saying, or what it really involved. I feel sure that he did not. I regret too some of the language that has been used about the Prime Minister. We have heard various attacks on him, the last word used about him which I noted was "prevarication."

There have been other attacks also from Honourable Members who ought to have known better. After all, may I remind the House that Mr. Lloyd George is the Prime Minister of Great Britain. May I remind them that he is a leader of great pre-eminence and surely some courtesy, some consideration is due to a man in his position. Lastly, may I remind this Assembly here that he was the head of the Government which gave these Reforms to the country. It is true that Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu were the sponsors, but had it not been for the powerful assistance of Mr. Lloyd George I say the Reforms Act would not have been passed and this Assembly would not have been sitting here to-day. Is it right then for Members to attack in the manner adopted to-day a man who has given this country those great privileges? Is that the way in which this Assembly is going to show its gratitude for the Reforms?

Now, what exactly is the subject of complaint, and what exactly does the Honourable Member want in regard to it? The motion is that the Prime Minister is:

“to make a specific declaration ratifying the declaration of August 1917 and repudiating the statement made by him on the 2nd August 1922, characterising the Reforms as an experiment and also to take necessary steps for an early grant of full dominion self-government to this country.”

That is, the Prime Minister is, in the first place to stand up apparently in the House of Commons in a white sheet and recant everything that he has said, and then by way of penitence he is to grant to this country immediate or early dominion self-government irrespective of other considerations because he has happened to say something which Members of this Assembly do not like. When it is said that this demand for explanation has been fully met, it is suggested that the Prime Minister should have himself made a public explanation of his statement in the House of Commons. Apart from a difficulty arising from the fact that the House of Commons is not sitting, what better channel could the Prime Minister choose than His Excellency the Viceroy, the King's Representative, to convey a message to this country? His Excellency has given you on two occasions now a solemn assurance on the authority of the Prime Minister that there is nothing in the speech however worded, which was intended or meant in any way to go back on the solemn declarations which we have heard so frequently—the declaration of August 1917, the Preamble to the Act, the solemn Message of His Majesty announcing His assent to the Bill and later the Pronouncement which He made through His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, when the Legislatures were opened. All those statements are on record and is it reasonable in any case to suppose that the Prime Minister ever intended by a speech to go back on solemn promises of that kind? Apart from that, have you not now from him, not from His Excellency alone,—His Excellency has authority direct from the Prime Minister to convey the assurance to you that this was not his intention and yet a Member says “I will not accept that. There is nothing in it.” Is that a fair way of treating any great statesman and leader? Again, can the Honourable Member who moved this Resolution think that it is really a serious recommendation to the Government? Can he think for one moment that the Government of India could constitutionally convey a rebuke of this character to the Prime Minister? Is it a practical proposition? Is it a right thing to ask Government to do? There can be only one answer to these questions. I am quite sure that many members know that it is an impossible request to make. Apart



[Sir William Vincent.]

from that, does this Assembly seriously wish to increase the feeling now prevalent in Great Britain against India ? I know there are people here who say, ' Oh, it does not matter what they say in England ' ; but it does matter. The assistance of Great Britain is essential to this country in every direction. It is essential for the protection of this country from foreign foes. It is essential in all military and naval matters. It is essential to the preservation of internal order. It is essential for commerce. Why, the whole of the commercial prosperity of Bengal has been built up by the British. There was no great City of Calcutta before the advent of the British administration. Again, can any one say that this country can afford to dispense with the assistance of the British in the administration of this country ? Do Members wish to increase the feeling against this country that is now unfortunately prevalent in England ? There is a great deal of bitter feeling in England. I regret it. I believe that it is largely unjustified. I should like to see it dispelled. The Government of India have confidence in the future of India. But this is not the kind of conduct to obtain good-will in England towards the Reforms Scheme. Let us consider the happenings of the last few years. We have had this non-co-operation movement permeating the country. We have had a serious rising and grave disorders. We have had a Moplah kingdom proclaimed in the South and heard talk of a Sikh Raj in the North. We have had proposals for an Indian Republic only given up for reasons of policy. We have had racial hostility promoted. We have had in some places the most wicked and mischievous attempts, happily unsuccessful attempts, to insult His Royal Highness, the heir to the Throne. Can any man in this Assembly wonder that there is bitterness in England against India or that feeling is hardening ? What should be our efforts in these circumstances ? Ought we not to direct our efforts to proving to His Majesty's Government that we, the Government of India and the Members of this Assembly, are worthy of the great trust imposed in us and that we are anxious to use the power confided in us wisely ? Sir, there is nothing in the Prime Minister's speech which is directed against this Assembly. Members who read it again and again will find that it is directed against only one class of persons and that is against those who have attempted to make the administration of this country impossible. I am not concerned here whether this discontent is our fault or whether it is anyone else's. The fact that the movement exists is the real point. We have attempted to deal with the movement patiently and fairly and we have secured the help and support of this Assembly in our policy. Still the movement is there and the feeling to which I have referred has been roused. Now in these circumstances is it wise to provoke further ill-will and alienate the sympathies of those whose help is necessary in furthering the reformed constitution ? Is it to the interest or benefit of India in any way ?

And here let me analyse the speech for a moment. I submit it is unfair and unreasonable to examine it in the meticulous manner that might be adopted if it were a Statute. It is unfair to concentrate criticism on particular words and say " These are wrong and incapable of explanation ". The speech has to be taken as a whole. But let me first take one of the words that has been chosen for criticism ; this word ' experiment ' I would not have wasted time on it if attention had not been drawn to it here by previous speakers and in the words of the Resolution. Now, is

not the new constitution an experiment? Is this not a perfectly true statement? Did not Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas say last year here—I do not go to a more distant authority—that it was an experiment, a unique experiment. I heard Dr. Gour, an ingenious lawyer say, 'Oh, that statement was before the Bill was passed and became law'. This is not correct. It was made a year and a half after the Bill was passed. Then I heard Mr. Jamnadas say he referred to diarchy when using the expression. I asked Mr. Darcy Lindsay to continue reading the report a little further to prove that there was no reference in it to diarchy at all. It related to the capacity of India for self-government. This is the second ingenious attempt to explain away the expression and the only conclusion I can come to is that while it was perfectly legitimate for Mr. Jamnadas, for myself or for the Committee which went home of which Mr. Samarth was a member to use the word 'experiment', yet when the Prime Minister of England uses it, it is high treason. Why Mr. Lloyd George, speaking of democracy generally, not in the East, said it is a Western experiment and a recent experiment at that. There is really nothing wrong in the use of the word. Objection has been taken to it however on the ground that the word 'experiment' implies that it means the grant of something which may be taken back and in particular attention was drawn to these words in the speech :

"I think it is right that we should say that if there is a change of that kind in the character of the Legislature and in the purpose of those who are chosen in the design of responsible and chosen leaders of the Indian people, that would constitute a serious situation and we should take it into account."

Now, suppose that a number of men absolutely hostile to His Majesty's Government came into this Assembly at the next election, suppose they voted down every possible measure, suppose they made the administration of this country impossible (I do not say it is going to happen. I do not believe it will for one moment) would it not in truth create a serious situation which His Majesty's Government have to consider? You have got to face facts; further the Act itself contemplates that the situation should be reconsidered if this should be found necessary, and there is nothing unconstitutional or new in what Mr. Lloyd George said. He undoubtedly had in mind the provisions of section 84A of the Government of India Act; and here I shall quote the name of Mr. Samarth again, for this is a section of the Act which, when giving evidence before the Joint Committee on behalf of the Moderates in India, he specifically accepted.

**Mr. N. M. Samarth** (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official) : I did.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent** : It was not a question of his personal acceptance at all. Mr. Samarth was speaking on behalf of the Moderates of India. That was in 1919. The proposition was considered perfectly reasonable then and it was embodied in a solemn Statute and yet in 1922, when there is the slightest suggestion that in certain events the Reforms may have to be reconsidered, everybody is up in arms. Surely the Prime Minister was only stating what is in the Statute. I do not want to stress this point however because I myself do not believe it will ever happen. I have still faith in the future of this country. I do not believe that at the next election non-co-operators will get in in such large numbers and I believe that even if they do, the fact of their being members of this Assembly will exercise a great restraining influence upon them. The

[Sir William Vincent.]

truth is that this Assembly has begun to establish its own traditions and any succeeding body of men will, in my  
 3 P.M. opinion, be unable to resist them. At the same time the warning was, I must say, justified and indeed people in England living 6,000 miles away, hearing nothing but the gloomiest reports about India have been much exercised as to the future. Further, was not the Prime Minister justified in issuing a warning to persons who have really been doing very great harm, very grave injury to the good name of this country? In such circumstances, I suggest that our attitude should be such as to show that we desire to prove our capacity, to prove that we will surmount difficulties and that we can work and will work the new Reforms successfully and not cavil at a word of this kind. There have been great difficulties, great drawbacks in our way, we have tried to meet them and have met them successfully. Great efforts have been made by enemies to ruin the Reforms. Government has failed to secure—I am not saying inside this Assembly—outside this Assembly, that support from a large section of the people which we had a right to demand, owing to the wicked folly of those who have striven to make government impossible in this country. And if we have succeeded in spite of those things, then Government has much to be thankful for to this Assembly and to many others who have helped to make the Reforms a success. It was for this reason that the Prime Minister addressed words of hearty appreciation to the members of the Assembly and others in his speech. What is the answer of this Assembly going to be to him who has acknowledged their services in such terms? What is the reply to be? Is the return to be the adoption of this Resolution? But, Sir, whether these Reforms are an experiment or not, there is one thing that has been repeatedly stated both in the Proclamation and said again by His Excellency a couple of days ago, and that is that the goal of this country is the progressive realization of responsible Government as an integral part of the British Empire. To my mind, and I have no doubt in the mind of every one else, responsible government has one meaning and one meaning only, that is a Government which is responsible to the elected representatives of the people. That goal is authoritatively defined. There is nothing, you have now the solemn assurance that there is nothing, in the Prime Minister's speech, which was intended in any way to cut down or minimise previous solemn declarations.

Now, I want to turn to another matter, the Indian Civil Service and the recruitment for it. I know that there is a great deal of feeling in this country in regard to what was said in the speech about that service. I myself, naturally, have a great pride in the work done by it. I believe the Members have rendered the greatest benefit to the country and that it was by their efforts that order has been created and the efficiency and the integrity of the administration is maintained; I am glad that this opinion is endorsed by so many Members here in this House. Further the sight in recent years of men doing willingly arduous, unpleasant duties on remuneration which makes their life one long struggle against poverty, making desperate efforts to educate their children and keep out of debt—I say the contemplation of this must excite the admiration of every reasonable man. I think myself, in those circumstances, it was only right and proper that they should receive encouragement from the highest authority in Great

Britain on their work and on their services. There is one word used in relation to this service which perhaps excited more feeling than anything else, and that is the words "steel frame" (Laughter.) The Honourable Member (Dr. Gour) laughs: he himself, many other Honourable Members, have had occasion to be grateful to the members of the Service in the past—for the services they have rendered to them and may render to them in the future—the Honourable Member will not smile so cheerfully when he seeks their assistance in vain! And here I want to make one point clear; and to say that it is His Majesty's Government's intention that there should be a substantial British element in the Services. Now if this is accepted, I ask whether it is not reasonable that the Prime Minister should make every effort to encourage the very best persons to come forward as recruits. It is in any case futile to ascribe improper motives for this decision. It is quite clear indeed that in announcing this decision, the Prime Minister was thinking of what was necessary, what was best, for this country and it is idle to suggest he was thinking of securing employment for a few Englishmen. I believe myself further that the presence of these British officers in this country will assist rather than retard the progress of the Reforms. The fact is that the Indianization of the Services must be regulated with regard to the success of the efforts of India in the attainment of other conditions essential for political progress; but here again it is made abundantly clear in the Viceroy's speech that there was no intention to violate previous pledges. It is unreasonable to expect absolute accuracy in a speech of this kind in every detail and when the Prime Minister said in his speech there were 1,200 British Civilians it was a mistake. There are about 1,200 members of the Service in all but this includes Indians. The recruitment of Indians since 1920 has been made at the rate of 33 per cent. rising by  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. annually to 48 per cent. every year. The real question before you is not whether there is to be an increasing association of Indians in the Services. That principle has been admitted. The Assembly has an assurance on that in the Preamble to the Act. The real question is whether this country wants to get rid of all European recruitment for the Service at present. That is the question, the real question which Members will have to answer. We recently issued a circular on this question of recruitment. I know it has been criticised. In my judgment we can afford to disregard that criticism. In no sense did the Government of India commit themselves to any particular view but as a necessary consequence of a Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, we invited the opinions of the Local Governments on this question of recruitment for the All-India Services. We endeavoured to put forward fairly, impartially, the arguments used on both sides. That circular has been accepted by many as a fair statement of the arguments. Government went so far as to say that they did not even commit themselves to accepting, save provisionally, the statements which I made in this Assembly last February. It has never been suggested at any time that this decision on this question rested with ourselves. We have repeatedly emphasised that it lay with His Majesty's Government. But, surely, the Government of India, on the recommendation of this Assembly is entitled without the least impropriety to obtain opinions and to ask for a comprehensive survey of a question of that importance to the future of India.

