

Monday, 12th February, 1923

COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

(Official Report)

VOL. III, PART II

(24th January, 1923 to 27th March, 1923)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

COUNCIL OF STATE, 1923.



DELHI
GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS,
1923

CONTENTS.

	Page
WEDNESDAY, 24TH JANUARY, 1923—	
Members Sworn	523
Death of the Honourable Maung Po. Bye	523—24
Grant of Honours to Members	524
Questions and Answers	525—14
Arrangement of Questions	545
Questions and Answers	545—48
Reports laid on the Table of Joint Committee on Bills	548
Governor General's Assent to Bills	548
Statement of Exchange Gains and Losses	548—60
Communications in Frontier Province	561
Muslims, Hindus, etc., in Government of India Secretariat	561—66
Policy of His Majesty's Government with reference to the Government of India Act	567—68
Emigration to the Straits Settlements and Malay States	568—69
Emigration to Ceylon	569—70
Business of the House	570
THURSDAY, 25TH JANUARY, 1923—	
Report of Joint Committee on the Workmen's Compensation Bill	571
The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill—Request for postponement	571—72
Resolution <i>re</i> Purchase of Stores in England	572—77
Appointment of Public Services Commission	577—78
Resolution regarding the Indian Civil and other Imperial Services	578—86
Resolution <i>re</i> Conditions of Service of future entrants to I. C. S.	586—87
MONDAY, 29TH JANUARY, 1923—	
Member Sworn	589
Questions and Answers	589—92
The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill	592—612
Message from the Legislative Assembly	612
TUESDAY, 30TH JANUARY, 1923—	
Questions and Answers	613—18
The Indian Boilers Bill	618
Message from the Governor General	618—19
The Registration of Chelas Bill	619—28
Resolution <i>re</i> Promotion of Irrigation Projects	629—50
WEDNESDAY, 31ST JANUARY, 1923—	
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly	651
Gift of Books by Sir William Geary	651
The Indian Cotton Cess Bill—Reference to Joint Committee	651—71
The Indian Cotton Cess Bill—Nomination to Joint Committee	671
Course of Business	671—72

WEDNESDAY, 31ST JANUARY, 1923—contd.

Resolution <i>re</i> Workmen's Compensation and Social Insurance in Agriculture	672—84
Resolution <i>re</i> Protection of Women and Children in Agriculture—Recommendations of International Labour Conference	684—89
Statement of Business	688

MONDAY, 12TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Questions and Answers	689—99
Dates for Discussion of Budget	699—700
Governor General's Assent to Bills	700
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly	700
Alteration of Date of <i>Shivraatri</i> and Course of Business	700
Resolutions of which notice is given but not moved in Council	701
Resolution <i>re</i> Repeal of Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1869	701—17
The Malabar (Completion of Trials) Supplementing Bill laid on the Table	717—18

WEDNESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Questions and Answers	719—32
The Cotton Transport Bill	733—39
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Bill	739—49
Statement of Business	749

THURSDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Statement <i>re</i> Government of India Presses laid on the table	751—53
The Malabar (Completion of Trials) Supplementing Bill	754—55
The Indian Mines Bill	755—59
The Indian Boilers Bill	759—65
Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labourers to Ceylon	765—70
Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labourers to Straits Settlements and Malay States	770—72

FRIDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Resolution <i>re</i> Inquiry into Industrial Finance and Industrial Banks	773—87
Resolution <i>re</i> the Adoption of a System of Compulsory National Military Training and Service	787—98
The Married Women's Property (Amendment) Bill laid on the Table	798
Resolution <i>re</i> the Adoption of a System of Compulsory National Military Training and Service	798—818
Resolution <i>re</i> Necessity of Census of Products of British India	818—19

MONDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Questions and Answers	821—23
Resolution <i>re</i> Necessity of Census of Products of British India	828—26
Resolution <i>re</i> Opportunities to Indians for qualifying for Secretaryships, etc.	825—27
Resolution <i>re</i> Radio Communications	828
Resolution <i>re</i> Imposition of an Export Duty on Benzine and Petrol	828—34

TUESDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Bills laid on the Table	885
The Prisoners (Amendment) Bill	885
The Indian Naval Armament Bill	886
The Workmen's Compensation Bill	887-78

WEDNESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1923—

Resolution <i>re</i> Administration of Ajmer-Merwara	879-88
Resolution <i>re</i> Cognizance by Legislature of Matters on which Govern- ment of India has undertaken legislation [Modification of Rule 23 (1) of the Rules of Business]	888-906
Resolution <i>re</i> Recommendations of the Committee on Indian Arms Rules	907

THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1923—

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill laid on the Table	909
Message from the Legislative Assembly	909
The Workmen's Compensation Bill	909-17
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill	917-20
The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill	929-31
Statement of Business	931

MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Questions and Answers	933-33
Bills laid on the Table	938
Resolution <i>re</i> Recommendations of Committee on Indian Arms Rules	939-62
Resolution <i>re</i> Amendment of Standing Orders	962-64
Discussion on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill	964

TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Message from the Legislative Assembly	967
Bills laid on the Table	967
The Indian Paper Currency Bill	967-68
The Prisoners (Amendment) Bill	968
The Repealing and Amending Bill	969
The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill	969-95
Message from the Legislative Assembly	995

WEDNESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

Bill laid on the Table	997
Conference <i>re</i> Regulations under the Electoral Rules	997
Resolution <i>re</i> Appointment of Indians to the Traffic Inspector Cadre	997-1020
Resolution <i>re</i> Appointment of Indians as Departmental Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, etc.	1020-50
Statement of Business	1050

THURSDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1923—

Member Sworn	1051
The Budget	1051-59
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill	1060-83

MONDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	1085
Statement laid on the Table	1085
Resolution <i>re</i> Imposition of an Export Duty on Benzine and Petroli	1085—1101
Resolution <i>re</i> Rights and Status of Indians in Kenya	1102—21
The Married Women's Property (Amendment) Bill	1122—23

TUESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1923—

Member Sworn	1127
Questions and Answers	1127—29
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill	1129—31
Bills assented to by the Governor General	1131—32

WEDNESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1923—

The Budget	1133—81
----------------------	---------

THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1923—

Absence from House at question time of Members who have given notice of Questions	1183
Questions and Answers	1183—90
Draft Notification <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labour to Mauritius	1190—91
The Indian Cotton Cess Bill	1191—1203
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill	1203—04
The Government Savings Banks (Amendment) Bill	1204—05
The Official Secrets Bill	1205—15
Message from the Legislative Assembly	1216
Statement of Business	1216

MONDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	1217—18
Message from the Legislative Assembly	1218
Bill laid on the Table	1218
Resolution <i>re</i> Amendment of Electoral Rules	1219—29
The Malkharoda and Gaontia Villages Laws Bill	1229—30

TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1923—

Announcement of Summer Session in July, 1923	1231
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill	1231—70

WEDNESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	1271
Resolution <i>re</i> Indian Stores Department	1271—85
Resolution <i>re</i> Eligibility of Political Prisoners for Election to Legislature	1285—1302

THURSDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1923—

The Malkharoda and Gaontia Villages Laws Bill	1303—04
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill	1304—24
Statement of Business	1324—25

	Pages.
WEDNESDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1923—	
Member Sworn	1327
Questions and Answers	1327—34
Bill laid on the Table	1334
The Indian Finance Bill	1335—36
The Mahendra Partab Singh Estates Bill	1336—38
Report of Select Committee on Amendments to Standing Orders	1338
Bills assented to by His Excellency the Governor General	1339
Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labour to Mauritius	1338—45
FRIDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1923—	
Messages from the Legislative Assembly	1347
Bills laid on the Table	1347—48
The Indian Finance Bill	1348—97
MONDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1923—	
Questions and Answers	1399—1401
The Mahendra Partab Singh Estates Bill	1401—07
The Legal Practitioners (Women) Bill	1407—08
The Indian Merchant Shipping Bill	1408—10
Statement of Business	1410
TUESDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1923—	
Message from the Legislative Assembly	1411
The Indian Finance Bill	1411—18
Adjournment of Council of State and attendance at meetings	1413

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Monday, the 12th February, 1923.

The Council assembled at Metcalfe House at Eleven of the Clock. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STATE RAILWAYS ANNUAL DEPRECIATION FUND.

91. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: Will the Government be pleased to state whether they have arrived at any final decision on the subject of the principle which can work automatically in practice regarding ways and means for providing a fund for the annual depreciation of all State Railways?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The Government of India await the report of the Railway Depreciation Fund Committee and till it is received and considered no final decision can be arrived at.

EUROPEAN, ANGLO-INDIAN AND INDIAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

92. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) What was the total cost of the undermentioned classes of employees on the Railway Staff as mentioned in Chapter 4, paragraph 32, of the Railway Administration Report for 1921-22:—

6,858 Europeans,
11,831 Anglo-Indians,
735,780 Indians?

(b) Also the number of those who drew their respective salaries in manner specified below:—

Salary ranging from	Europeans.	Anglo-Indians.	Indians.
Rs. 50 to 100	2		
Rs. 100 to 200			1
Rs. 200 to 500			1
Rs. 500 to 750			1
Rs. 750 to 1,000			
Rs. 1,000 to 1,500			
Rs. 1,500 and above			

[12TH FEB. 1923.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The information in the detail asked for is not available. It can only be collected by special compilations from all the different Railways and the Government are reluctant to put Railway Administrations to this trouble.

STATISTICS OF GOODS WAGONS.

93. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: Will the Government be pleased to furnish statistics about goods wagons in the form given below?

Goods wagons conveying	FROM 1ST JANUARY TO 30TH JUNE			FROM 1ST JULY TO 31ST OCTOBER		
	1920	1921	1922	1920	1921	1922
Private merchandise						
Private coal						
Railway materials for railway services.						
Coal for railways						

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The information asked for is not available.

The attention of the Honourable Member is however invited to Appendix 5 in Volume II of the Administration Report where the weight of the traffic carried is given under various different headings.

GOODS WAGON RUNNING.

94. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: What was the average number of hours during the calendar year 1922 during which a goods wagon was run on active traffic service?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The precise figure asked for is not available. The figures in the Administration Report for 1921-22 show that the average annual mileage per goods wagon on all lines was under 12,000 miles. The average through speed of goods trains is about 10 miles per hour, and from these figures it can be deduced that the actual running time occupied represents only about 50 days in the year. It must however be borne in mind that these figures exclude all the time taken in loading, unloading, marshalling and working in the yards.

The HONOURABLE SIR ARTHUR FROMM: Can the Honourable Member tell us the number of running days which obtain, say, in America, for wagons?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I understand, Sir, that on the Pennsylvania Railway the wagons run on the average about 25 miles a day throughout the year; that is putting it in a different form; while from the figures I have given in India they run a little under 40 miles a day.

The HONOURABLE SIR ARTHUR FROMM: I wanted to know the number of days if the Honourable Member has the information.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Well, if a wagon on the Pennsylvania Railway runs 25 miles a day on the average throughout the 365 days in a year, then supposing it ran for the full 24 hours it would get over the whole of its journey in 38 days taking the average speed of an American goods train to be the same as that of goods trains in India, namely, ten miles an hour. If however the American goods trains are faster than the Indian ones, say, they average 12½ to 15 miles an hour, then the running days per wagon per year in America is about 27. That is the number of days a wagon runs in a year in America, while in India it runs for about 50 days.

The HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS: Do Government think there is any room for improvement?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I think every railway administration in the world hopes for improvement in the number of days it gets out of its wagons. But I think India comes out very well when compared with other countries, being far ahead of most of them.

GOODS WAGON EARNING.

95. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: What is the average gross earning per hour of a goods wagon when actually running on active traffic service?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The earnings per hour may approximately be estimated at Rs. 2-8 and Rs. 1-12 per Broad Gauge and Metre Gauge wagon, respectively, when running.

GOODS WAGON AWAITING LOAD.

96. The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: What is the average number of days in a year during which a goods wagon stands idle for want of load or for repairs in a railway yard?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer just given to his question No. 94. If a wagon runs for an average about 50 days, I gather it would stand idle for something over 300 days.

VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

97. The HONOURABLE KHAN BAHADUR SIR AHMEDTHAMBY MARICAI: (a) With reference to my question No. 27 asked in the meeting of the Council held at Simla on the 6th September 1922 and the Government answer thereto, will Government be pleased to state whether they have now arrived at a final decision in the matter?

(b) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article in the "Madras Mail", dated the 25th November 1922, headed "Vizagapatam Harbour, His Excellency's interest"?

(c) Is it a fact that the whole scheme is approximately estimated at 3½ crores and that this amount should be contributed by the Government of India, the Government of Madras and the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, each holding themselves responsible for a third of the amount?

(d) Is it a fact that the Vizagapatam Harbour Preliminary Bill is being drafted? If so, when is this Bill to be introduced in the Indian Legislature?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: (a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) Government have seen the article.

(c) An up to date estimate has not yet been received and no decision regarding financing the scheme has been arrived at.

(d) No Bill is being drafted by the Government of India at present and they are not in a position to say whether, and if so, when such a Bill will be introduced in the Indian Legislature.

PURCHASE OF STORES BY HIGH COMMISSIONER.

98. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the nature and the total cost of all stores so far purchased by the High Commissioner of India in London, since the creation of the post in 1920, on behalf of the Government of India?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state if tenders were invited by the High Commissioner in all cases of such purchase, from reputed Indian, British, Continental and American manufacturers?

(c) If so, will the Government be pleased to state specifically the quotations from each source and the names of manufacturers from whom the bulk of each description of stores were ultimately bought?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state the total differences, if any, between the prices at which the stores have been actually bought and the lowest quotation for that or superior quality of articles tendered for?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: (a) The details in the form desired by the Honourable Member are not available to the Government of India and they do not consider that they would be justified in asking the High Commissioner to undertake to extract further figures. A statement is, however, laid on the table showing the total expenditure incurred on the purchase of stores by the High Commissioner for the Government of India, Provincial Governments and Indian States during the years 1920-1921 and 1921-1922 classified under certain main headings. It is hoped that this information will be sufficient for the Honourable Member's purposes.

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the letter from the Government of India in the Department of Industries, No. S-360, dated the 22nd December 1921, to the Secretary to the High Commissioner for India, which was laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly. This letter states the procedure followed by the London Store Department in calling for tenders and also the instructions given by the Government of India to the High Commissioner regarding the procedure which they desired him to follow in future.

(c) and (d). The Government of India regret that they would not be able to furnish the detailed information desired in these two parts of the question without having them specially compiled by the High Commissioner. Such a compilation would involve immense labour in the extraction of the details from past records, even if complete records were still available, and the Government of India do not consider that they would be

justified in asking the High Commissioner to undertake the work. I would, however, invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the half-yearly statements which have been prepared by the High Commissioner from the period ending on the 31st December 1921, which show all cases in which the lowest tender has not been accepted. These statements are placed on the table of the Legislative Assembly as soon as they are received from the High Commissioner and two such statements have already been placed before the Legislature in that way.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS: Will the Government be pleased to lay similar statements on the Table of the Council of State?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: As far as I know, Sir, there is no objection at all.

Statement showing the total expenditure incurred on the purchase of stores by the High Commissioner for the Government of India, Provincial Governments and Indian States during the years 1920-21 and 1921-22 classified under certain main headings.

Head.	YEAR.	
	1920-21.	1921-22.
	£	£
Stamps	369,000	389,000
Posts and Telegraphs	932,000	972,000
General Administration	479,000	* 415,000
Stationery and Printing	258,000	216,000
Army Heads and Aviation	5,436,000	4,172,000
Marine	401,000	214,000
State Railways	3,757,000	2,872,000
Provincial, Local and Native States	992,000	1,038,000
Other heads	668,000	670,000
Stores lost or damaged at sea	3,000	5,000
Total	13,295,000	11,818,000

*Includes 38 Currency.

PURCHASE OF STORES FROM INDIAN MANUFACTURERS.

99. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state, year by year, the value and quantity of the stores purchased by the Government of India from Indian manufacturers from the year 1914 to the end of 1922?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I place on the table a statement showing the expenditure in thousands of rupees incurred by Government Departments, Provincial as well as Central, on stores produced in India purchased from private dealers, from the official years 1914-15 to 1920-21 inclusive. The figures for 1921-22 are not yet available.

This statement does not include figures relating to (1) purchases of articles of the same kind and of an aggregate value not exceeding Rs. 50 at one time, (2) purchases made by contractors for Government works, (3) purchases always made in India, such as bricks, Indian lime and mortar, Indian timber, etc., and (4) purchases made by or on behalf of the military authorities.

Information showing the quantity of stores purchased is not available.

Statement showing the expenditure in thousands of rupees on stores produced in India purchased from private dealers by Government Departments during the official years 1914-15 to 1920-21 inclusive.

1914-15.	1915-16.	1916-17.	1917-18.	1918-19.	1919-20.	1920-21.
Rs. 2,62,91	Rs. 2,54,89	Rs. 2,97,13	Rs. 3,54,02	Rs. 5,18,86	Rs. 5,23,84	Rs. 5,10,88

DECREASE IN STORES PURCHASED.

100. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state the reason of the decrease in quantity, if any, of the stores purchased from Indian manufacturers since the Armistice?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: As stated in the reply to the previous question, information cannot be given of the quantity of stores purchased, but the figures already furnished do not indicate that there has been any decrease in the purchase of such stores since the Armistice.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICAN FREE STATES.

101. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state if they contemplate the appointment of a Commission to visit the South African Free States to enquire locally from the men on the spot if the Indians already repatriated or about to be so are all returning voluntarily and not under force or under cover of false promises?

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA: The Honourable Member presumably refers to the Union of South Africa. When the scheme for the voluntary repatriation of Indians was introduced by the Union Government in 1920, that Government gave an explicit assurance that all officers concerned in the working of the scheme had been informed from the outset that no compulsion or persuasion whatever was to be used. The Government of India have no reason to suppose that the assurance given has not been strictly observed. They do not therefore propose to consider the appointment of a Commission for the purpose suggested by the Honourable Member.

INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS SETTling IN AUSTRALIA.

102. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state if they contemplate to guarantee the cost of stock, plant and equipment of such Indian Army officers as desire to settle in Australia?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: The answer is in the negative. A copy of the answer given in the Legislative Assembly on the 15th January, 1923, to a question which was asked on this subject will be furnished to the Honourable Member, if so desired.

STAFF OF KANCHRAPARA WORKSHOP.

103. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state the total number of men now serving in the Kanchrapara Workshop of the Eastern Bengal Railway who draw a salary of more than Rs. 300 (Rupees three hundred) a month and how many of them are Indians?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The total number is 31 and of these one is an Indian.

STAFF OF JAMALPUR WORKSHOP.

104. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Will the Government be pleased to state the total number of Indians, Europeans and Anglo-Indians, respectively, now serving in the Jamalpur Workshop of the East Indian Railway, who draw a salary of Rs. 500 and more?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The numbers are:

Indians	1
Europeans	41
Anglo-Indians	3

INDIANS ON RAILWAYS DRAWING MORE THAN Rs. 300.

105. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: What is the total number of Indians drawing a salary of Rs. 300 (Rupees three hundred) and more in the following Railways, respectively:—

- (a) The East Indian Railway,
- (b) The Eastern Bengal Railway,
- (c) The Assam Bengal Railway,
- (d) The Great Indian Peninsula Railway,
- (e) The North-Western Railway,
- (f) The Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway,
- (g) The Southern Mahratta Railway,
- (h) The Bengal Nagpur Railway, and
- (i) The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Information in respect of Railway Companies staff drawing Rs. 300 and over is not readily available but the number of Indians drawing Rs. 250 and over employed by the following railways mentioned by the Honourable Member is approximately:

East Indian Railway	186
Assam Bengal Railway	16
Great Indian Peninsula Railway	162
Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway	32
Bengal Nagpur Railway	107
Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway	188

Particulars of the corresponding Indian Staff employed on the three State Railways, namely, the North-Western, Eastern Bengal and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways, is given in the Classified List of State Railway Establishment, a copy of which is in the Library.

REPRESSIVE LAWS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

106. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY: Do the Government contemplate introducing any legislation in

the present session of the Indian Legislature incorporating such portion of the recommendations of the Repressive Laws Committee as have not yet been given effect to?

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: No.

MANUFACTURE OF SUGAR.

107. The HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA: Will Government be pleased to state whether it is under their contemplation to appoint a Committee for the development of sugar-cane cultivation and manufacture of sugar, similar to the Central Cotton Committee?

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA: A proposal of this kind was made by the Indian Sugar Committee, but Government regret that, owing to financial stringency, they are unable to proceed with it.

COUNCIL CHAMBER AT RAISINA.

108. The HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA: Will Government be pleased to state when the new Council Chamber at Raisina will be completed and finished and when the Councils are likely to meet there?

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: According to the latest information the new Legislative Chambers in New Delhi should be completed by January, 1926. The date of the first meeting of the Council in the new Chamber must depend on the date of the completion of the Chamber.

LADY HARDINGE MEDICAL COLLEGE.

109. The HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA: Will Government be pleased to state—

- (a) the initial cost up to date on the Lady Hardinge Medical College for women at Delhi;
- (b) the initial cost of buildings and equipment up to date;
- (c) the annual expenditure on it;
- (d) whether it is an Imperial institute or a Provincial one;
- (e) what amount, if any, has been granted by the Government of India or the Provincial Governments as recurring and non-recurring expenditure;
- (f) how much money has been collected from private subscriptions;
- (g) by what means is the present total expenditure met;
- (h) for what reasons Government of India has not or is not going to help it by any grant-in-aid;
- (i) how many female students are at present getting education in the college and from what provinces;
- (j) why is it not affiliated to any University as yet and is there any proposal for such an affiliation;
- (k) up to what standard the college is now teaching the students and what degree will they get?

The HONOURABLE MR. M. S. D. BUTLER: (a) and (b). The total non-recurring expenditure up-to-date, which has been incurred on buildings and equipment, is Rs. 29,00,000.

(c) The budgetted expenditure for 1922-23 is Rs. 2,91,600 exclusive of payments (referred to under (e)) made through the Countess of Dufferin Fund

(d) The College is a private institution, but is aided by Government

(e) The following recurring grants have been made by the Government of India :

	Rs.
1916-17	1,00,000
1917-18	1,25,000
1918-19	1,50,000
1919-20	1,75,000
1920-21	2,00,000
1921-22	2,00,000
1922-23	2,00,000

In addition contributions (amounting in 1921-22 to Rs. 51,675) are made by the Government of India through the Countess of Dufferin Fund to members of the Women's Medical Service on the staff of the Medical College Rs. 28,000 have been sanctioned by provincial Governments for the year 1922-23.

In addition, scholarships (amounting during the current year to Rs. 7,080) are paid by provincial Governments. No non-recurring grants have been made by the Government of India or by provincial Governments.

(f) Including Rs. 3 lakhs recently granted from the Lady Reading Women of India Fund the total amount collected from private subscriptions is Rs. 31,12,000.

(g) The estimated expenditure for 1922-23, which has been reduced on account of the financial stringency, is, as stated under (c), Rs. 2,91,600, which is met as follows :

	Rs.
Grant from Government of India	2,00,000
Grants from provincial Governments	28,000
Donation from Lady Reading Fund	12,000
Donations from Indian States	5,000
Payments by patients	18,400
Tuition fees of students	14,500
Miscellaneous	15,700
Total	<u>2,91,600</u>

(h) The Government of India have not withdrawn their recurring grant of two lakhs.

(i) There are 92 women students drawn from the following provinces :

Punjab	24
Madras	13
United Provinces	11
Bombay	8
Burma	7
Central India	5
Sind	5
Delhi Province	4
Hyderabad State	4
Rengal	3
North-West Frontier Province	3
Bihar and Orissa	2
Assam	1
Tibet	1
Central Provinces	1
Total	<u>92</u>

(j) The College is affiliated to the Punjab University for the F.Sc. Examination, and for the M.B., B.S. degree.

(k) Up to the M.B., B.S. degree of the Punjab University.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the Honourable Mr. Sarma if he had any information that the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy would not attend.

The HONOURABLE MR B. N. SARMA: No, Sir.

SETTLERS IN KENYA.

110. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a newspaper report that the European settlers in the Kenya Colony are determined to use violence against the Indian settlers in the contingency of the Colonial Secretary's suggestions for the equitable solution of the Indian problem being given effect to, and to a further newspaper report that the Indian settlers are afraid of violence?

(b) If so, what steps, if any, have this Government taken for the protection and safety of the Indian settlers of Kenya?

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA: (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) The Government of India have already informed the Secretary of State of the apprehension caused in India by these reports. They are confident that the Colonial Government have both the power and the will to maintain law and order in the Colony and to repress violence, by whatever class of the community it may be offered.

INDIANS IN FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

111. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: Has the attention of Government been drawn to the recent newspaper reports of maltreatment of Indians in the Federated Malay States, especially to the statement published in the *Servant* of January 4th, 1923, of an Indian long settled and holding a high position in the Federated Malay States, who writes under the *nom-de-plume* of "Fair Play"?

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA: The article in the *Servant* to which the Honourable Member refers is presumably that which appeared in the issues of the 5th January 1923. If so, the reply is in the affirmative. The attention of Government has also been drawn to the rejoinder which appeared in *New India* of 12th January last.

GROUPING OF INDIAN RAILWAYS.

112. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: Is it a fact that the question of grouping of Indian railways is being considered by the Railway Board?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: No definite proposals for grouping railways are at present under consideration.

RAILWAY BRANCH LINE EXPENSES.

113. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: Will Government be pleased to state what steps, if any, are taken to check the growth of working expenses on railways constructed under Branch Line terms, and paying a minimum dividend to shareholders guaranteed by the Secretary of State for India?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Railways constructed under Branch Line Terms and granted financial assistance in the shape of a guarantee of interest are worked either by

- (a) the main line administration, or
- (b) the branch line company itself.

In the case of (a), the Branch Line is usually worked for a fixed percentage of gross earnings of the branch, as laid down in Clause 3 (ix) of the Branch Line Terms published as Appendix B to Volume I of the Railway Administration Report for 1921-22 and the growth of expenditure on the Branch Line does not affect its net earnings.

In the case of (b), the amount to be spent each year on working expenses is subject to the approval and sanction of the Government of India, as laid down in Clause 3 VIII (a) of the Terms referred to and this sanction is not of course given until after the Government have satisfied themselves of the necessity for the expenditure.

INTER-EMPIRE ECONOMIC CONFERENCE.

114. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a full statement about the Inter-Empire Economic Conference for the development of Inter-Empire trade in which India participates as a member?

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: The only information that the Government of India have is that the proposed Imperial Economic Conference should study the possibility of co-operation in the development of the resources of the British Empire and the strengthening of economic relations between its constituent parts. The Government of India have informed the Secretary of State that if other Dominions agree to the proposed Conference, India will agree to take part, but they have not so far heard whether any decision has, as yet, been made.

DATES FOR DISCUSSION OF BUDGET.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Letter from the Governor General:

"For the purposes of sub-section (1) of section 67A of the Government of India Act and in pursuance of Rules 43, 46 and 47 of the Indian Legislative Rules and of Standing Order 70 of the Council of State Standing Orders, I, Rufus Daniel, Earl of Reading, hereby appoint the following days for the presentation to the Council of State and to the Legislative Assembly of the statement of the estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Governor General in Council (in the said Rules and Standing Order referred to as the Budget) and for the subsequent stages of the

[The President.]
said Budget in the Council of State and in the Legislative Assembly, namely:

Thursday, March, the 1st. Presentation of the Budget in both Chambers.

Monday and Tuesday, March, the 5th and 6th. General discussion in the Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, March, the 7th. General discussion in the Council of State.

Monday to Saturday, March, the 12th to 17th. Voting of demands for grants in the Legislative Assembly.

READING,
Governor General."

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S ASSENT TO BILLS:

The SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL: Sir, information has been received from the Governor General that he has been pleased to grant his assent to the following Bill, namely, the Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Act, 1923.

BILLS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL: Sir, in accordance with Rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I lay on the table the Bills which were passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meetings on the 31st January and the 6th and 10th February 1923. They are as follows:

Bill to give effect in British India to the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armament.