I want to return to one point. I am afraid I have not made it quite clear—that His Majesty's Government's decision to retain a substantial

" [Sir William Vincent.]

proportion of British in the Civil Service is not intended to conflict with the policy of increasing association of Indians in that Service. And here I want to go back to the metaphor of the steel frame. I say that I believe it is not incompatible with the increasing association of Indians in the Service or the incorporation of Jamshedpur steel with Sheffield steel in the frame ; but both classes of steel must be of proved and tested capacity. I want here to turn to another reason which, in my judgment, may have actuated the Prime Minister in the pronouncement on the Services. He has, I suppose, more experience of conditions in Europe than almost any one and he has witnessed the absolute collapse of conditions in Russia and indeed nearer home than that, and also in Austria, owing to the sudden breakdown of the administrative and executive machinery of the country ; and I suggest that it was against a danger of this kind that he sought to safeguard India when he spoke of the great Service which has built up the Indian administration. It was due to the breakdown of that machinery that the *debacle* occurred in Russia. Otherwise why should he have spoken as he did. He is no lover of a bureaucracy ; he has been a radical all his life ; and he was the head of a Government which gave India the Act of 1919. Why then should he suddenly come out in this way for the protection of the Civil Service. I believe the reason was that he was thinking of the good of India and all he said was spoken simply and solely for the benefit and the true interests of this country.

Now I want to turn to this question of functions and privileges. The Civil Service has occupied a peculiar position in this country and has had more to do with shaping and controlling the policy of the administration than is the case elsewhere. There may of course be a similar system in other countries, but not to my knowledge. But, Sir, it is inevitable that with the progressive development of self-governing institutions in India the functions of these Services must and will adjust themselves to the new conditions. The essential point—a point put to me by a colleague of mine yesterday is that once you have secured the fact that the ultimate goal is self-government, all questions are subsidiary and will solve themselves. For myself, I believe the Prime Minister's intention really was simply to guarantee the Services protection in their financial and other legitimate interests ; also to assure them of his support in the performance of arduous, unpleasant, and often unpopular duties out here ; and finally to encourage the best class of recruits. Further, looking over the evidence before the Joint Committee, when my Honourable friend was giving evidence, I found there that that leader of Indian Moderates, Mr. Chintamani, also spoke of the protection of the privileges and rights of the Civil Service as a perfectly legitimate thing (*Mr. N. M. Samarth* : " Under the then existing conditions.") Quite so. The rights of men in the Service at present. I thought that my friend had not studied the Report, but I see he is well aware of the facts. At any rate I believe the intention of the Prime Minister was to protect these legitimate interests and he was right to do so.

I want to say one word more about the work of the Civil Service. I believe they have made loyal and wholehearted efforts to carry out and

give effect to the Reforms Scheme. Why then is there such hostility to that Service? I can only say that these attacks are to my mind absolutely unjustified. I am not going to talk about this word "trust," because no one has drawn attention to it but I want to turn at once to the last recommendation of the Honourable Member; the proposal for early self-government on dominion lines in this country. That is the real question, the momentous question, before the Council and it must exercise every member of this Assembly before they accept this recommendation. There are only two methods of securing self-government, one is by force and one is by the consent and assistance of His Majesty's Government. If it is to be evolution with the assistance of His Majesty's Government, that can only be by action of Parliament and I fear that the present Resolution is not going to, and some of the speeches made here to-day are not going to, encourage the goodwill and assistance of His Majesty's Government. If, however, we were really to examine this question of Dominion self-government, what is the position? I want you to look at it from a practical point of view. Theories and catchwords are of no use in a matter of this kind. Is this country fitted now for democracy; is this country in a position to defend itself? Is there any army except the British Army and that which is officered by the British? Is not time needed for the development of an army? Why, in the Dominions where there is a community of race and interests, of habits and customs, where the sense of civic responsibility is developed, where that unanimity of opinion in essential principles which is the foundation and only foundation of democratic government, exists, it took years to secure self-government. Why should any one think that in this country this vast sub-continent, with its diverse races, diverse religions, diverse languages, and illiterate masses, accustomed to autocratic government with no education in constitutional matters, it will be possible to surmount *per saltum* all these obstacles which have delayed the development of self-government in other countries? Time is essential to solve these difficulties. What has been the effect of precipitate change in China and Russia? What is the meaning of democratic government? It is Government by the majority. I want every one to realize that this means that the minority will be absolutely dependent for the enjoyment of their rights, liberties and property on the vote of the majority. Can any one say that in the present state of development the rights of minorities will be secured under a democracy? Ponder therefore carefully what it really means before you accept the Resolution. And I should like here to quote a passage on this point from Mr. Montagu, because Members accept him as a real friend of political progress in India. What does he say?

"On the other hand if India will believe in our good faith, as she ought to believe, if she will accept the offer that has been made to her by the British Parliament, then she will find that the British Empire, for which so many Indians and Englishmen have so recently died, and which at this present moment is saving the world, will give her liberty but not license, freedom but not anarchy, progress but not stampede, peace and the fulfilment of the best destinies that the future can possibly offer her."

It is in that spirit that I want the Members of this Assembly to vote on this Resolution. I have spoken of the rights of minorities. May I now

[Sir William Vincent.]

say a word of vested interests? Have Members considered the dangers that might come to them from precipitate changes? The landlords in Russia have learned how easy it was to stir up the peasants against them. What was the result and where is the landlord in Russia now? And from one vested interest to another the transfer of activity is very speedy; nor would agitation be lacking to promote it. Read what a leading organ of the Press publishing now in this country says. Here is an article from an extremist paper:

"The Congress must assume the leadership of the peasants and labourers. They should organise the peasants and labour unions and, whenever necessary, should enforce its demands by mass action."

Is that the sort of thing that is wanted here? What would be the result of such agitation raised in this country without a strong established Government backed up by military force? This again is a point which Members might consider. But I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I believe that these differences will die with the growing spirit of nationality which is really in my judgment a new spirit due to the administration of this country by the British. I believe that all these disintegrating forces will succumb to it. I hope that this national spirit will grow till it permeates all sections, transcends all these sectional and religious differences of which I have spoken. It alone will bring about the education of the people in the duties and responsibilities of Government and in the necessity of fairness to minorities. That spirit will come, but it requires time for its development. It is for this reason that I appeal to the Members of this Assembly to reject this part of the present Resolution on the ground that the country is not ripe for the change which the Honourable Member proposes in the present state of development. I have worked, I suppose, as hard as any European official in this Chamber for the success of the Reforms. (Hear, hear.) I have made it my business to do so and so have all the other members of the Government. We are anxious that the Members of this Assembly should not by some ill-advised action jeopardise the whole success of their future and that they should not antagonise the feeling of Great Britain at this critical juncture, for I tell you the juncture is critical and that feeling is hardening there and it is for this reason I ask you to reject this Resolution. The Honourable Member may be successful, he may win a Pyrrhic victory in this Assembly, but it will be a victory which will not enure to the credit of the Assembly or to the benefit of India but solely to the advantage of those who are hostile to all constitutional reforms and all political progress in this country (Hear, hear.)

**Dr. H. S. Gour:** I wish to make a personal explanation. I did not like to interrupt the Honourable the Home Member when he was delivering his speech. He referred to certain Members as having used the term "prevarication" with reference to the Prime Minister. I might point out to the Honourable Member that I never used the word "prevarication" with reference to the Prime Minister.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent:** Excuse me, may I explain? I took the word "prevarication" down on paper from the Honourable Member.

**Dr. H. S. Gour:** I am absolutely certain I never used that expression. I never used the word "prevarication" with reference to the Prime

Minister. What I said was that the Act is there and cannot be twisted out of its sense by any equivocation or prevarication of any person.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** We were discussing the Prime Minister's speech and the question was whether he was attempting to evade the provisions of the Act, and when Dr. Gour said " the prevarication of any person " I understood him to mean the Prime Minister. If I was wrong, I am sure the House will sympathise with me and admit that there are extenuating circumstances. (Laughter.)

**Rao Bahadur T. Rangaohariar :** Sir, after listening to the very eloquent and able speech of the magician of this House, it required some nerve on my part to rise again to persist in the foolish course which he thinks this Assembly will be adopting by adopting any Resolution on the Premier's speech. I may at once say that I am in entire agreement with the Honourable the Home Member that the Resolution as moved in regard to the Premier's speech in the House of Commons is absolutely out of place. It is unnecessary to get a re-affirmation of what has been declared to us by Statute. There are Statutory methods of restricting, modifying or enlarging the privileges or rights which have been granted to this country. If those Statutory methods to restrict are adopted, we shall then fight those questions out in a Statutory manner. The time has not come for that and I pray to God that such a time will not come. I am also in entire agreement with the Honourable the Home Member that he and his companions on the Government Benches in this Assembly have contributed very largely by their co-operation with us, the representatives of the people, in the successful working of the new reformed constitution. We are all thankful to them ; in fact I think in one of the speeches I made in this Assembly last year I gave credit to Englishmen and to Scotchmen also (Laughter) that they always fight before a thing is accomplished but, when the thing is accomplished, they take it as a settled fact and sit down to work as ardently as when they were fighting it. That is why, Sir, they rule the world, that is why we are where we are and that is why we are proud of the British connection, though not of British rule, not of the British raj. The word " Swaraj " has been sanctified from the lips of His Gracious Majesty the King. Sir, my objection to the speech of the Premier is not because he has used the word " experiment." Sir, the British Empire in India is an experiment, the whole world is watching its work in this country. It is an experiment to put us on the road to Swaraj, and that experiment will, I am sure, succeed. We have been put on a definite step towards that Swaraj and, therefore, I think, the Mover made a mistake in catching hold of the wrong word in the speech. Sir, I have read the speech, re-read the speech and re-read it again. In view of the pronouncements of such an august personage like the noble and just Viceroy, whom we have got to guide our destinies, I tried my best to bring myself to believe that there is nothing in the speech, that we may ignore it and let it pass and we may take the assurances conveyed to us through His Excellency the Viceroy. But, Sir, when I have regard to the occasion on which the speech was made, when I have regard to the history of what led to the speech, when I have regard to the past history of this subject of the Indianisation of the Services, I feel I will be failing in my duty to my country if I do not convey the humble message of this House and of the people of this country that they view the sentiments contained in the



[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

speech with alarm. The whole tenor of it, the underlying sentiments are all opposed to previous declarations by His Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor and by responsible Ministers, and it is opposed to the whole spirit of the reformed constitution under which we are working.

The Premier is a great man—probably the greatest man England has produced in the last decade. Coming therefore from him, and having regard to the treatment which it received in the House of Commons when he was delivering his speech, I was a little bit struck that half a dozen persons did not jump up at once in the House and say “What is it you are doing?” If they had done so, I should not have been making this motion to-day. But, Sir, I want to convey to the British nation by a message from this Assembly that we view with grave concern the sentiments contained in that speech. Let it be said to the credit of the Government of India that their circular of the 30th May last issued to the Local Governments stated the case most fairly, frankly, and fully on this question of the Indianisation of Services. It is true they have not committed themselves to any definite view on the matter, but they recognise the force of public opinion in this country as regards this vexed question. Was it not this question, Sir, which made Lord Lytton write that famous minute directly he assumed the Viceroyalty of this country? Did he not say—I have got the exact language here :

“We all know that those claims and expectations never can or will be fulfilled. We have to choose between prohibiting them (namely, the natives of India) or cheating them. We have chosen the least straightforward course. Since I am writing confidentially I do not hesitate to say that both the Government of India and the Government of England appear to me at the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words or promises they have uttered to the ear.”

Such is the painful history of this question; and therefore, Sir, the Government of India very rightly gauged the situation when they stated in their circular that the Indians attach far greater importance to this question than even to the question of Swaraj. His Majesty the King-Emperor in the message which he graciously sent to this country directly the Act was passed said that :

“there was one gift which yet remains and without which the progress of the country cannot be consummated—the right of the people to direct her affairs and safeguard her interests; the defence of India against foreign aggression is a duty of common Imperial interest and pride; the control of her domestic concerns is a burden which India legitimately aspires to take upon her own shoulders.”

Those were the words, gracious words, of His Majesty. It is in fulfilment of that gift that the Indianisation of the Services is taken as the bedrock upon which this domestic control can be accomplished. That was in 1919. The Indian Civil Service revolted. We also remember the speech made by Lord Chelmsford soon after the armistice in the old Imperial Legislative Council, which engendered grave suspicion in the minds of the people, as regards the attitude of Government towards the reforms and this question in particular. But we all felt so satisfied and gratified at the attitude adopted by the Civil Service after the Reform Act came into force that we thought we were settling down. We didn't

know that this secret propaganda was being carried on in England. What prevented the Indian Civil Service from making their claims and demands in this country? Are we people who behave with any sense of irresponsibility that you should not trust us to safeguard your rights and privileges? Have we not time and again risen from our places and given our guarantee that all just claims on the part of the different Services, whether it be Civil or Military Service or any other Service in this country, will be met? We are not a nation of savages. We are not a nation of barbarians, that we should ignore claims and rights based on contract. Would the Indianisation of the Civil Service prevent the realisation of those claims which you may have, which the Indian Civil Service may have? Therefore, Sir, even before the Local Governments have had an opportunity of expressing their opinion on this Government of India circular, and before the Government of India makes its recommendations here comes a pronouncement by no less a personage than the Premier of Great Britain. And, Sir, what is the occasion for that speech? It had been arranged there should be a day for this discussion. The Civil Service people had asked for a definite date for discussion on this subject, and taking advantage of the second reading of a Bill regarding the appropriation of the Consolidated Fund, the Honourable Member who raised the question—I think, Sir Samuel Hoare—raised it in a very fair manner. He said:

“We do not want to dictate to India what she should do. It is her own concern. But we want to place before them the just claims of the Civil Service.” That, Sir, was the right attitude which he adopted. But the second gentleman who spoke—I am not sure if I am pronouncing his name correctly, Sir William Joynson-Hicks—drew pointed attention to this, that “it was the moderate view that this country was going to have complete Indianisation of Services, and that Englishmen must gradually quit all these offices.” It was to that statement the Premier was replying. He said they wanted a reassurance on two matters—the rights or rather, increased pay and prospects for the people already in the service and also the prospects of the people who are to come into the Civil Service. It was not a casual speech. He wanted to give a word of hope, a word of expectation, and reassurance to people who wanted to enter the Indian Civil Service. And what does he say? What is the hope he holds out? There are 1,200 appointments open to the Indian Civil Service. They form the steel frame; they form the nucleus. Are we to endorse those words? Sir, the word ‘nucleus’ with us Hindus in a joint family has a very very significant meaning. I may have inherited Rs. 10 from my father, and by my own skill and learning amassed lakhs and lakhs; but the other members of my joint family pounce upon it, saying as it comes from the nucleus of our ancestral property, we are all entitled to have it. I cannot forget the word ‘nucleus.’

I cannot forget the words ‘steel frame’; I cannot forget the words ‘British rule’; I cannot forget the words ‘British Raj’; I cannot forget his expression asking Indians to assist them in governing this country, not that they should assist us in governing our country, but that we should assist them perpetually in order that they should govern this country. Was that the intention of the reformed constitution? If that is so, let us have it fair and square. Let us understand on what terms we are co-operating. If these are the terms on which you ask

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangaachariar.]

us to co-operate, I for my part decline to co-operate. Sir, we have some here to co-operate with ourselves and with you in obtaining Swaraj, words uttered by His Majesty the King-Emperor. We are here, Sir, to co-operate with you when you assist us in gradually placing us in positions of control and responsibility which hitherto you have been occupying. Sir, what does the Premier say? What was the warning he uttered? No doubt "there have been some failures hitherto; but let us not say that the experiment has completely failed." Is it that it has partially failed but it has not completely failed yet? What is the warning he gives to the leaders of thought here? He says "Take care. Do not behave so badly for this question can be determined even before the ten years are out." And what was it that we were to take care of? Not that we should not paralyse this Government and all that. If he had said that I would have had no quarrel with him. But what he has said is—I am tempted to quote his very words—"If they should be men who were simply using all the powers of the machine in order to attain some purpose which was detrimental to British rule"—not British connection—"and subversive of the whole system upon which India had been governed up to now." We all know how India has been governed up to now; power was in the hands of the Civil Service. It is to break that that this reformed constitution was given. We are now told, Sir, that even if we work the Reform Act as it is we will be acting so badly that they will have to take serious notice of that conduct and that speech is followed by cheers in the House of Commons. Sir, are we to have this state of things? Are we not to make the people of England understand that we resent such treatment? My friend, the Honourable Sir William Vincent, appeals to us with all his eloquence, with all his irrelevant references to Mr. Samarth and other people, dragging us away from the real issue in the case, making us forget the real issue in the case. I did not know he was a clever advocate; I had thought that he was a clever administrator only; I am sure if he were at the bar he will simply be leading with a roaring practice. Sir, let us face the issue. Why should we shut our eyes to what has been stated? They are entitled to their views; we are entitled to ours. All that I ask in my amendment is: let us humbly convey this message to the great British nation, that we feel perturbed by these sentiments which are contained in this speech. I feel constrained to say that if these sentiments are allowed to remain there without our expressing our views about them the British Nation may not know the effect of the speech will be disastrous. Sir, most people in this country have got full faith in the British nation, although it was shaken somewhat after the Dyer Debate. We are trying our level best to work the reforms to the best of our ability; we are honestly trying to do what we can to make the reforms a success, and as I have already said the Civil Service is nobly assisting us in that matter, although there are a few exceptions here and there—I am afraid the province from which my friend, Dr. Gour, comes is a province which rather figures in a different category in this matter; but there it is; and therefore, Sir, when we have been getting on so well, that this bombshell should come and that we should take it quietly, and that you the Home Member should advise

us to take it quietly without even giving vent to our feelings and that you should frighten us with all sorts of things and say that it will be putting up the British nation's back against us, is not right. Why should the British nation be angry if we tell them our feelings in this matter? Why should they, a nation which faced the Germans, which faced the whole world, why should they be put out on such small pretexts? I do not believe it. I give them greater credit than you do. I have greater faith in their common-sense; I have greater faith in their sense of justice, and I have greater faith in their real desire for improving the condition of this country. I have great faith in England, Sir, and therefore I wish to convey this message to that country saying that we feel greatly perturbed, we feel that this is likely to destroy the faith which the people of this country have in the British connection and in their good intentions towards us. We want Swaraj, and not British Raj and before that we want the Indianisation of the Services. Therefore, Sir, I move my amendment.

“ That for the Resolution as it stands the following be substituted :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey the message from this Assembly to His Majesty's Government through the Secretary of State for India, that it views with grave concern the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Prime Minister in the House of Commons on the 2nd of August, 1922, and it considers that the tenour of the whole speech and the sentiments therein are subversive of the declarations made by His Majesty and His Majesty's responsible Ministers and that it is calculated to destroy the faith of this Assembly and of the people of this country in the good intentions of the British nation both in the matter of attaining ‘ Swaraj ’ and of the Indianisation of its Services ’.”

**Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary** (Calcutta : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : Sir, in deference to the expression of opinion that fell from the Chair this morning, I propose to ask the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment. At the same time I desire to oppose the Resolution as strongly as possible, lock, stock and barrel. I believe it is a dead horse, deader than Mr. Darcy Lindsay's, and I do not therefore propose to labour the various points raised in that Resolution. In fairness to ourselves and to those whom I represent in my party, I desire to dissociate ourselves entirely from what has been said questioning the sincerity of the Premier's disavowal through His Excellency the Viceroy or the supposed threat that whatever Parliament may do India will not submit. Having said that much, Sir, I am afraid I shall not have much longer earned those cheers here that greeted me from some parts of the House. I propose to ask the Assembly to concentrate its attention on the amendment of Mr. Rangachariar subject to further amendments that I ask your leave, Sir, to let me move. Having regard to the turn which this debate has taken and the clearing up of the ground following the pronouncement of His Excellency the Viceroy we owe it to ourselves as responsible representatives of the people to give expression to the apprehension and concern that have been roused about which everybody is fully aware. At the same time we must do so with proper restraint and a proper sense of responsibility. Therefore, Sir, I take strong objection to certain expressions in Mr. Rangachariar's amendment which if my amendment is carried will stand deleted. The first amendment that I propose with your leave to move, Sir, is that for the words “ subversive of ” the words “ in conflict

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

with " should be substituted in the amendment. My second amendment would be for the words " destroy the faith of " substitute the words " create serious apprehensions in the minds of ". I do not repeat the word ' grave ' because it appears before. My third amendment would be to omit the words " in the good intentions of the British nation."

Therefore, if my amendment is carried, the amended amendment will stand in a way that I believe, would get rid of most, if not all the objections that have been levelled against the Resolution and in some cases properly levelled against it. In order that the Assembly may follow my amendments I shall read the Resolution as it will stand in an amended form :

" This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey the message from this Assembly to His Majesty's Government through the Secretary of State for India that it views with grave concern the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Prime Minister in the House of Commons on the 2nd of August, 1922, and it considers the tenor of the whole speech and the sentiments therein are *in conflict with* the declarations made by His Majesty and His Majesty's responsible Ministers and that it is calculated to *create serious apprehension in the minds of* this Assembly and of the people of this country both in the matter of attaining Swaraj and of the Indianisation of its Services."

**Reo Bahadur T. Rangachariar :** I accept it.

**Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary :** Mr. Rangachariar accepts it, and therefore so far as he is concerned, my difficulty disappears but that is not necessarily the end of all difficulties. Even on a rainy day like this in the high Simla Hills a good deal of dust has been raised in my neighbourhood and behind my friend Mr. Rangachariar (by Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Subrahmanayam). The nature of the dust it is difficult to analyse. Mr. Subrahmanayam, according to Dr. Gour, was qualifying for diplomatic service. I myself thought that he had taken up the role of furnishing some amusement to the House on this long rainy day which he thought Sir William Vincent had provided for us free of charge. In passing, Sir, and speaking seriously, I think the Assembly, at least those who are of our way of thinking, owe a debt of gratitude to the Honourable the Home Member for setting apart a day for this debate instead of leaving us to the chances of a non-official day, and therefore on my behalf as well as on behalf of my friends, I desire to convey our sense of gratitude to him.

Sir, our difficulties are many. We have been told that with regard to anything that we may do or say here, we shall be antagonising the British Parliament and the British people, and yesterday elsewhere, I believe the Honourable the Home Member said, British capital also. I do not think we shall be doing anything of the kind as Mr. Rangachariar has very clearly, forcibly and in his characteristic fashion put. I believe, on the other hand, we shall be lacking in our duty as representatives of the people,—such as we are, our representative character is often assailed, because some people think that we do not represent them,—but knowing what the feeling in the country is, the apprehensions that have been aroused and the anger and disappointment that have been caused, I think we shall be failing in our duty if we do not state in this Assembly, to the Government of India and through it to His Majesty's Government in England what the real feeling of the people is with regard to this question,

The way in which the amendment will now be put, and I hope passed, will convey that sense of apprehension and disappointment. The nervousness about British annoyance is gratuitous.