Bill to provide for the payment by certain classes of employers to their workmen of compensation for injury by accident.

Bill further to amend the Indian Factories Act, 1911.

ALTERATION OF DATE OF SHIVRATHRI AND COURSE OF BUSINESS.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I understand that the date for the Hindu festival *Shivrathri* has been changed from the 14th to the 13th of February. There is a meeting of the Council fixed for to-morrow. But I understand it is the general desire of this Council that we should not sit on that holiday but we should sit on the next day, Wednesday; and therefore I propose that the meeting for Tuesday should take place on Wednesday. I may add that the change in the date of this holiday has given the greatest inconvenience to everybody, as it has disturbed our arrangements during the whole of this week. I will ask the Leader of the House to say if he has any objection to my suggestion.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Law Member): I have no objection.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Very well, the business set down for to-morrow will be taken on Wednesday, the 14th.

**RESOLUTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE IS GIVEN BUT NOT
MOVED IN COUNCIL.**

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Sir Ahmedthamby Maricair.

(The Honourable Member was not present to move the Resolution put down in his name.)

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I must draw the attention of the House to the grave inconvenience caused to everybody by Honourable Members giving notice of Resolutions, setting them down on the paper, and then giving practically no notice that they do not intend to move them. I reminded the Council two or three sessions ago that it is a courteous act on the part of a Non-Official Member who puts a question, to give notice to the Member of the Government concerned that he is not attending to put that question, because it enables a Member of the Government to attend in another place. It is even more desirable that when a Resolution is set down, and a Member is not able or does not intend to move it, he should give notice. By not doing so he causes the greatest dislocation to our business; he causes inconvenience to the Government and causes inconvenience to other Members who might not possibly attend at all but for the fact that the Resolution was on the paper. I do hope Members will bear in mind these very reasonable rules of courtesy, and that it will become an established convention that this should always be done.

**RESOLUTION RE REPEAL OF ARMY AMALGAMATION SCHEME
OF 1859.**

THE HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, before I move my Resolution, I beg permission to add three words after the word "repealing," the words "or substantially modifying." The Resolution as it stands reads thus:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to urge on the Secretary of State how pressing is the necessity of repealing the Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 in view of the intolerable burden of existing military expenditure."

I want to add the words "or substantially modifying" after the word "repealing."

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The addition proposed is merely in the nature of a verbal amendment and I assume the House will not object to permission being given.

THE HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: Sir, I daresay most of the Members of the Council, perhaps, are aware of what is the Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1859; but for those gentlemen who may not be aware of it, I will just take up a few minutes by saying what it is. When the East India Company was transferred to the Crown in 1858, several changes had to be made in the constitution itself, both on the Civil and the Military side. As far as the Army was concerned, it was thought by Parliament that the East India Company's Army, which was a local European force, should be abolished, and that the Queen's Army and the old Indian Army might be amalgamated. That scheme was called the Army Amalgamation Scheme. A Bill for that purpose had to be introduced into Parliament in that year, 1859; and from the proceedings of those days it would appear that there was a great deal of opposition to the passing of that Amalgamation Scheme Bill

[12TH FEB. 1928.]

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

Members of Parliament, particularly of the House of Commons, some of whom were retired Indian Members, and experts in the military line, opposed it most stiffly. In the same way the Government of India was opposed to it. So far as the India Council was concerned, you will be able to learn from the records themselves that every member of the Council of India opposed it, and there were very many distinguished military experts on that Council. Apart from the military experts there was Sir John Lawrence, afterwards the Viceroy, who had saved India during the days of the Mutiny. Sir John Lawrence, himself a Punjab man, thoroughly knew what the military difficulty was and yet he was opposed to it. Therefore it may be said with truth that when the Army Amalgamation Scheme was passed by Parliament, it was passed in the teeth and in the face of the robust opposition of both Members of the Council of India and of Members of the House of Commons, apart from that of the Government of India. This scheme came into operation from 1860, and thereafter, say, for three or four years, a large number of questions on the scheme passed between the Government of India and the House of Commons and the War Office. Numbers of questions were put because the Army was divided into two parts, what you call the regimental army and the staff corps which was established in 1861. But I need not go into all those military questions of the day. Perhaps I may take it that you know more or less about them. But it will be asked, if this Army Amalgamation Scheme has been in operation for so many years (say, for nearly 62 years), why seek to have it either repealed or modified now? There are many good reasons for it, but one of the principal reasons is this: that this scheme has been productive from the very beginning of the greatest financial embarrassments to the Government of India. And as my study of this military finance question goes as far back as 1880, and on which I have spoken on many platforms during the last 42 years, I should say that I am personally convinced that the root-cause of the many financial embarrassments that have been experienced by the Government of India from time to time is chiefly due to the practical results of this Army Amalgamation Scheme. Instead of giving my own account of it, Sir, I may inform the House that every statement I make here is not my own. Every statement that I am now making is founded on official records, on the authority of the records of the Government of India, despatches from the Secretary of State, debates in the House of Commons, proceedings of commissions, committees and other like bodies that had from time to time inquired into the whole question of Indian expenditure, both civil and military. But there was a Committee specially appointed jointly by the two Houses in 1871. It was generally known by the name of the Fawcett Committee because the late Professor Fawcett was the most important member of that Committee though presided over by a Minister named Mr. Ayrton. His cross-examination on a variety of questions on Indian matters was of such a crucial character that Mr. Fawcett became the most leading and conspicuous member on that Committee. Mr. Fawcett also was a Member of the House of Commons and was afterwards able therefore to speak every year on the budget debate on these very questions, military and civil, with the greatest accuracy. This Committee, which was officially designated "East India Finance Committee," sat from 1871 to 1874. The Committee consisted of some very distinguished members of both Houses of Parliament including some who afterwards became Secretaries of State. It included Sir Stafford Northcote, and the Marquis of Salisbury, who became Secretary of State for India and a Prime Minister afterwards, and many others. It happened that Parliament came to an end in 1874; it was

dissolved. This Committee had made their interim reports in the meantime in 1871, 1872, 1873 and 1874. But Parliament having been dissolved, it unfortunately happened that when the new Parliament was formed, this Committee was not revived. Practically what happened, therefore, was that this Committee also dissolved without making a real good report on the mass of evidence taken during the four years. If that Committee had been revived and had gone on and concluded its proceedings, it would in all probability have happened that a thoroughly useful and substantial report might have been presented to Parliament. And I believe that, had that report been made, Mr. Fawcett would have made many points in reference to this Amalgamation Scheme, on which he was very keen. What was recorded in evidence before the Committee, namely, that many of the embarrassments of the Government of India in matters financial arose principally from the practical operation of this Army Amalgamation Scheme, would have been prominently brought to the notice of the House. But I am not going to take up the time of this House with that evidence. The time is short. I am allowed by the President 30 minutes within which to finish my speech though I feel that on this subject, I may speak for 8 hours and still not finish it. That is the reason why I will only content myself with enlarging on the question of policy and read out to the House a few extracts with the permission of Mr. President. I will first read to the House what Mr. Fawcett said as to the true nature of the scheme to prove that there is nothing like this Amalgamation Scheme which had been for half a century so injurious to the finances of India. Mr. Fawcett said:

“A few years after the abolition of the East India Company, what is known as the Army Amalgamation Scheme was carried out in direct opposition to the advice of the most experienced Indian statesmen. India was thus as it were bound hand and foot to our own costly system of army administration without any regard apparently being had to the fact that various schemes of military organisation which may be perfectly suited to a country so wealthy as England may be altogether unsuited to a country so poor as India.”

That is the first point that was made. I leave out certain other quotations and quote the second part:

“A kind of partnership has been established between England and India and as one of these countries is extremely rich and the other extremely poor, much of the same incongruity and many of the same inconveniences arise as if two individuals were to join in house keeping, one of whose income was £20,000 a year and the other only £1,000.”

That was the sort of comparison which Mr. Fawcett made as to the consequence of the Amalgamation Scheme. India, a poor country, was asked to go into partnership with a wealthy country like England. England's military expenditure compared to her revenues was only a fleabite compared to the revenues of India which was only 30 crores or thereabout. Mr. Fawcett further observed:

“An expenditure which will be quite appropriate to one whose income is £20,000 would bring nothing but embarrassment to one whose income was only £1,000. The money which is expended may be judiciously spent but if the man with a smaller income finds that he is gradually becoming embarrassed with debt because he had to live beyond his income it is no compensation to him to be told that he is only asked to bear his proper share of the expenses. His position would be the more intolerable if like India, after having been compelled against his wish to join the partnership he is forced to continue it, whether he desires to do so or not.”