Sir, we have not yet been charged, as the Mover of the amendment has been charged, with showing mistrust to His Excellency by bringing forward this amendment after his pronouncement. If the same charge was to be levelled against me and against those who think with me, I should take the liberty of quoting from His Excellency's speech, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

"I prefer to use this opportunity to consider with you matters of wider import to India and her future which I know are seriously engaging your thoughts and are forming the subject of your discussions."

His Excellency must have had before him the various Resolutions and allied questions that had been sent in, and I read his speech as not a desire that it should be the last word on this matter but as an invitation that the Legislature of both Houses should consider the matter with him. I look upon that as permission if not an invitation, when one proceeds to read His Excellency's speech carefully and between the lines,—I need not quote from the speech at length, at all events, the opening lines of His Excellency's speech on this subject are as strong a disapproval of what has been done as could be on his part. I do not want to put the case higher than that. Mr. Lindsay himself has called it an unsavoury incident, a non-official European member of the Legislature in another place yesterday called it unfortunate. That is enough material for me to proceed and to invite this Assembly to pass if possible unanimously, if not by a majority, the amendment that Mr. Rangachariar has moved with such further amendments as I have ventured to propose.

Sir, I have no quarrel with the word 'experiment.' On the other hand, His Excellency's interpretation puts the matter beyond doubt more than ever. I am sorry the matter has not been referred to earlier in the debate. "Is it not a legitimate," this was in reply to the Deputation that waited upon His Excellency, "Is it not a legitimate use of popular language to refer to a new and hitherto untried departure as an experiment?" That does not necessarily involve any desire to go back upon the pledges given to us unless you take it with the context. But what does the Premier say, that I took exception to in the amendment that I wanted to move and which I asked your leave to withdraw,—"whether a system which the West has preferred for its own conditions, its own temperament is suitable for India" is a question that he desires to be kept open. There may be occasion to revise the details in the light of such facts as the Joint Committee later on may have before them. But I submit, and I submit with emphasis, that the question as to whether the scheme in general is suitable for India or not can never more arise. That should have been considered and considered very gravely when the "experiment" was initiated. It would be wrong to the people here, it would be wrong to the people in England, to scrap that "experiment" later, as a whole, on the basis that it is unsuitable for India. England has been governing India long enough. It knows its inwardness as well as the Indians themselves. There is no good starting afresh at every stage an array of our troubles, disorders and disqualifications. Whether an experiment like this would be suitable in India or not raises a fundamental

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

question which would not be permissible for the Premier to raise again at this stage or later. When we say so we show enough to justify the use of the expression that his speech—very much of the type of the Curate's Egg—is in conflict with former declarations. There are many other passages that can be quoted. Some have been commented on. But it is not necessary to multiply. It is the whole tenour of the speech, the abuse of the occasion on which it was delivered, the manner of its delivery and the way in which it was received that we are objecting to for they create an atmosphere that will hurt us if we are not careful. I do not say that the Assembly will waste its time over academic discussions with regard to anything and everything that may be said in or out of Parliament that happens to go against its interests or that of the country. But there are moments, Sir, when we can not possibly ignore what has been said and done. Such a moment was when the Assembly, with the consent of all right-minded people, lodged its strong protest against the pronouncement, post prandial no doubt but a pronouncement all the same, of Mr. Winston Churchill with regard to Kenya, and if there was anything constitutionally wrong in our trying to move a motion like this in this House, now I am sure, Sir, you and the Governor General would have in exercise of your rights told us so and disallowed the Resolution. That is enough for me so far as the constitutional aspect of the question is concerned.

About the question of expediency and as to whether by our present action we are going to forfeit the certificate of good behaviour and sensible conduct that we have so arduously earned I am not and shall never be concerned. If it is that we should speak out—speak out not alone our own minds but give expression to what is being said and thought in the country? If it is right, I think it is our duty to place before the Governor General and through him before the British Government in England how intense is the people feeling and we must do it in order that judgment may not go against us by default. One does not know when the chapter of gloss and commentary begins, how matters may be whittled down. I am afraid, Sir, the Honourable the Home Member has done the British Premier more injustice than some Honourable Members of whom he was complaining. We are, in this part of the House, quite prepared to accept what the Prime Minister has conveyed to His Excellency. But that does not go very far. What does it come to? "The Prime Minister authorises me to say" says His Excellency "that nothing in his statement in the House of Commons was intended to conflict with or indicate any departure from the policy announced in the formal Declaration and in His Majesty's Proclamation." Of course, it is so. It was bound to be so. A responsible Prime Minister could not go back on the Declarations and Acts, even if he would there was no difficulty in accepting that assurance, whether conveyed through the Viceroy or made in Parliament. But our grievance is with regard to the whole of the speech, its tenor, its spirit, the tendency to whittle down, interpret, explain away, or diminish what has been granted to us by the Reforms Act. So far as we are concerned and so far as the Civil Service are concerned, we ought both to be content to and must take the Reform

Scheme where it is and let developments, as matter of natural evolution, grow. But as Dr. Gour has shown by quotations matters have been taken more further.

Sir, I desire to take this opportunity of associating myself with those who have borne eloquent and willing testimony to the good work of the Indian Civil Service. I have never hesitated to bear my own testimony in regard to that, and I am sure that they will always be with us in the attempt that we are making—the very difficult attempt as they know—to work the reforms. But was the Prime Minister sure that he was doing the Civil Service a good service in raising the matter as he has done, in the *Dens ex Machena* sort of fashion? Why, we were friends before and hoped to continue. Now, unfortunately, a sort of barrier has sprung up. The barrier, I hope, will not stand, but all the same there is between us now a barrier which was not the seeking of the representatives of the Service itself, but of people who did not understand the situation and who have brought about a state of things which will do no good either to ourselves or the Service. Could anyone imagine that we were going back or could go back on what is obligatory under contract and even independent of contract with regard to their pay and pensions? But, so far as the question of status and the future position and status of the Indian Civil Service goes the Reforms Scheme settled that and everybody must be content to take it at that. Whatever the natural consequence of that is will have to follow and no later pronouncement, will alter it. No intimidation that can be indulged in will affect the situation unless that Act is altered.

Sir, we have been told that this speech was meant as a cheery word for the Service. I am afraid it has had a contrary effect and it has drawn the attention of the British youth in a more pointed manner than ever before, to the supposed dangers that would be recruits would be subjected to if they were to enter the Service now. And, Sir, was the Prime Minister going to allow the British non-co-operators who were keeping away from the Civil Service examinations to intimidate him? What if only 19 out of 99 were British candidates? Whose fault was it? And if the 80 Indian candidates that appeared and did well, what can keep the successful among them out of the Service? It is a fair, open competitive examination in which His Majesty's subjects, whether in Great Britain or India are entitled freely to compete and the best will be chosen. The Indian Civil Service will and must always be the Indian Civil Service and the idea of its irreducible British complexion would not hold water at any time if the capable Indian candidates happened to crowd out at the examination the British candidate in England. There has never been any machinery to achieve this and the best have been taken always with the best of British and Indian Members. It will be the Indian Civil Service. Well, since the Roman Empire, there has never been, we are told, so glorious a thing as the Indian Civil Service barring possibly the six years old Coalition Ministry of the Premier, comparison of which he would not allow with Lenin's Ministry. The Prime Minister was wise in not bringing down the comparison to the Holy Roman Empire, which was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire. But I hope, Sir, that the Indian Civil Service will always be Indian, will always be Civil, and always be a Service. Steel frame



[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

if they want to be, let them be, I do not mind. What is the place of a steel frame? It does not show itself—its Services. It cannot stand by itself, but you have to put a variety of things round it. By itself it would be gaurt and poor. It may rust. It may require a little occasional paint or varnish. We do not grudge it. Who has said that they should go out? Lord Sydenham speaks of the appalling spectacle of an Indian stampede. Where is it? Does the Service know about it excepting the few that are frankly antagonistic? But I do submit that the speech has beyond doubt created grave apprehension and concern in the minds of the loyal and law-abiding people who are whole-heartedly co-operating. It is their hands that ought to be strengthened and not the non-co-operators as the speech tends to do. If the non-co-operators choose to come, why they cease to be non-co-operators the moment they enter the Council? And what is more, Sir, at that table where you call upon them to take the oath, allegiance to the Sovereign and to the Constitution the last vestiges of non-co-operation disappear. I see I have raised a smile on the Home Member's very gleeful countenance. But what will be the consequences of a breach of that oath of allegiance? They are well known. People who come here will come with their eyes open and I shall not be afraid of that. They may put their point of view. If we are here, we shall put our point of view and we shall try to do our duty to the constitution, to the Empire and to the Sovereign and we shall expect the Civil Service and all other Services to help. Gratuitous and needless irritation has been caused and it is of the utmost importance therefore that we should convey to the Government and through the Government to the British Cabinet that grave unrest has been created—graver than ever before, because even those who have been staunchly co-operating are now doubtful. That is a state of things that ought to be guarded against. I hope the Assembly, by carrying this amendment in its amended form, will let the Government here and people know that they are trying to do their duty, that they cannot and must not shirk.

**Mr. President:** Further amendment moved :

“ In line 6 of Mr. Bangachariar's amendment, to omit the words ‘ subversive of ’ in order to insert the words ‘ in conflict with ’.”

The question I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** Further amendment moved :

“ In line 8, to omit the words ‘ destroy the faith of ’ in order to insert the words ‘ create serious apprehension in the minds of ’.”

The question I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** Further amendment moved :

“ In lines 8 and 9, to omit the words ‘ in the good intentions of the British nation ’.”

The question I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. C. W. Rhodes** (Bengal : European) : Sir, I have no quarrel with the Honourable Leader of the Democratic Party for raising a dis-

discussion on this amendment. I have no quarrel with him for the temperate terms in which he has spoken. If the temperate manner in which he has put forward his views had been used inside and outside this House by others, I venture to think, Sir, that the Prime Minister's speech would never have been necessary and never have been made. But I am going to appeal to him not to press his amendment to a division, even in its amended form. He says that he desires the House of Commons and the British public to know the feeling of this House. Well, Sir, the reporters are present and they will know without the necessity of proceeding to a division.

They will know that in this House there are people able to take a responsible view of the position and to occupy the front benches. They will know too there are people to whom the safety of the Empire cannot be trusted. Therefore I welcome the discussion, for discussions clear the air. But divisions create divisions. I think this would especially be the case if we were to pass what is tantamount to a vote of censure on the Prime Minister. To censure the Prime Minister, to call his speech offensive—I had made a note of the word prevarication, but I have crossed it out—is to censure the mother of Parliaments, and the mother in very truth of this Parliament in which we are now sitting. That Parliament under the present Prime Minister, as the Home Member has remarked, brought us into being. We look to it to nurse us through our infancy and to build us up into robust manhood. Too often during the past year have charges of discourtesy and ingratitude—unfortunately sometimes, I am afraid, not without reason—had to be levelled against some in India. Let us, at all events, avoid any grounds for such a charge, as Mr. Ranga-chariar in his remarks to-day has avoided any. I hold no brief for the Prime Minister and I doubt very much whether he would be grateful for my puny support.