This is a very pertinent extract and my own belief is that whatever may be said about the efficiency of the army brought about by this Army Amalgamation Scheme one thing is certain, that is, that India has never been able to respond to all the costly proposals made from time to time by

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

the War Office on this subject and that is the reason why it has happened, as Members will see if they will only take the trouble to go into the old records as I have done, that although almost every year despatches went from the Government of India to the Secretary of State imploring, praying, protesting, one thing after another, everything has been in vain. The War Office was very obdurate. The War Office said, "Here is the Amalgamation Scheme. You are a partner. You are bound to join with me in partnership and you must foot the bill, never mind what the bill is." So much so that the Government of India had no voice in it, absolutely none. Several Finance Ministers have said so from time to time. That also will be found in the records. During the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, the then Finance Minister, Sir Evelyn Baring, afterwards Lord Cromer, emphatically said so. In some of the papers it was said at that time that India has a voice and Lord Cromer contradicted it by saying plainly that India has no voice. Again, there was the Simla Army Commission. That body also went minutely into the whole question. With the permission of the President, I will read only one passage of figures. I do not want to trouble the House with any figures at all to-day. But the one I am just going to read is very important as an illustration of the continuous new charges annually passed on to India by the War Office. I will read to the House what is stated in the despatch of the 21st November, 1884. This despatch points out to the Secretary of State at that time how India has been burdened every year with more and more demands, great or small, by the War Office. Here is an account of such yearly burden between 1864 and 1884. I repeat that it is only a simple illustration of many other things which have happened since then. Every two or three years there have been increases of salaries of officers; there has been an increase of pay to the soldier, also increased expenditure on depôts, transport, ordnance and many other things besides. "Many a mickle makes a muckle" and every little item has gone to swell the military expenditure and the result has been, as I said, that to-day we find ourselves so much embarrassed in regard to our financial position. I personally believe that a portion of this expenditure is due to the exceptional causes brought about by the war and to the further increases consequent on the fresh organisation of 1920-21. But I will only as an illustration read with the permission of the President a paragraph from the Despatch just referred to:

"In 1864 increased rates of pay were granted to medical officers of the British service in India—amounting to £20,000 a year and a revised scale of clothing and compensation to the British army was introduced costing £20,000 more. Then in 1865-66, there were increased rates of pay granted to Veterinary Surgeons. That was a small matter, amounting to £3,500. In 1866-67, gymnastic instruction was introduced into the British army and India was asked to pay £15,000 a year. Then in 1867-68, there was an increase of two pence a day in the pay of the British soldiers and there was an additional burden of £250,000 a year. Then there was in the same year skeleton companies of Royal Engineers at a cost of £2,500 a year. Then there was an increase of £15,000 in 1868-69 owing to increased pay given to paymasters, quarter masters and so on. In 1870-71 the grant of good conduct pay was increased by £35,000,"

and so on and so on. But I will not weary the House with many other figures. From 1867 however to 1893 the annual permanent new recurring expenditure on account of the military Services increased by nearly one million sterling. Thereafter the one million swelled to one million and a half, to 2 millions, 3 millions, 4 millions, ever increasing but never diminishing till at last as a result of this Army Amalgamation Scheme we find ourselves to-day in the position of an annual total charge

of 62 millions without exchange. Now, I do not mean to say that the Army is inefficient. I dare say that the British army is the most efficient instrument in the world and we know that it was very efficient during the late War and but for the British Army, France would have been nowhere to-day. I am willing to pay my tribute of praise to the efficiency of the British Army. But I am not going to attack any officer; I am not going to criticise any military arrangement, neither the Commander-in-Chief nor his subordinates; I am only attacking and criticising the policy underlying the Army Amalgamation Scheme. As Members of this House are well aware, expenditure depends upon policy; that is the maxim; whether right or wrong, it is generally considered that expenditure is dependent on policy. If the policy is a wise and economic one, of course, the country is benefitted; if, on the contrary, the policy is unwise and burdensome, the country is worse off. That is the consequence of a given policy for the time being. I therefore ask the House to consider *what is the policy underlying the Army Amalgamation Scheme?* As I have said, and as stated by Mr. Fawcett in the House of Commons, it is the policy which has bound India "hand and foot" to the War Office. India cannot utter a single word. The Government of India may raise its voice, as you will find from the records that it has done year after year for many years past, but the War Office is deaf; its ears are stuffed with cotton wool. All it says is, "here is the bill; are you going to pay it or not;" and perhaps if the Commander-in-Chief does demur, they say as it were, at the point of the bayonet, "Are you going to pay it or not? If you do not, we will take it forcibly." That is the position in which India has been since 1859. Half a dozen times during the last 50 years Committees have been formed. The Government of India did not wish to pay these War Office bills and after much correspondence the Secretary of State for the time being appointed a Committee to investigate the matter. But all these half a dozen Committees which were appointed in the past ended in nothing. The War Office was strong and brought forward such plausible arguments that nothing was done with the exception of some small reductions here and there. So much so, that when Lord Salisbury was Secretary of State for India he characterised the conduct of the War Office as "mean" and "squalid". I am not speaking of this from my own book: I speak from what is on record. Then, later on, Lord Northbrook, once Viceroy of India, was himself the Chairman of one of these Committees. He said that he was disgusted with the way in which the War Office was squeezing India and he considered it to be "a scandal." Those are some of the views which have been expressed. I need not say anything more. This state of matters has gone on for years and years and we are going from bad to worse. What has been the cumulative effect of this amalgamation policy? Whatever may be its abstract value and however efficient it may have made the British Indian Army, still the result is that India is in such a position to-day that even with its expanded revenue of so many millions it is not able to meet the army expenditure, especially during the last two years. The result is that the tax-payers are heavily burdened with a taxation amounting to 21 crores of rupees. That is the effect of the amalgamation policy of 1859.

Now, Sir, having said so much, I leave it to the consideration of this House and particularly to the consideration of my friend the Commander-in-Chief. He no doubt will oppose me on this subject for he is after all a military man. But I also consider that although he may be a military man he is at the same time Commander-in-Chief of the forces in India

[Sir Dinshaw, Wacha.]

and that his duty and interest lie in defending India as far as possible from the encroachments of the War Office. He has to save us from unnecessary and extravagant expenditure which India is helpless to resist. The policy may be good from the British point-of view, but it is not good from the point of view of the tax-payer of India. If he is not able to reduce this expenditure, how is the country to get on; how is the administration to get on? If the administration has been able to get along, it is because there has been many a windfall formerly in opium and now in railways. In that way the Government has joggled along. There is nothing beyond that. The tax-paying ability of India is very little; we have no elastic revenue in India even to-day. England is very rich; England has even to-day a yearly income of 4,000 million pounds; India has not an income of even 1,000. Can you under this economic condition expect that an organization which is suited to such a wealthy country like England is suited to such a comparatively poor country as India? From the efficiency point of view it may be all right. But what is the use of that? India has to pay its way and it can only "cut its coat according to the cloth" which is available; if the quantity of cloth is small it cannot enjoy such an ample garment as England wears. That is a reasonable commonsense view, and I am sure that every one in this House will agree with me that if India is not able to afford the burdens of this amalgamation policy what is the use of having it? The expenditure incurred under it is beyond India's capacity to meet. The burden of taxation is rising and rising; times are changing; the constitution is changed; the Assembly is growing more powerful now and it will become more powerful day by day; and if the military expenditure goes on as it has gone on for many years past, then I emphatically say that a day of reckoning will come. It may be that the present military arrangements may be swept away and one cannot say what other catastrophic changes may take place. We know, Sir, from history how people over-burdened with taxation at first get sullen and discontented until their exasperation drives them into revolt. God forbid that India should have any revolt of that kind. But at the same time I appeal, not only to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief but to His Excellency the Viceroy, that in view of what may happen if things go on as they are, it would be wisdom and an act of farsighted statesmanship to realize that the time has come for a departure from the policy of the past in this connection in order to relieve the finances of India. We have, of course, the Inchcape Committee now sitting; but I do not know whether its axe will be so severely applied as to make everybody feel its sharpness. I am not in its confidence, and until we know what its report will be, we can only hope that it will succeed in materially reducing the military expenditure to a figure which India can bear. But even the Inchcape Committee, to whom I have addressed a letter on the subject, although it may reduce military expenditure, cannot effect any material improvement in military finances if the army is to continue under the aegis of the War Office. If that control continues then our expenditure will continue to increase even more. There can be no doubt about that; 50 years' experience has shown that it will increase and the finances of India will not be able to meet it. If India was able to, I would not grudge the Commander-in-Chief getting double his pay. But no, we are poor; we go in tattered clothes while they in England go in broad-cloth. That is the position. Therefore I say the first thing is to appeal to Lord Reading, the Viceroy. He has come to us as he has declared from time to time with the intent and purpose, above all things, to do justice

between man and man, between black and white. All are equal in his eyes. And if justice is to be done, my appeal to the Governor General in Council is, "pray appeal to the Secretary of State to either repeal the Amalgamation Scheme or modify it so that India may have an equal voice with the War Office." At the present moment India has no voice. But the Central Legislature will become more powerful in the future and if the War Office will not change its policy the Legislature will compel it to change by and by. But what is the use of waiting till they are compelled to do it? If they are wise they ought to take the new departure now with grace. And if the statesmen at the helm of the Home Government are wise they will see to it that this Amalgamation Scheme is altogether abolished and that a new scheme equitable to India and in every way suited to its financial condition is substituted. If not, modify it substantially, as I have said in my amendment, in such a way as to enable India to breathe freely and to see that the Government of India may not be fettered hand and foot as it is now, and that we can go on smoothly, so smoothly that everybody may think that fiscal autonomy will come soon, and that the Central Government will have more money available for education, for sanitation, and for all other objects of great public utility. At the present time we are starving. 21 crores have to be paid away at once. Everything is stopped and the Inchcape Axe is coming. I do not mean to say that it is only the military expenditure that has gone up; but I do say this, and that most emphatically, that more or less it is the military expenditure that has brought all this financial embarrassment. Therefore, Sir, without further expatiating on this subject, I beg to conclude by appealing to the House to support my Resolution. I have no doubt that the head of the Army, who is here, will be very sympathetic after having heard me and he will see that some good does come out of this debate to-day. With these words, Sir, I take my seat.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: Sir, after what the proposer has said—and a very elaborate dissertation we have heard from him on this subject—I feel some sympathy for his point of view. He is evidently out, as we are all out, and though perhaps Honourable Members may not wholly appreciate it, I myself also am out, to reduce the military expenditure. I am sorry that I cannot however accept this Resolution on the part of Government for the simple reason that, as I hope I shall be able to show, far from having the effect which the Honourable Member thinks it will have, namely, to reduce the military expenditure, it will have exactly the opposite effect by increasing it very considerably; and for that reason I must on behalf of Government oppose the Resolution. I do not propose to discuss at any length the merits or the demerits of the arguments employed in the inquiry, to which my Honourable friend referred, of 1859 which led originally to the Army Amalgamation Scheme. Many of these had reference to circumstances which, of course, long ago disappeared, and I imagine it to be the wish of this Council to consider the matter more from the practical point of view of the present day than the consequences, financial and others, which would have ensued if the original Amalgamation Scheme had not been adopted. I may point out, however, in passing that the Amalgamation Scheme was originally opposed by its critics mainly on political and on military grounds and not on the financial ones, which I understand have particularly actuated my Honourable friend in putting his proposal forward. It was shown in 1859 that the local Army on the lines of the old East India Company's forces was more expensive and less efficient than the British regular troops. At the present day it is clear to