**Mr. N. M. Samarth :** I agree.

**Mr. C. W. Rhodes :** It is not to be expected that in those northern climes every phrase can be framed with all the knowledge and understanding of those who know their India. We, Sir, in considering his speech, cannot even frame a Resolution without amending it and then amending it again and whittling it down. But let us leave the phrases and get at the underlying principle. It is the word "experiment" that has so vexed the Mover of the original Resolution. Sir, I consider that the Prime Minister used that word, as has been pointed out, in the right way, for immediately after the passage of which complaint is made, he made that remark which has already been quoted. He compared our Indian experiment with the experiments made in the English constitution—"Perfected," he said "by centuries of experiment." I contend that the Prime Minister never meant that if this experiment proved a failure, we had to go back to the *status quo ante*; but rather it was an experiment to find a path through an uncharted sea with the intention that if one path failed, another path would be found until we have reached a sound constitution. Every one must admit, Sir, that diarchy, for instance, is an experiment. Personally I think it is by no means an ideal one. To contend that the Reform Scheme is not an experiment but an Act is to contend that it is incapable of improvement and that we are to advance no further. If it is an Act in the sense that has been quoted and not an experiment

[Mr. C. W. Rhodes.]

in the sense I have indicated, then it is final for all time. It is like the law of the Medes and the Persians. We are neither to advance nor to go back. I do not think the House would for a minute accept that interpretation. Mr. Jammadas explains the speech as delivered to placate the die-hards. I am as independent as Mr. Jammadas and I will neither placate the die-hards at Home nor the die-hards here. I detest the doctrine of the non co-operator. I am not afraid, like some of my Honourable friends, of his entering this House, for the minute he enters this House, he will cease to be a non-co-operator. In fact, I shall probably welcome him more warmly than even Mr. Jammadas, for I do not think it is likely that he will stand against me in my constituency.

Then we have had this reference—I am quite willing to speak frankly and say unfortunate reference—to the “steel frame.” It has been pointed out by the Home Member that steel is now being produced in India in more senses than one. While Government was in the abstract the steel frame was necessary. It is necessary until it obtains the concrete. I am not a builder myself but I am told that even concrete walls have reinforcements of steel to guard against earthquake. Earthquakes are not unknown in this country as the Home Member has been at pains to point out. But, Sir, what is the test of the attitude of the Prime Minister and of the British House of Commons towards India? Surely it lies in action and not in words. The Reform Scheme itself, which as I have pointed out is not a final experiment, was the gift of the Prime Minister’s Ministry. Did the appointment of His Excellency Lord Reading show that the Government had any intention of reacting? Did the appointment still later as Governor of my own province of the Under Secretary who was at the India Office when the reforms were instituted show a tendency to revert? May I bring it nearer home?

Does the appointment of the Honourable Home Member to the India Office mean that in future the reforms are to be abolished? Our pleasure at his appointment is mitigated by our loss at his departure. He is one of those civil servants, I suppose, for whom the country has no use, but I have found no expression of it in the House this afternoon. In fact, whenever I ask any of my Indian friends whom they want to get rid of they are never able to tell me.

**Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary** : That shows that they do not want to get rid of any of the right sort.

**Mr. C. W. Rhodes** : I think, Sir, these appointments, especially the last named, are an earnest that no speeches or phrases can gainsay the fact that India is on the road to self-government, and she is further on the road than many of us realise to-day. There have been frequent references this afternoon to Dominion Home Rule as the goal. Well, Sir, I think on one point, we have actually gone past Dominion Home Rule. I know of no Governor appointed in Canada, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa from a son of the soil. I have heard of such in India. The Prime Minister has rightly pointed out that self-government consists both of administration and legislation, and personally, Sir, if I wished to wreck the reforms, I would vote for every proposition to abolish the English element in the reforms forthwith and I would put there untried and

inexperienced men, however patriotic and well intentioned, in their places. I hold and hold strongly that no one can wreck the reforms except ourselves, and it is against that danger the Home Member has been warning us. As our Viceroy has often pointed out, justice must be the foundation of Indian self-government, justice to those who are loyally working to-day against their own pecuniary interests to make the reforms a success, justice not only to written contracts but to the understanding on which these men were brought from home.

I with some of my friends who are moving Resolutions in favour of Indianisation would pause for a minute to realise how fast that process is going on. Executive officers, especially in the higher grades, cannot be made in a day. If the process is unduly hurried, we shall find, and I have already seen signs of it, that the inevitable mistakes in selection and the errors of inexperience will cause a revulsion of feeling amongst the common people of India and they will be asking for the reforms to be abolished. Now, Sir, I am not one of those who make a fetish of the best government. I believe that the nation like the individual can only learn by its mistakes (Hear, hear), but we must take care that those mistakes are not fatal. Progress must be line upon line, and line upon line, here a little and there a little. I have been long enough in this House to realise that the Assembly is growing both in power and responsibility. It is building up almost unknown to itself those conventions which are more valuable and powerful than any Statutes, and which (the only point on which I agree with Mr. Kamat) are more valuable than the declarations even of a Prime Minister. But whilst all this is true, it is unfortunately equally true that we have alarmed many of our best friends in England and I do not share with my Honourable friend on my right here the feeling of flippant indifference as to whether we have alarmed these people or not. We do require their support, we do require, I think, the support of the non-official European in India whose patience is sometimes strained, and I think, as I say, we have undoubtedly alarmed them by taking too long views, and by making people think that we are determined to rush the car of state to inevitable disaster. Whether we are to blame or not is not the point. A wrong impression has been created and it is our duty to see that our motives and intentions are properly understood. We must get rid of these soul-searing suspicions. I believe them to be honest on both sides, but I also believe them to be without foundation. They can be removed more effectively by experience than by declarations, but experience takes time and in the meantime, frank declarations can do something to remove misunderstanding. The position of the Government has been made clear by His Excellency the Viceroy and by the Home Member this afternoon. In the course of this discussion, until Mr. Rangachariar spoke I do not think our own position had been made equally plain. If it is our intention to treat the Services fairly as he suggests irrespective of race, if it is our intention to require from those Services and to require without detriment to their own welfare cordial co-operation, if it is our intention to advance along the road of self-government unhurrying and yet unfaltering, consolidating the ground as we advance, if it is our intention to remove suspicion, to bury the hatchet and to kill racial hatred, in the name of the country, let us say so,

[Mr. C. W. Rhodes.]

as Mr. Rangachariar has done to-day. I wish only it had been said before more often and more earnestly by others. We have heard much more even to-day of the virtues of the non-co-operator than the virtues of those co-operators on the Government benches who, every one has admitted, have been working to make the reforms a success. Only thus can we remove that suspicion in England of which the Prime Minister's speech, I frankly admit, gives evidence, that the new Councils are trying to move too fast, are not yet fully responsible, are prepared to ignore contractual obligations, are recklessly spurning the assistance of those who have been the mainstay of the administration in the past and so forth. We know exactly how much, or rather how little, truth there is in these suspicions, but they are honestly believed by many in England and by not a few in India. Kill these suspicions and we shall have no cause to complain of a lack of sympathy with us in England. We have a difficult task in our constitution-building. In spite of what Sir Sarvadhikary said, we do require the sympathy of England in that constitution-building, (*Sir D. P. Sarvadhikary* : "I never said to the contrary.") The remedy lies in our own hands. Only we, as I said before, can wreck the reforms and only we can make them a success. We have had frank speaking to-day and I know that my colleagues will not object to frank speaking from me ; in fact, I feel sure that they will welcome it, for I want to bring home to the House that suspicion in India has created suspicion in England and that irritation is contagious. Let us put our suspicions behind us and devote our whole energies to the heavy tasks that lie before. Those tasks lie between us and the goal of India's aspirations and only by tackling them with sober moderation, without bitterness and in a spirit of justice can we hope to bring the goal, which we all desire, nearer.

**Munshi Iswar Saran** (Cities of the United Provinces : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, before I offer a few remarks on the subject under discussion I shall, if I may, make a suggestion to the Honourable the Home Member. If I heard him aright, he permitted himself to say that he was not surprised at the Resolution moved by Mr. Agnihotri knowing his character as he did. If I have rightly heard him, I shall suggest to the Honourable the Home Member that it will be better for the continuance of the present relations between the various sections of the House that such remarks should not be made. I hope he will take my remark in the spirit in which it is offered because if you once begin to go into and analyse the character of speakers we really do not know where we shall end. It is, therefore, advisable that we should confine ourselves to the views as they are expressed by the various speakers who have the honour of addressing this Assembly.

I think, Sir, it is hardly necessary for me to say that it is not in a light spirit that I am getting up to engage your attention for a few minutes. I have read the speech of the Prime Minister in the light of the reply given by His Excellency the Viceroy and the observations made by him in this Chamber only a few days ago with all that care and attention which is due to the utterances of these exalted personages. But after deep reflection and careful consideration I am constrained to observe that I find myself in utter disagreement with

the Honourable the Home Member. Let me assure the House that I do not lay stress on this phrase here and that phrase there, I do not attach importance to the use of the word "experiment" nor am I frightened by the use of the expression "steel frame." My point is that after reading the speech as a whole and more particularly after taking note of the spirit behind the words, we find a great deal in it which has caused us concern, I had almost said, dismay.

Sir, before I deal with the main question, I shall, with your permission, deal with the preliminary objection, as we lawyers say, that has been taken to this debate. We are told, 'If you pass this Resolution you antagonise the Prime Minister. If you pass this Resolution, you antagonise the British public' and my Honourable friend, Mr. Rhodes, among others, in offering this advice, has given to us a lecture on self-government and our duties and responsibilities without taking the trouble of coming into close grips with the real question at issue. Sir, I submit that it is our duty as elected representatives to let the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and the British Parliament know that this speech has caused considerable dissatisfaction in the country. If we do not do that, I submit, we fail in our duty and it is, therefore, up to us to speak out our mind on the present occasion fully and frankly.

As regards the speech itself, I should be the last person not to attach due weight and importance to the communication of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister to His Excellency the Viceroy and I should be sorry indeed not to accept a statement made by so exalted a person as His Excellency the Viceroy. But I shall most earnestly beg the House to consider how the matter stands. "What does the Right Honourable the Prime Minister say?" He says no departure from the present policy is contemplated. That may be. But look to the speech itself. There are two main ideas to which I shall invite your attention. One is of perpetual minority and the other is of the steel frame. I do not object to the expression but we are told that the steel frame is to continue and whatever fabric you may build later on it is to remain at the foundation. I say, this "steel frame" and responsible government, cannot exist together. Either the one must go or the other. If you are going to have responsible government, how, in the name of common-sense, I ask, can you have this steel frame in its present form. There will no doubt remain some sort of a frame, whether steel or gold, I do not know. All I can safely prophesy is that the "steel frame" in its present shape and form, with all its present attributes, will disappear. The Honourable the Home Member has said "Well, there will be Jamshedpur steel and Sheffield steel." I am afraid he forgot to notice that the Right Honourable the Prime Minister only referred to the Sheffield steel and not to Jamshedpur steel at all. What did he say? The Indian Civil Service? No. The British Civil Service and let me pass here for a minute to pay my tribute to the admirable work done by this excellent body of men and at the same time let me say, with apologies to the Prime Minister, that the Indian members of the Civil Service have not lagged behind their European colleagues in their devotion to duty. I shall, in this connection, put this question to the three Indian members of the Executive Council. Do they form part of the

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

steel frame ? It will be impertinent on my part to characterise them. I shall leave the characterisation to themselves but I can only tell them that the Right Honourable the Prime Minister does not consider that they are a part of the steel frame. Why, in the name of fairness, I ask, should we shut our eyes to real issues ? Let us say that the Prime Minister wants Sheffield steel to rule over us in its present form forever. Then, I ask, if this is not a departure from the present policy, what else is ? Sir, the Honourable the Home Member says " Oh, look at the difficulties in the path of full self-government. You cannot defend your country." We have heard this too often and so have we heard this theory of trusteeship and minority. I wish some gentlemen on behalf of Government would vouchsafe to us the information when our minority is going to cease. We have been under your rule for 150 years and how long are we to remain minors ? Will you be pleased to give us that information ? Is this minority to go on till the crack of doom ? As regards this theory of trusteeship, we have heard it *ad nauseum*. I use this expression without meaning any offence. I shall beg the House to get away from all these catchwords and meaningless phrases. Let us get to the bedrock of facts and what is the fact. India needs England and England needs India in their own interests. On this understanding let us settle the policy of the future. Let us understand that the future arrangement is to be based on the recognition of this principle of self interest. That is commonsense. That is fairness. This perpetual trusteeship, this perpetual minority of ours, I say, Sir, is distressing. I say ' Read the speech as a whole ' and you are driven in spite of your very best efforts to the conclusion that the Right Honourable the Prime Minister for reasons which it is not for me to say permitted himself to make observations which are destructive of hope. I shall not at this late stage weary the House with quotations but if you read the speech you will find, that he cannot contemplate any time when England will give up the trust or words to that effect and also that he cannot contemplate the time when the British Civil Service with all its present powers and privileges will cease to exist. A word more, Sir. It is asked " When you get Swaraj, what about the white man." Let me give the answer plainly. The white man will be welcomed as a friend, as an equal, as a comrade, not as a master, not as a ruler, not as a guardian. We do not want the white man to be our perpetual ruler, our perpetual trustee, our perpetual guardian. We have had enough of this everlasting trust. We extend to the white man, and I speak with absolute truth and sincerity, the hand of fellowship and good comradeship, but I do resent and as long as there is the last breath of life left in me I shall continue to resent this perpetual domination of the Civil Service or any other Service and it is therefore that I ask each and every member of this House to cordially support Mr. Rangachariar's amendment. In the course of the debate certain expressions have been used which I regret. We should approach this question with a due sense of responsibility, but on each and every occasion pray do not attempt to frighten us by saying " Oh, if you do this, you endanger Reforms ; if you do that, the Reforms will go ; if you do a third thing, the British public and the British Parliament will turn against you."

Is the country, I ask, going to secure the sympathy of the British public and of the British Parliament by saying things in which it does not believe? My own belief is that we shall secure the friendship of the British public and of the British Parliament, and even of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, if we tell them what we feel as self-respecting men and not if we lie low even when a speech of this character is made. (Applause.)

**Dr. Nand Lal** (West Punjab : Non-Muhammadan): Sir, while not identifying myself with the phraseology and the language of the original motion, and equally not associating myself with some of the expressions which dropped from the lips of the Honourable Mover, I wish the Honourable Sir William Vincent would have been in the same predicament in which we, the co-operators, are. During the course of attempting to make some converts to our camp, this accidental speech, which metaphorically may be considered a bomb, fell upon our bald heads, a good many issues have been raised. And I appreciate the arguments which have been advanced in favour of those issues by my learned friend, Mr. Rangachariar. Sir, the Honourable Sir William Vincent, entertains an idea purporting to say, I designedly say purporting to say, that it will be a kind of ingratitude on our part to raise our voice on this occasion and try to comment upon the speech made by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister. I may at once tell him that we cannot stand this charge. I may be allowed to say further that an Indian can claim to be credited with this, that he will never be found guilty of ingratitude. We are grateful indeed to the Premier for what he has done for us. So far as the giving of the reforms is concerned, he has contributed a great deal to it, and India feels indebted to that extent, but so far as his present attitude is concerned, namely, the attitude as it is shown through the medium of his speech, we feel slighted, and therefore, we ask this House to record that we, the people of this country, feel very much incensed. As to the other points, which have been raised in regard to the question of the Indian Civil Service, I beg to ask, is there any Indian who seriously denies the great value of the services, which were rendered by the Indian Civil Service, to this country? Is there any Indian who says that the British element should not be allowed to remain so far as even the other Services are concerned? What we urge is this, that now the indigenous element may be taken to serve in this country. If any Englishman comes here, as a friend, and wishes to co-operate and take part in any of the Services in this country, he is welcome, but he should remain contented with the salary which India can afford to pay. He should bear in mind that he will be coming to join this Service or that Service and not to pose as our master; he should now give up the idea of dominating; what we are against is the spirit of 'rule.' If an Englishman comes to India and considers himself as one of public servants, we shall co-operate and welcome him. But the contention which has been put forward on behalf of this country is, in reality, against the 'steel frame-work'; that is the crux of the whole thing; this character, which has been given to the Indian Civil Service, is, to my mind, really capable of being criticised. And on this ground, all of us have raised our voice, and I believe the whole House will appreciate the modest terms in which the amendment of Rao Bahadur Rangachariar has been put forward. Sir, the Honourable Sir William Vincent says that this country requires



[Dr. Nand Lal.]

the British element. This was never denied. The point, which is at issue now is the proportion and magnitude of that element.

That point has not been debated upon by the Honourable the Home Member, and now it has got to be faced. Another point, which required to be discussed and has not been debated upon fully, is this, whether there was any pressing need of making the expressions, now under debate, namely, "steel frame-work" and "experiment." I may be allowed to say that there was no such need. Apart from it the conditions, under which those expressions have been made, and the occasion, on which those statements were given, have caused an apprehension in the minds of the people in this country that, perhaps, the Right Honourable the Prime Minister by his speech has belittled what was given to us; and that is why we come forward and set forth our sincere and respectful protest. A doubt was entertained by my Honourable friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam in respect of our ability to raise our voice. With due deference to his legal acumen and erudition, I beg to differ. When I come to the Government of India Act, 1919, when I read the provisions of section 84A, I do not find that there is any clear provision, embodied in that section, which has got a wholesale divesting effect; nowhere it is given that the reforms, which have been given to India, can, by a single stroke, be taken back. At least I do construe in that way, and, therefore, I differ from him so far as the legal interpretation of that section is concerned. On the top of it he tells us that we are debarred from passing Resolutions and that if these Resolutions are passed, they will carry no weight whatsoever.

On that ground also I differ. Does he really mean, with the Honourable Sir William Vincent, that we may keep on hearing such sort of speeches which may go to render our legitimate rights so seriously minimised, and that we must keep quiet? I may be allowed to say that on occasions like this silence amounts to an admission and acceptance. On principle then, we feel constrained to say, though very respectfully, that the Right Honourable the Prime Minister did not choose the right course though, it may be granted, he did not intend to divest us of our rights. At this juncture, when we find the country disturbed, I feel compelled to say, that the opinion, which was expressed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, was not proper. We, the co-operators, are fighting a regular battle; we, in our humble way, were trying to make converts to our own side, and as has already been said, the aforesaid speech from England has, really, crippled us, and instead of strengthening our hands has weakened our cause.

Another issue which deserves to be debated upon and which has emanated, inferentially, from the eloquence of the Honourable Sir William Vincent is this. "What will be the idea of the English people in England?" "What will be the view of the Prime Minister when we are going to sit in judgment, so far as his pronouncement is concerned." In reply to that, I may submit that England will, to my belief, appreciate if we convey our sincere feeling to that country. England will not be in favour of our suppressing the truth and not

conveying our sentiments to that country, and similarly the Right Honourable the Prime Minister will not, I can entertain a hope, be in favour of our not expressing our sincere feelings. Sir William Vincent goes to the length of saying, "does this Assembly desire that the Prime Minister may stand on the floor of the House of Commons and withdraw what he has stated?" The amendment, which has been moved by Mr. Rangachariar, does not, to my mind, expressly demand that. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that it does, even then I may venture to submit that my stay in England brought home to me that one of the virtues of the people in England is this that they are open to conviction. Consequently, if the Right Honourable the Prime Minister is convinced that he was wrong in making the statements, I am almost sure, that he will be glad to say that he was wrong and to make amends, or he may send a message to this country that he withdraws his remarks, and, therefore, the suspicion that has arisen in the mind of Sir William Vincent, I may submit, is not a correct one.

The question which is to be confronted is this; we are in favour of reforms; we want that the indigenous element may be in prominence. That is our desire. We are in favour of the success of these reforms, so are the official members, and that is why this question is being debated. That is the real reason which has prompted us to raise our voices. We should not be condemned for this. We are conveying the public opinion to the Government Benches and it is our duty to do so.

With these few remarks I very strongly support the amendment which has so ably been moved, and I resume my seat.

**Mr. B. C. Allen** (Assam : Nominated Official) : I had hoped, Sir, that the speech of the Honourable the Home Member would have been followed by a withdrawal of the Resolution and of all the amendments appended to it. My hope has, unfortunately, been disappointed and, in the absence of a non-official European representative of Assam, I am compelled to add my plea to the pleas put forward by Mr. Darcy Lindsay and Mr. Rhodes. I recognise the immense distance we have travelled during the course of this debate. We have risen from the deplorable utterances of Mr. Agnihotri, through the fiery but provocative eloquence of Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, to the serene atmosphere of the speech delivered by Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary. At one time it seemed possible that the storm might be diverted on to the heads of the Indian Civil Service. I rejoiced at the suggestion. We are accustomed to criticism and censure and to subject the Indian Civil Service to a little more of that would do no harm to any one. But the lightning is again playing round the head of the Prime Minister, and we must therefore pull ourselves together and climb the remaining 1,800 feet that remain before the summit of the mountain can be reached. We are considering a very welcome modification in the terms of the Resolution. It remains for us to withdraw the Resolution altogether.

I ask the House to consider whether it is not a common feature of all Legislative Assemblies to be very jealous of the honour of their leaders. What would this House think if Resolutions were passed in Canada or Australia denouncing the utterances of the Leader of this House, whether

[Mr. B. C. Allen.]

the recognised leader or the leader of one of our principal parties ? Should we not all rise as one man to repudiate the affront put upon us ? And what do the House think will be the feeling of the House of Commons when they hear the conduct of the Prime Minister of England called in question, when, in the words of the Honourable the Home Member, Resolutions are passed calling upon him to stand before the House in a white sheet and to apologise for what he has said ? I submit, Sir, that, while we are jealous of our own dignity and honour, we should be no less careful to respect the dignity and honour of others. It is on this account that I venture to support Mr. Darcy Lindsay in urging on the House the withdrawal of these Resolutions. These Resolutions, if accepted, can do little good ; they are likely, as other speakers have pointed out, to do appreciable harm. I do not want to take up the time of the House by referring to those sorely-trying words "experiment" and "steel frame". I can understand that from one point of view Honourable Members may think it curious that a Legislature should be dependent upon an Executive over which they have no control for the execution of their will. But, after all, there is precedent for an arrangement of this kind. In America the Executive is entirely independent of the Legislature. In France, I believe, that the control exercised is of the slightest. Even in England I doubt whether the House of Commons interferes to any appreciable degree with the work of the great Departments. Honourable Members have referred to the Indianisation of the Services. They have asked that the Services might be Indianised more rapidly. This is a matter in which I have been at pains to endeavour to ascertain the opinion of Indians in my Division. I asked them to express their views freely and frankly. Not one of them was prepared to press for the discontinuance of recruitment of Englishmen. All of them recognised that there was still room in a country so divided as India is by different sectional and religious fissures for the employment of an establishment which stood entirely aloof from all these dividing factors. It is unnecessary for me to dwell further on this particular aspect of the debate and I merely desire once more to associate myself with Mr. Darcy Lindsay in the request for a greater degree of sweet reasonableness, for a spirit of conciliation rather than of the animosity which breeds animosity and opposition in its turn.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey** (Finance Member) : Like my

5 P.M.

Honourable colleague, Sir William Vincent, I have always been jealous of the reputation of this House ;

to the best of my ability I have sought, as my colleagues have sought, to assist this House to maintain the high reputation which stands to its credit in the outside world ; and therefore if I express a real measure of sympathy with the majority of the House to-day, and in especial with those who have put forward these Resolutions in the difficulties in which they find themselves, I hope, I shall not be misunderstood, for my sympathy is sincere. For how does their case stand ? Here we have a speech made by a great Minister in England—a Minister engaged at the moment in matters of vast international importance, so vast that Indian questions can at the time only occupy a minor place in his mind ; and in that speech there are expressions used which have caused umbrage in this country, which have been commented on in the press and which we learn are resented by many Members of this House. They desire to give

expression to that resentment. And here their difficulties <sup>begin</sup> ~~begin~~; and here begins my sympathy with them, for their quandary is great.