[H. E. the Commander-in-Chief.]

demonstration that if the Government of India were to maintain a separate British force of their own enlisted for special and continuous service in India, it would be very much more costly and far less efficient than employing, as they do now, regular British regiments which come to India for a tour of duty and on the same rates of pay as they receive whilst serving in the United Kingdom. I believe that my Honourable friend holds to the doctrine of relative efficiency. He has referred to it in what he has already said, and contends that the British soldiers in India to-day are too efficient for the work that they have here to perform and that we ought to cut our coat according to our cloth. I fully agree as regards his coat and his cloth, but I cannot follow him into the theories of the relative efficiency of the armed forces of the King. My experience forces me to the conclusion that the first and the paramount necessity in war is to beat the enemy and that if you calculate too narrowly a margin of relative efficiency, you will probably find that the enemy will beat you. I cannot accept, therefore, a lower standard of efficiency than that at which the Government of India have hitherto very rightly aimed. In matters of defence such a policy could not possibly be contemplated. India contains one-fifth of the entire population of the globe. It has the longest and the most frequently crossed land frontier of any country in the world; and where the interests at stake are so large and the dangers so formidable, I should not be doing my duty as Commander-in-Chief if I were to accept a standard of efficiency lower than that which the Great War has proved to be necessary in order to avoid defeat. Now, if it is admitted that we should continue to employ in India European troops of the same moral and fighting value as those which have been employed here for the last thirty or forty years, it is easy to show that the present arrangement is by far the most economical way of doing it. It would be impossible to persuade soldiers to enlist for continuous service in India at the same rates of pay that they would accept if their service is to be spent partly in India and partly in England. This seems to be axiomatic. In order to provide a force separate from the British Army for service in India as was done in the old East India Company days, we should have to set up in the United Kingdom an organization for recruiting and training on modern lines at a prohibitive cost to the Indian tax-payer. The establishments which existed when the Peel Commission sat in 1859 no longer exist to-day, and the re-creation of them under modern conditions owing to the enormous rise in prices, would be an exceedingly costly affair. Moreover, it will be both unwise and financially unjustifiable to institute a machinery which would enter into direct competition with the British recruiting establishments in England in order to obtain in the open market the man-power that India would require, even if—and this is by no means certain—the Imperial Government would permit you to compete with her in the markets of the United Kingdom. Moreover, the pensionary charges that will be sufficiently attractive to induce the right class of men to enlist, would have to be considerably more liberal than those which are now paid to the British personnel in the Indian Army to-day.

Of the military aspect of the problem, I need say little. The arguments which were used in 1859 apply with equal force to-day, and I am sure this Council will recognise the great advantage which accrues to India from having at her disposal a portion of the British regular Army. If our arrangements were independent, we should with the long service Army have no means of maintaining a reserve either for the replacement

of casualties or for expansion in the war. The periodical reliefs enable the British soldier to-day to maintain the requisite standard of health and physical fitness. The soldiers as well as their officers have the advantage of deriving their discipline and training from the most up-to-date schools of military science in England and the war experience of many battle-fields. But above all things, the officers and men of the British Army are imbued with the instinct of discipline and of loyalty to the Empire as a whole in a degree which could never be achieved by a purely local European force.

I turn now to what would appear to be the principal count in my Honourable friend's indictment. He seems to think that
 12 Noon. the present arrangement is one which in practice diminishes the control of the Secretary of State and the Government of India over the application of Indian revenues, in that the Government of India are compelled to pay to the British soldier rates which in the last resort are fixed by an extraneous authority. The Honourable Member has told us something of his attitude towards the War Office, and I think he at least insinuated that the will of the War Office was arbitrarily imposed upon us here in India, and that we had no redress of any sort. Now, perhaps I am the person of all others whose business it is to discuss and to settle with the War Office such matters as are under discussion between the Government at Home and the Government of India, and I can assure him that I do not take it lying down as he apparently imagines. It is certainly true that we have to pay the rates which the Home Government find necessary in order to get us the article we require, but we do this as a matter of business, and not as a surrender to the arbitrary dictation of the War Office, as he seems to think. We, the Government of India, are looking for the same article as are His Majesty's Government. We enter the same market side by side, and instead of competing against one another and thereby raising the prices against each other, we, by mutual agreement, go into the market together in order to get what we require at the lowest possible rate. I am sure my Honourable friend, with his business acumen, will appreciate this, but I am not sure that he fully realises the fact that we do not have to pay the British soldier here in India more than he receives for his services rendered in the United Kingdom. It is the general rule that when European personnel is employed in India, some extra emolument has to be given to compensate them for the hardships and expenses of this so-called exile. British troops serving in Mesopotamia are paid more than those serving in India, for they receive a Colonial allowance in addition to their Home rates of pay. Some little time ago the cost of the British gendarmerie in Mesopotamia was worked out and it was ascertained that the average cost per head of the gendarmerie in Palestine was no less than £650 a year, as compared with £350 per head a year, which is the cost of the regular British soldier employed in the same country. I have recently obtained also the statistics of the rates of pay which are paid by the various Dominions for their localised British personnel. In 1909 the pay of the private soldier of the permanent force in Cape Colony was 5 shillings a day on enlistment, and on completing two years' service, it was 6 shillings a day. The total pay of the private soldier in the British Army in the same country and in the same year was one shilling a day. I will not waste the time of the Council by quoting figures from the other self-governing Dominions, for I think I have said enough to show that our present system of employing regular regiments of the British Army here in India is not only the most efficient from the military point of view, but:

[H. E. the Commander-in-Chief.]

is by far the most economical method of supplying what India requires in the shape of British contingents. I ask this Council therefore to conclude that, whilst it may be possible for India to limit her military expenditure by employing a lesser number of British troops than she employs at present, she cannot hope to do so by attempting to adopt a lower scale of remuneration for the British section of her army. It is, of course, idle to imagine that the Indian Government, recruiting under its own agency, could possibly obtain better value for her money than do the recruiting agencies of Her Majesty's Government, and in my opinion the problematical advantage which the Honourable Member seems to envisage would be both illusory and uneconomical. I regret therefore that the Government is unable to accept the Honourable Member's Resolution. I can assure him that to act on his suggestion would be ruinous financially and thoroughly unsound. From a military point of view it would be a mistake fraught with grave danger to the State and in the present critical state of the world's history it would be disastrous to Indian interests. I must therefore oppose this Resolution.

The HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I should have very much wished to take no part in this discussion, but the "little sympathy" which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said he has for the Resolution tempts me to put the question raised by the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha before this Council in another light; a light based not on any conjecture or views of my own, but on the views of eminent military and civil servants of the Crown during the last 30 or 40 years. For obvious reasons I wish to confine my remarks to quotations from the writings of ex-military and civil servants of the Crown, and I hope, Sir, that you will not mind if I put the point of view that I have in my mind before this House in the shape of quotations only. I ask for that permission on this occasion because, except by that method, I would not to-day be able to elaborate the points I have in view. May I take it that I have that permission?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: As long as they are of reasonable length.

The HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS: Thank you, Sir. There is just one preliminary remark that I would like to make. I would like to pay my personal homage and respect to the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha, whom I may aptly call the Grand Old Man of this Council, for the great feeling, the ardent patriotism and, may I add, the real and sincere loyalty to the Crown with which he has brought up this question before the House. It is perhaps in the fitness of things that the question which had its beginnings more than 60 years back should be handled by the oldest and the most respected Member in this House. Nobody I know of is more capable or is better fitted to handle it, and my only regret is that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has not been able to give it a more warm reception than merely "some sympathy." I propose, Sir, just to refer to what His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said in connection with the Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 having been opposed by English Members then in Parliament on political grounds. I feel that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief perhaps overlooked, when he said so, that several Members, some of whom I think my Honourable friend Sir Dinshaw Wacha quoted, did point out with great sagacity and foresight

that a scheme like this, objectionable though it may have been in 1859 on political grounds, would mean great expense to India, and might militate against India's financial resources. I am not sure, but I am under the impression that the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha himself read out a quotation from Professor Fawcett. So that it has to be borne in mind that people who had foresight, sagacity, and knowledge did then warn the British Government that the scheme might be much too costly for Indian resources to bear, and alas, that warning has come only too true.