The actual Resolution placed before you is couched in terms which are a direct and an open condemnation of the Prime Minister. In supporting it the Mover expressed himself as feeling that that speech exhibited "a betrayal and a violation of pledges solemnly given." He went on to say that it placed on India "a brand of inferiority;" he characterizes the speech as "altogether aggressive." In other words, he takes on himself to repudiate entirely the subsequent statement which Mr. Lloyd George authorised His Excellency the Viceroy to place before India and before this Chamber. Now obviously that line of attack would not work. It was repudiated not in one place but in half a dozen places in this House, even among supporters of the amended Resolution. Obviously, when Mr. Lloyd George said that he had no intention of going back in any way on the declaration of 1917, that statement had to be accepted without cavil by any responsible person in this House. Then the attack on the word "experiment" would not work; that was blown into ridicule by the Home Member. The frontal attack has failed; there has been no betrayal and no violation of pledges; and those who feel that under pressure of the criticisms in the press and elsewhere they must give expression to their feelings, have to fall back on a side attack. They have racked their brains to produce a long series of amendments, one of which Mr. Rangachariar's, at present holds the field. Even that amendment in itself has had to be subjected to further amendments. But what does the amendment come to? Mr. Rangachariar in his speech, in which he was forced into attacks on a previous speaker in the House of Commons, feeling no doubt that he could not sufficiently enforce his point by attacks on Mr. Lloyd George himself, described Mr. Lloyd George's speech as "subversive of previous declarations," or, as the amendment now stands, "incompatible with declarations made by His Majesty and His Majesty's responsible Ministers," and again as "calculated to destroy the faith of this Assembly," or, as the amendment now reads, "to create serious apprehensions in the minds of Indians."

Now, is there seriously any practical difference between the original form of abuse and the line of attack which Mr. Rangachariar and his friends would now adopt? To me they are substantially the same. If you are going to accuse the Prime Minister of utterances which are either incompatible with previous declarations or subversive of previous declarations, you are equally accusing him of bad faith. You are equally—though you may veil your words by any form of gloss that you may adopt—accusing him in some form or other of violation of pledges. They do not even press their attack with any show of conviction. Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary supported the amendment; but he could not explain to us what he was attacking. He had to say that it was not one word or another word of the speech that he objected to; it was its tenor. Mr. Iawar Saran could point out no particular phrase, no particular expression, no particular declaration of policy to which he found exception; he simply disliked its tone. And so we are reduced to this, that either we are as an Assembly to accuse the Prime Minister of declarations which are subversive of a previous policy or declarations which are incompatible with a previous policy or declarations which cause serious apprehensions

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

in India as to the good faith of the British Government (I go through the whole gamut of the glosses or we are to convey to him some message which tells him that we do not like the tone and tenor of his speech. Well for my part I object just as much to telling Mr. Lloyd George that he has made a declaration which is a violation of previous pledges as to telling him that he has made a declaration which is subversive of previous policy or incompatible with previous policy or has caused apprehensions in India ; it seems little more politic to have to tell the Premier that we do not like the tone of his speech. Let me say this : I do not think that either in Parliament or among the British public at large the exact terms of any Resolution or amendment we may pass to-day will make much difference. They know as well as we know here what attacks have been made in the press on Mr. Lloyd George's speech ; they will learn of the declarations of dissatisfaction with which the debate opened in the Assembly to-day.

They will look only to the substance and not to the form of words, and to them there will be this conclusion that this Assembly is dissatisfied by a speech made by the Prime Minister of England, and that it feels it incumbent on itself to assert in one form or another that the Premier has been guilty of a violation of pledges made by His Majesty and His Majesty's Government. Now I am perhaps a common place person to whom principle is at times less important than expedience ; but as such, my temperament leads me to suggest to the House to-day that it should seriously consider a definite balance of advantages. We know that there are many people who attach such importance to the expression of their feelings that they will insist on giving vent to those feelings at any cost, quite apart from any calculation of the effect of so doing on the attainment of the substance of the object which they have in view. Now those people are not, I think, the most successful people in life, nor are they those who most often attain the purpose which they have at heart. If the House yields to those who insist upon an expression of their feelings, feelings which as I have shown are in themselves so vague and so intangible that those who express them are unable to point to any particular matter to which they object, will it or will it not assist itself in gaining the object which it has in view ? It is an axiom,—I need not labour it,—it is an axiom that you can make no further advance in constitutional Government in this country without the good will of the British Parliament and of the British people behind the British Parliament. It is all very well for Mr. Kamat to say that India will not submit to the recall of concessions, already made in its favour. Those words were, I think, unnecessarily heroic, since, as far as I am aware, there never has been any intention on the part of the British people or the British Parliament to go back upon the declarations already made. I do not pause to inquire the manner in which Mr. Kamat would enforce his maintenance of the rights and privileges already gained by the Indian people ; we can leave that point unexplored. The fact remains that, to secure the common object which both you and your Government have in view, namely, the steady and healthy advance in India in the direction of constitutional reforms, you need the goodwill of the British people and the goodwill of the British Parliament. Now it has been said

to-day, and more than once, that there has been a hardening of opinion in England on the subject of India. Though it has lately my very pleasant lot to visit England I pretend to no special or unusual knowledge on that subject ; believe me that an officer on leave after many years service in India is too much engaged in quest of those social and material satisfactions which England yields to concern himself over much either with English or Indian politics. But it is impossible for the most unobservant of men to visit England without realising two things, first the very greatly increased interest taken by all sections of the English population in Indian affairs, and secondly the serious apprehensions that do exist throughout all classes in England as to the course which affairs are taking in India. It will not, I am sure, offend the *amour propre* of this Assembly if I say that the people in England judge of affairs in India not entirely by the debates in this Assembly or by its attitude. It is perfectly true that there have been occasions in which this Assembly has recorded votes or taken action that has caused a good deal of comment in England.

There was no little surprise at the result of our debate of about this time last year when the Assembly at large asserted its belief that the time had already come for a very speedy advance in responsible government. Again, I would refer to the action of the Assembly on the subject of the Budget, which caused some anxiety and apprehension in the City of London itself. But for the most part, the people of England take their impression of the course of affairs in India and their view of the capacity of India for further advance in reforms not from what transpires in this Assembly but from what goes on in India at large. Remember that it is an inevitable consequence of modern journalistic enterprise that it is interested mostly in what are often described as incidents ; and incidents such as riots, strikes and disturbances form copy which the journalist can not afford to neglect. The real tenor of Indian opinion, and the real feelings of the great mass of the more solid Indian population may, perhaps, not be reflected in such incidents ; but you have got to reckon with the impression which a constant recurrence of such incidents creates. It is hardly to be wondered that in England people remember chiefly those untoward affairs to which my Honourable colleague has already drawn attention. It is they that loom largest in their minds, not the progress made by the Legislatures of India under the Reforms Scheme. I need not go through the melancholy tale again—the campaign of the non-co-operation which conveyed to many people in England the feeling that India was giving way to an anarchical policy very akin to that which destroyed Russia. I need not refer to the deliberate boycott of European goods, all the more insensate because people in Europe knew that India itself was at present quite unable to supply the goods that were required. I need not refer again to the long story of riot and bloodshed ; riots in Bombay, riots produced in one place by agrarian agitation, riots produced in another by industrial agitation, fostered for political motives. I do not desire to emphasise again the very deep impression made in England on all classes by steps taken by a section of the population to discredit the visit of the Prince of Wales. But there the impression remains, universal and deep seated;

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

spread throughout the British public at large, that the state of things in India is far from sound. Now, you need friends—you need friends, I say, not only in Parliament but among the great British public which has a very close touch with its representatives in Parliament. Are you going to gain more friends by an attack on Mr. Lloyd George? Are you going to gain them by a suggestion that by something that Great Minister has said he has violated a pledge given by His Majesty's Government? Are you going to gain them by insisting, as Mr. Ranga-chariar would insist, that he has endeavoured to place a check on the Indianisation of the Services? They know the truth as well as you know it, I mean that our existing orders provide for the speedy recruitment of a steadily increasing number of Indians. Indeed, are you going to gain friends again by any form or kind of attack on Mr. Lloyd George? I say again, for I am arguing on the amendment and not on the Resolution, already clearly defunct, that you will not amend matters by adopting any form of amendment which your ingenuity can devise. Whatever form of attack you make, it will be all one to the British public and to the British Parliament. There may be many people in England who have their own differences with the Prime Minister on matters of policy; but they will settle those differences at their own time and in their own way. They will regard with very different eyes indeed an attack which comes from outside and which seeks to discredit a Minister who has a unique position in England, nay, more than that, a Minister who has a name throughout the Continent of Europe such as I think few Englishmen have ever enjoyed.

I have put these alternatives fairly before you; I only ask you as serious and sober thinkers to decide. The main position has really been abandoned; what remains of the attack is indeterminate and intangible. You have to admit that you cannot fix on any definite declaration which amounts to a reversal or even a suggestion of a reversal of policy. You have had to admit in the last resort that what you do not like is something in the general tenor of the Prime Minister's speech. But you feel yourselves obliged in spite of that to give expression to these feelings. I say deliberately, that there are occasions when the expression of feelings of this kind is less dignified and less advantageous because less dignified than the considered and deliberate intention to pursue in spite of what rightly or wrongly you may deem to be opposition, a policy on which you are already determined. In the pursuance of that policy you have the assistance, as you know and as you have acknowledged, of the Indian Government. In the pursuance of that policy you have the assistance of those services which—I am proud to say that I can use here not my words but your own—have been of such great value to India in the past and whose good will is still with you. Given that co-operation which the Act assumes, you will, I am certain, have the good will of the great mass of the British public. Whatever apprehensions they may now feel, I myself would be loath to believe that the English people, which after a contest of centuries has won representative and democratic institutions for itself, would wish to deny them in due time to the people of India. You have that behind you. And yet there are some who

still desire to give expression to feelings of resentment at a time and in a manner which can do you no good and which may conceivably do you much harm. It is for you to choose if you will allow them to do this.

**Sir Montagu dePomeroy Webb** (Bombay : European) : Sir, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I cannot resist at this stage adding my voice to those appeals which have already been made to the mover of this Resolution and to the mover of the amendment to withdraw that Resolution and to withdraw that amendment, and I do so on perhaps somewhat different grounds to those which have just been taken by the Honourable the Finance Member. I think I understand the feeling which has prompted these Resolutions. I think I fully understand and sympathise with those feelings. Some alarm has been aroused perhaps by a feeling that our march in the direction of self-government for this country is somehow or other likely to be retarded by Mr. Lloyd George's recent speech. I quite sympathise with those feelings because I am one of those who believe that the march forward in the direction of self-government cannot be stopped. There is not going to be any turn back now in that step that we are taking in the direction of the goal that we all hope to attain.

And that being so, I can understand and sympathise with the feelings of anxiety that have arisen. But having said that much, I do not feel that we shall in any way help our forward movement either by passing this Resolution or by supporting the amendment put forward by Mr. Rangachariar. The Resolution itself proposes to ask Mr. Lloyd George to practically retract what he has said. I think this House will recognise that that is an absurdity and an impossibility. The Resolution went on to ask for an early grant of full dominion self-government because Mr. Lloyd George had made some remarks with which we did not agree. I think the House will recognise that that course is not possible and acceptable. I come therefore now to the amendment. The amendment merely asks this House to convey an expression of opinion on two matters, one that Mr. Lloyd George's recent speech is in conflict with the accepted policy which is now in force and secondly, because it has created serious apprehensions in this country. Now, with regard to the conflict we ourselves have had, Mr. Lloyd George's assurance, conveyed through His Excellency the Viceroy, that his speech was not intended to be in conflict and that it was not in conflict with the present policy. We know ourselves that the author of the speech, as members have pointed out, was the promoter, in fact, of the reforms. What then is the use of our passing a Resolution almost conveying the lie direct to Mr. Lloyd George and telling him that, notwithstanding his assertion that his speech was not in conflict with the present policy, we consider it is. I submit that such a Resolution is really absurd. We then come only to the last portion of the amendment which says that Mr. Lloyd George's speech has created serious apprehensions in this country. Now, on that fact I think there will be no doubt whatever, we have seen that in certain parts of the country apprehensions have been aroused, but I submit that the meetings that have been held, the deputation that waited on His Excellency the Viceroy, and this debate to-day, have given full expression to those apprehensions. All that has been



[Sir Montagu Webb.]

said to-day, or a great part of it, I have no doubt will be wired home and the people there will have every opportunity to judge the feelings of apprehension that have been caused. But I submit that there is no reason for us to go any further and pass a Resolution asking the Secretary of State to inform Mr. Lloyd George of these apprehensions. I think, if I may say so, that some of my Indian friends are far too sensitive of what I should be inclined to call Welsh poetry and reinforced concrete metaphors. I do not think we need trouble ourselves about these expressions very much although they have raised anxiety in some quarters. They certainly have not done so in my own constituency. We ourselves, in the part of the world from which I come, are quite satisfied that the Reform Scheme is progressing satisfactorily and we for our part have not the slightest intention of being diverted in our intentions to go forward by these references to steel structures or anything of that kind. We consider that as a political—what shall I say, political talk which does not influence us in any way whatever. I would therefore appeal to Mr. Rangachariar that it would be in keeping with the dignity of this House if, having expressed the apprehensions which are felt in the country, we contented ourselves by ending at that point, and it is for that reason that I would appeal to Mr. Rangachariar to be content with the expressions of apprehension that have been made and to withdraw his amendment. I would appeal also to the Mover of the original Resolution to withdraw his Resolution.

**Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri :** Sir, I have to offer my thanks for the certificate of character that the Honourable the Home Member has been pleased to award to me and also thank him in anticipation for any other honour that may be in store for me. It is not surprising that such a certificate should come from the Home Member who is an adept and prompt in giving certificates in this House as well as in the other ; what is surprising to me is that he has been put in such a sad plight as to follow a line of argument which is left only for people who have no arguments to advance in reply to their formidable adversary. Sir, I think the Home Member said that when I was speaking on the Viceroy's speech I happened to make a remark to the effect that I refuse to accept the assurance . . . . .

**Mr. President :** Will the Honourable Member speak a little louder and more distinctly ?

**Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri :** The Honourable the Home Member said that in my speech I said " I refused to accept the assurance that was given by His Excellency the Viceroy." So far as I remember I did not use the word ' refuse ' but as the Home Member says that he took it down while I did not write what I said, I may accept what he says ; but so far as I remember, I said " I regret I cannot accept it " but I did not use the word " refuse." I believe I would not have been in the wrong, even if I had used such a word. The Honourable the Home Member also said that " it is due to the Prime Minister that we sit in this House and is this the way that we should express our gratitude to him ? " I have already said in my speech that we feel it the more simply because such

a speech and such a statement should come from a man who is the presiding head of the Government which gave us the Reforms. We are much more aggrieved because of that. We are very sorry that the donor who has given us the Reforms should have used such expressions. The Honourable the Home Member also said that feeling in English is a little bitter at present owing to the unfortunate incidents during the visit of the Prince of Wales. May I ask the Home Member as to who is responsible for this? Is it not the Government of India who having invited the Prince of Wales at a time which was not suitable, is equally if not more, responsible? Did I not myself give that warning on the occasion when the "welcome" Resolution was moved in this House that, apart from its being right or wrong, there was a feeling among a section of Indians for boycotting the visit? That feeling was there. The Home Member knew as well as the Government of India knew that the feeling was very strong at the time and was not likely to die out before the visit of the Prince of Wales. I am very sorry that some unfortunate incidents happened, but I hold the Government equally responsible with some of my countrymen who behaved as they did. Much comment has been made on the use of the word "experiment." Mr. Jamnadas has explained it. I also explained it and every one in the House has explained it, that the word by itself may not be objectionable because every new effort in the human development is regarded as an experiment; but what we object to is the sense in which the word has been used.

The Home Member has also said that by passing such a Resolution we will be helping the people who are hostile to the Government. Not in the least; the people that are hostile to the Government are absolutely indifferent to what the Premier has said in his speech; but on the contrary those people who are co-operating with the Government, feel the disappointment and apprehensions at the speech. It is this section, whose faith has been shaken by the Premier's speech.

The Honourable the Home Member and Honourable Mr. Subrahmanayam have drawn the attention to section 84 of the Government of India Act.

#### **The Honourable Sir William Vincent : 84-A.**

**Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri :** I mean—section 84-A. In reply I may be permitted to remind him to look at the Preamble also,—the Act itself is based on the Declaration and the preamble. The British Parliament has a statutory power of vetoing the money bills but by the convention already created the Parliament declined to interfere in such matters. A similar ruling was given by the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons on the discussions about the appointment of ministers in this country—the same is also apparent in regard to the relations with Dominions. Similar conventions are to apply to this also. We have the conventions and will like to create them if we have not, and therefore section 84-A could not give practical authority to restrict the Reforms. I may also draw the attention of the House to the speech of Sir Donald

[Mr. K. R. L. Agnihotri.]

Maclean during the second reading of the Government of India Bill. He said :

“ But as far as I have been able to judge the responsible men of India, their ambition is to be a self-governing Dominion within the ambit of the British Empire. That is an ambition which we can to some extent facilitate by the generous passage of such a measure as this and the success of Acts of Parliament of this kind does not depend so much upon the mere words that constitute the Bills as on the spirit in which they are not only put upon the Statute Book but are administered. If that spirit is a broad-minded and generous spirit, even an imperfect measure like this can go a long way to reach the goal which I am sure we all wish to attain.”

Sir, what we rely on is the spirit, and the good will with which this Act was framed, and I object to the hostile spirit in which it is said that they may take away what they have given to us.

The Honourable the Home Member also mentioned about Jamshedpur steel frame and Sheffield steel frame. My Honourable friend Munshi Iswar Saran has already replied to it. But if there is any doubt on the point, I may read out the speech of the Honourable Mr. Lloyd George to show that he referred to British Civil Servants only ; he can see no period when they can dispense with the guidance and the assistance of the small nucleus of the British Civil Servants ; he means, British Civil Servants only and does not include the Indian portion of the Civil Servants. He says, “ it is essential that that should be strengthened, but whatever you do in the way of strengthening it, there is one institution in regard to which it must not be crippled, one institution which will not be deprived of its functions or privileges, and that is the institution which built up the British raj, the British Civil Service in India ; ” he does not mention the other component part, the Indian Civil Service.

The Home Member has also said that we cannot get the complete responsible self-government at an early date. I was not prepared for this remark from the Home Member, as I had thought that this point had already been discussed and debated in this very House last year, and that the necessity of proving our capacity to-day would not arise. He has given certain reasons, *e.g.*, the want of unity in diverse communities, etc. I may reply that here also I do not hold the Government of India free from the charge of responsibility for these difficulties ; I may here refresh the memory of the Honourable the Home Member to what a Government official in the Province of Assam—Eastern Bengal and Assam—did some years ago when he openly declared that he cared more for his favourite wife than for the other. I will not mention the name of the gentleman who was at the head of the Government at that time and whose activities I think are well known to this House.

The Home Member has said, how can you do without a strong established Government backed by the military. What can you do for your defence ? In reply I may read out His Majesty's gracious message where he has said about the defence of this country :

“ The defence of India against foreign aggression is the duty of common Imperial interest and pride.”

Therefore I say that even though full self-government is granted to us, the work of defence of the country is common to us and the British Empire, as the British Empire has pledged herself to help other Colonial Dominions. The British Empire will come to our rescue as we did in the great war. The Home Government is a partner with us ; why should they not share an equal responsibility for our defence ? It is natural that we should expect that assistance from them also, if for nothing else then at least in return for the assistance and sacrifices that we made for England. The Government has also recommended in the Oath of admission, and I may be reminded that this promise was made to us in 1833, that India should be associated with the Government of this country, and that all the Services should be open to Indians equally with the foreigners. Was that ever taken into consideration, or any operation given to it ? If we are backward, the Government of India is equally responsible for it as ourselves.

With these words, Sir, I have pleasure in supporting the amendment which my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, has moved.

**The Honourable Sir William Vincent :** Sir, I am not going to detain the Assembly for more than five minutes. I only want to deal with one complaint of the Honourable Member who spoke last and said that I had misrepresented him. I said that he had refused to accept the assurance given by His Excellency. He now says, " I did not say that, but I did say that I regret that I cannot accept the assurance of His Excellency." If there is any difference between the two expressions, which I do not understand, I am to blame, not he, but to my mind there is very little difference. In any case both mean that this House is asked deliberately to reject the assurance given by the Prime Minister and His Excellency the Viceroy and to convey a message which will do great harm to this country in England, and throw the Assembly open to the just accusation that they turn on the very man that gave them the Reforms, and are ready to bite the hand that fed them.

**Mr. President :** The original Resolution was :

" That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to request the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India, to make a specific declaration ratifying the declaration of August 1917 and repudiating the statement made by Mr. Lloyd George on the 2nd August 1922, characterising the Reforms as an experiment and also to take necessary steps for an early grant of full Dominion Self-Government to this country."

Since which an amendment has been moved to omit all the words after the words " Governor General in Council " and to insert the words :

" that he may be pleased to convey the message from this Assembly to His Majesty's Government, through the Secretary of State for India, that it views with grave concern the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Prime Minister in the House of Commons on the 2nd of August 1922, and it considers that the tenor of the whole speech and the sentiments therein are in conflict with the declarations made by His Majesty and His Majesty's responsible Ministers and that it is calculated to create serious apprehension in the minds of this Assembly and of the people of this country both in the matter of attaining Swaraj and of the Indianisation of its Services."

The question is whether that amendment be made,

The Assembly then divided as follows :

AYES—48.

Abdul Majid, Shaikh.	Misra, Mr. P. L.
Abdut Rahim Khan, Mr.	Mudaliar, Mr. S.
Abdulla, Mr. S. M.	Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
Agarwalla, Lala Girdl arilal.	Nag, Mr. G. C.
Agnihotri, Mr. K. B. L.	Nand Lal, Dr.
Ahmed, Mr. K.	Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Asjad-ul-Jah, Maulvi Miyan.	Rajan Baksh Shah, Makhdam S.
Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.	Ramaya Pantulu, Mr. J.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.	Rangachariar, Mr. T.
Bajpai, Mr. S. P.	Reddi, Mr. M. K.
Bhargava, Pandit J. L.	Saklatvala, Mr. N. B.
Bishambhar Nath, Mr.	Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.	Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
Das, Babu B. S.	Singh, Babu B. P.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.	Sinha, Babu Adit Prasad.
Gour, Dr. H. S.	Sinha, Balu Ambika Prasad.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.	Sinha, Babu L. P.
Iswar Sasan, Munshi.	Sinha, Beohar Raghunir.
Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr.	Sohan Lal, Bakshi.
Jatkar, Mr. R. H. R.	Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
Kamat, Mr. B. S.	Ujagar Singh, Baba Bedi.
Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.	Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Majumdar, Mr. J. N.	Vishindas Mr. H.
Man Singh, Bhai.	Yamin Khan, Mr. M.

NOES—34.

Abdul Rahman, Munshi.	Ikramullah Khan, Raja M. M.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.	Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
Allen, Mr. B. C.	Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Arbuthnot, Mr. R. E. V.	Mitter, Mr. K. N.
Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.	Moir, Mr. T. E.
Bray, Mr. Denys.	Percival, Mr. P. E.
Bardon, Mr. E.	Rhodca, Mr. C. W.
Butler, Mr. M. S. D.	Sapru, the Honourable Dr. T. B.
Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.	Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhri.
Clarke, Mr. G. R.	Singh, Mr. S. N.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.	Sloccock, Mr. F. S. A.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.	Tollinton, Mr. H. P.
Davies, Mr. R. W.	Vincent, the Honourable Sir William.
Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.	Waghorn, Colonel W. D.
Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.	Way, Mr. T. A. H.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.	Webb, Sir M. dePomeroy.
Hullah, Mr. J.	Zahiruddin Ahmed, Mr.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President :** The question is, that the following Resolution, as amended, be accepted :

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey the message from this Assembly to His Majesty's Government through the Secretary of State for India, that it views with grave concern the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Prime Minister in the House of Commons on the 2nd of August, 1922, and it considers that the tenor of the whole speech and the sentiments therein are in conflict with the declarations made by His Majesty and His Majesty's responsible Ministers and that it is calculated to create serious apprehension in the minds of this Assembly and of the people of this country both in the matter of attaining Swaraj and of the Indianisation of its Services.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 11th September, 1922.