With these preliminary remarks, Sir, I propose to put forward other points of view, which I think the House ought to know, in the shape of some quotations. I am now reading from one or two parts of the Welby Commission Report of 1900. Mr. Buchanan referred to the Capitation Grant as follows: 'Military charges amount in all to £1,585,938 and they include expenditure for raising and training recruits for India, for deferred pay for service on the Indian establishment, and, for non-effective services of the European army serving in India and he said as under:

"In order to justify these charges, various (and sometimes conflicting) theories are brought forward of the supposed relation of India to the Home Government. Sometimes she is treated as an independent power, at other times as in a position of strict administrative and legislative dependence. Sometimes she is spoken of as a partner in a joint concern, at other times as a more or less unwilling purchaser in a limited market. These theories would not demand attention if it were not that frequent use is made of them by public Departments at Home, particularly by the War Office, when imposing new charges on India. The theory frequently put forward that the United Kingdom and India are 'partners having an equal interest in respect of a joint undertaking' appears to be untenable and the arguments adduced by Lord Cromer (when Finance Minister) in his Despatch of March 2, 1883, unanswerable. 'The Indian authorities,' he says, 'are so far from having an equal voice in the decision on such matters that it may be said without exaggeration they have scarcely any voice at all'. The Indian Government, however strongly it may protest, must always in the end agree to the terms imposed on her. India is a dependency of the United Kingdom and her Government strictly dependent on that of the United Kingdom. If, however, the Home Government is supreme, she ought to exercise her supreme power with moderation and consideration. If the Indian Government is dependent, she should enjoy some of the advantages of dependence and be free from some of the burdens of independence."

Regarding the Capitation Grant, the same Mr. Buchanan goes on to say:

"This is represented as the cost price of the recruiting and training of the British soldier at the time he is sent out to India, and India is made to hire British soldiers at that price. The charge has no parallel elsewhere in the Empire. It would never have been made *de novo*. Its origin dates back to the time when India had a European force of her own and for its service a recruiting station of her own at Warley in this country. When the Company's European Army was abolished, the British Government made India pay not only for the British regiments supplied, but a proportion of the general recruiting charges at Home. Nothing has given rise to more frequent and long continued disputes between the two Governments from 1861 onwards. Numerous committees and commissions have been appointed. The War Office and the India Office never agree and, as Sir Henry Brackenbury, who advocates the abolition of the charge, stated in evidence before us, 'Nobody in India believes in the fairness of the capitation charges'."

I would not like to weary the House with more quotations of this nature but I should very much like to put before the House what the Government of India themselves said in 1883. It is again a quotation from the Welby Commission Report and I hope that the House will be able to infer what some Englishmen at least think is or should be the fate of the Capitation Grant and I hope the House will also see that this is what Sir Dinshaw Wacha has in his mind when he amended his Resolution and

[Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

used the words "substantially modified". The Government of India, in a despatch, dated the 10th August 1883, said as under:

"It is evident that the responsible Indian authorities have to approach this question from an entirely different point of view. A reserve of British troops available for service in India would, no doubt, be very useful; but the Indian Government cannot look upon its peace establishment mainly in the light of a school or training ground for the reserve. On the contrary, the first and most important feature in any military organisation suitable to the wants of India is that a relatively high peace establishment should be maintained in order to preserve internal order. We are unwilling to use the commonplace argument that India is held by the sword, because, although it is true, we do not consider it is the whole truth and moreover we disagree with many of the conclusions which are drawn from this argument. There can, however, be no doubt that British rule in India rests on force, moral and physical, and, as an inevitable consequence of this condition of things, such a question as that of short service in the Army, with the attendant issue involved in the constitution of a reserve, must be approached, when considering Indian requirements, from a point of view wholly different from that which would be adopted in considering the requirements of England. Under these circumstances, we do not see how any partnership, properly so called, is possible."

I am very much obliged to the House for having given me the permission to read a few quotations. I will add only one word more. I appeal to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to accept the Resolution moved by the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha. It after all only suggests that substantial modifications may be made. I hope His Excellency has been trying to relieve us from the control of the War Office, whether it is through the Secretary of State or through anybody else. But I feel one thing, and that is that there is a great deal that India has to say against the Capitation charges which are imposed on her by the Amalgamation Scheme and I hope that the quotations that I have put before the House will move the House to carry the Resolution, should it unfortunately happen that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief cannot see his way to accept the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS (Bombay: Non-Muhammadian): I rise to support this Resolution. I agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas in thinking that it came rather as a surprise to us, Sir, on this side of the House that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief merely expressed some sympathy but did not see his way to accept the Resolution in the amended form. As the Resolution stood, perhaps His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief might have objected to it but in the amended form the Resolution asks for nothing more than a substantial modification of the Army Amalgamation Scheme and we thought that His Excellency would see that the financial situation of the country itself demands some sort of reconsideration of the whole scheme and of modifying it so as to suit the needs of the country. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said in his speech that this scheme was opposed in 1859 on military and political grounds. My Honourable friend Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas has quoted certain passages to show that it was opposed on financial grounds. May I draw the attention of His Excellency to the remark of Sir Charles Trevelyan who said that it was extravagant and crushing in practice and then he said that it is in the nature of a one-sided partnership, in which India was not allowed freedom of contract. It was opposed also on financial grounds by Sir John Lawrence, who was afterwards Lord Lawrence, and by other Members in the House of Commons, but, leaving that aside, I come to the chief ground on which His Excellency based his opposition to the Resolution. His Excellency

said that he thought and the Government of India agreed in the view that the Resolution, if accepted, would have an effect quite the contrary to what the Honourable Mover thinks it will have. We, Sir, think that it will be good for us financially if it is carried. That is our opinion, though perhaps we must bow to the greater experience of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief when he says that if we went into the open English market we would have to pay what ordinary labour receives, and that if we competed with the British War Office in recruiting for the army we would have to pay little more. We do not doubt that in the open market we would be able to obtain equally competent and efficient men. But even if we did not succeed in doing so, and had to pay a little more, as a matter of policy, as the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha said, we would like a beginning to be made as regards direct recruitment, so that the Government of India should be free from the shackles of the War Office. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said that he was not a man who would take orders from the War Office. We all believe it; not only this House but everybody in the country knows what His Excellency has been doing in the interests of India in the way of fighting the War Office and higher authorities in England if their orders seemed to him against the interests of India. But we know, Sir, that there are occasions when even His Excellency and the Government of India cannot go against the wishes of the War Office. I will quote one instance. I asked a question in regard to schemes sent by the Government of India about the Indianization of the army, and supposed to be held up in England under the orders of the War Office. Although reference to this matter was made in the English papers, it was kept secret here and, in reply to my question the Government of India were not in a position to give any information. In all such matters we want the Government of India to have full freedom; we want them to have as much freedom from the control of the War Office as it is possible to have. If it is absolutely necessary in the long run, for financial reasons, that we should co-operate with the War Office, we will do so at the time and as equal partners. We will go of our own accord and say, "will you do this for us?" And we shall pay them, if necessary, a certain charge for their services. But what we do not want is that they should lay down the law to us while we pay up. We want full freedom of action for the Government of India. If that is obtained, then, even if we have to pay a little more in the beginning, in the long run it will be for the good of the country. For these reasons, Sir, I strongly support the Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE LIEUTENANT RAO BAHADUR CHAUDHRI LAL CHAND (Punjab : Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I have only one or two observations to make. When I was listening to the Honourable Mover I felt that the Government of India had been pressing forward the same demands and was in such a pitiable condition that they wanted the support of this House to bring pressure upon the Secretary of State to repeal this Amalgamation Scheme. But from what has fallen from the lips of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, I gather that the Government of India are not in that pitiable condition. The disease that is sought to be cured is the heavy expenditure in the Army Department. But when His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief says that no efficient army could be kept without this expenditure there is an end of any talk on this subject.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: I never said that.

THE HONOURABLE LIEUTENANT RAO BAHADUR CHAUDHRI LAL CHAND: I am sorry. We may talk as financiers and economists about

[Lieut. Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand.]

these things but in reality on matters like this we should consult men who have served in the army and who know more about military matters than we do. Yesterday I had the good fortune to attend a meeting of the Indian Officers' Association at Rohtak. Quite informally I put this Resolution before some of the Members and they said that the only remedy for this heavy expenditure lies in two directions. They said, ask the extremists not to give trouble inside India and ask the Afghans to discontinue their raids on the frontier. If you could bring about that desirable state of things then of course military expenditure could be reduced. But not before that. With these few words I oppose the Resolution. I am not convinced that the repeal of the Amalgamation Scheme or any modification of it will bring about any reduction in the expenditure.

The HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS (Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to rise in support of the Resolution which has been so ably moved by our veteran of the House. He has voiced the true feelings of all intelligent Indians. I have not, I am sorry to say, been convinced by the arguments put forward by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief when stating that the adoption of this Resolution will lead to an increase in expenditure. In India the cost of living is much lower than it is in the United Kingdom and housing and other arrangements are also cheaper, and the said cost of living is going down considerably in both countries owing to the unemployment question and to a fall in prices of the necessities of life. So India is right in demanding that the scale of the pay of British soldiers ought to be brought down to the British Indian scale. The heavy increase in expenditure on the army has always been criticised, and I think rightly criticised, by all Indians. The Government of India have all along been, for the last 60 years, protesting against the Amalgamation Scheme Act, and no convincing arguments have been put forward to refute the arguments of able military experts who have hitherto expressed their views on this subject. With these few words, Sir, I support the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE LALA SUKHBIR SINHA (United Provinces Northern: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, my friend the Honourable Chaudhri Lal Chand has taken quite a different view of the subject. He has said that if we can get the Afghans not to attack India or if we can arrange with the extremists or non-co-operators not to have any disturbance in the country, then army expenditure is bound to come down. But that is not the question before the House. The question before the House relates to the Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 which my Honourable friend Sir Dinshaw Wacha wants to be modified. He says that at present under the Scheme neither the Government of India nor the Secretary of State has any voice whatever in army policy. The policy is decided by the War Office and the Government of India have to carry it out and pay for it. Therefore what he wants is that that policy should either be repealed or modified, according to the requirements of India. I therefore strongly support the Resolution so ably put forward by the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha.

The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: Sir, what have the Government said about my Resolution? Of course, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief from his point of view may be right in thinking that it would be ruinous if the Amalgamation Scheme was repealed or modified, that we will not get recruits cheaper than before; perhaps they may be

dearer. But, Sir, eschewed—and deliberately eschewed—from entering into any details of this character, what should be the future Army of India, what should be its strength, whether recruits should be obtained cheaper or dearer, and many other things, because all those questions are subordinate to the fundamental question, which is a *question of policy*. And, so far as that policy is concerned, I regret to say that although I was greatly expecting to hear that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief would make some remarks that the policy so long pursued was unwise and detrimental to India's interests, he seems to think that, whatever may happen, the policy is right and correct, when the facts are absolutely against him. I can stand for 12 hours here and convince His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and those who share his views that these facts of mine are correct and that the Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 has been, is and will in the future be disastrous to India unless it is modified. It is that policy that I say should be modified. I want that policy to be modified for doing what? For doing justice to India, for doing justice to the Government of India and their officers who from time to time in the last 50 years have said, "We have no voice; we protest and protest and do everything in vain, but nothing happens. The War Office is obdurate and the War Office is tyrannical." The military expenditure crushes India and crushes India to a tremendous extent. Where is the money to come from? It does not come from the pockets of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief or the Chief of the Staff at the War Office or from the British Treasury. The British Treasury wants to have its estimates reduced partially at the expense of India. Years and years ago Mr. Samuel Laing, the second Finance Minister, said that "India is the milch cow of England" and India is "sacrificed to the exigencies of British estimates." That fact is true and it has been proved in London papers like the "Times" and the "Westminster Review," etc. Twenty thousand troops who generally remain in the depôts at Home are more or less utilised for Imperial defence and whenever there is an opportunity these troops are sent out on Imperial service at India's expense. The British Army in India is not simply for the purpose of defending India; it is also for the purpose of maintaining *British supremacy* in India and it is British supremacy that entails so burdensome an expenditure. If that is to be maintained and if India is still to be retained as a partner, why should not the rich partner pay for the maintenance of that British supremacy in some shape or another? Why should it not contribute substantially, Sir, towards our military expenditure, whereby India's burdens may be reduced? All those are questions to which nobody has given a thought; the same is the case with His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. There are wheels within wheels, facts within facts, of which we have no knowledge. India is poor, India is dumb and powerless; India is dumb because India has no voice and the military bureaucracy at Home is omnipotent. That is the whole situation. Are we going to go on suffering indefinitely or are we going to change? If we are going to change the constitution, so that people may have self-Government for themselves, are we not prepared to govern ourselves so as to keep military affairs in our own hands in such a way that it may not be a burden? India suffers for want of money for education and a hundred other objects of the greatest benefit to the country. What is the use of this unproductive expenditure which goes to waste like water from year to year? We have had 21 crores of taxation because of the military expenditure. Had these 21 crores been expended on education, sanitation and other productive objects, if these 21 crores had been available for a number of other purposes now starved, would we not be vastly

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

benefited? Who is benefited now? No one except England. And England is doing a great injustice to India. I am sorry to say this, but His Excellency has provoked me on to saying it: I wanted deliberately to refrain from saying it. Now, I think, I should say that England is doing a great injustice to India, and that is the reason why I appeal to the late Lord Chief Justice of England who is now the Viceroy of India to do justice to India. If he does not do it, no man will ever do it, and India will remain for ever bound hand and foot to the War Office. Is that the situation that my friends here desire? Is that the situation that is wanted? We want to rise; we want to be a nation and build it strongly brick by brick in years to come, so that we may have full responsible self-government but we want it never mind if it takes 25 or 50 years. The country is now awaiting it. It does not want to see that we should be incapable of defending external aggression. We should be trained and prepared for that eventuality. By all means do it in such a way that we may not feel the financial burden. Everything must have its due proportion. There is not a single country in the world where the Army is so costly as that in England. Germany had a huge army, France had a huge army, Russia had a huge army, Italy had a huge army, and what was their expenditure? Refer to their war books. Refer to their annual estimates and you will find that the cost of a soldier in these countries is nothing compared to the cost of a soldier in England. England can afford to pay, but not India. I should like to see how England will recruit her soldiers in the future. That is a point to be considered. Sir, I assure you that I am speaking here from a feeling—a strong feeling—that India has been done injustice for the last 50 years in the matter of the army services and that the time has come now for a new departure to be made. That departure consists in ending or mending the Amalgamation Scheme of 1859. I do not want the total repeal of the amalgamation. I want it to be so satisfactorily modified that the Government of India, which is our own Government, should have a free hand in the matter and should be able to say 'Thus far and no further shall we go.' I pray and I appeal to Government, let them not exasperate the tax-payer. That is a state to be sternly avoided. All India wishes nought but justice in this matter. Let this great military wrong be righted. My single voice will not do it. This voice will spread over all India and an agitation will be set on foot which will not cease till this ruinous Amalgamation Scheme is substantially modified. With these words I take my seat.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: Sir, this discussion has passed into a channel—I might almost say into an atmosphere—which is hardly, I think, within the terms of the Resolution. I dealt with the Resolution including my Honourable friend's amendment both from the point of view of the military necessity as it is to-day, and of the situation as it was in 1859.

THE HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: So far as the policy is concerned, the situation has not changed a bit.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: I do not propose to enter into the intricacies, generalisations and objections raised by my Honourable friend, for they are, to my mind, wholly irrelevant to the terms and the scope of the Resolution itself. I do not mean to say that there is not some justification for the references that have been made both by the Mover of the Resolution and by others, to the size of the military

Budget. But I would point out that those criticisms and particularly the exuberance with which my Honourable friend has attacked the military expenditure are based upon the experience of the past years. We are now within a fortnight of the Budget and therefore the arguments of my Honourable friend might well be postponed until this Council have had an opportunity of discussing, in accordance with the announcement made to-day by His Excellency the Governor General, the Budget of the coming year 1923-24. More than that, I cannot say. But it seems to me somewhat unreasonable for Honourable Members here to attack the military expenditure in the way that they have done when their knowledge is based entirely upon what happened in the past. I decline to go into the political arguments that my Honourable friend has raised. I think they are foreign and beyond the scope of the Resolution that is before us. My contention is that the repeal, or even the modification of the Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 will not provide you with a cheaper military organization than that which you have got to-day.

The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA: We shall see.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF: After all I am an expert on these matters. I have had very considerable experience in the production of the British soldier both here and in England, and I tell you that if the Resolution is adopted, the soldier will cost you more than he does to-day and for that reason I still oppose this Resolution.

The Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha asked for a division and the Council divided as follows:

AYES—12.

Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. R.
Harnam Singh, Raja Sir.
Jaffer, Mr. I. H.
Kale, Mr. V. G.
Khaparde, Mr. G. S.
Lalubhai Samaldas, Mr.

Nandy, Maharaja Sir Manindra.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Mr.
Rampal Singh, Raja Sir.
Ram Saran Das, Mr.
Sinha, Mr. Sukhbir.
Wacha, Sir Dinshaw.

NOES—16.

Amin-ul-Islam, Mr.
Barron, Mr. C. A.
Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.
Crerar, Mr. J.
Forrest, Mr. H. T. S.
Froom, Sir Arthur.
Lal Chand, Lieut.

MacWatt, Major-General R. C.
Miller, Sir Leslie.
Muzammil-ullah Khan, Nawab.
Rawlinson, H. E. Lord.
Sarma, Mr. B. N.
Shafi, Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad.
Tek Chand, Mr.
Thompson, Mr. J. P.

The motion was negatived.

THE MALABAR (COMPLETION OF TRIALS) SUPPLEMENTING BILL LAID ON THE TABLE.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Law Member): Sir, I beg to crave permission to invite your attention to a somewhat important and urgent matter. The Malabar Completion of Trials Ordinance will expire on the 18th of this month, and unless an Act is passed by the Indian Legislature providing for appeals against convictions, the result will be that the convicts will be without any remedy in so far as appeals.

[Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

to the High Court are concerned. A Bill has been introduced in the other House and has passed through that House to-day, providing for that contingency. But under Rule 25 of the Rules of Business that Bill ordinarily will be laid on the table of this House the day after its passage through the other House. As Honourable Members are aware, this Council is not sitting to-morrow. The next sitting will be on Wednesday and the only other sitting, during this week, of the House will be on Thursday. It is clear therefore that, unless this Bill is passed by this House at the latest at its sitting on Thursday, the convicts will be without any remedy and there will be no Act of the Legislature providing for an appeal before the expiry of the Ordinance to which I have already referred. In these circumstances I crave your permission that the Bill be laid on the table to-day so that the Honourable Members may have three days' notice before it is finally taken up on Thursday next.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: This must not be made into a precedent, but as the Council is not sitting to-morrow owing to the change in the date of this Hindu festival, I think it would be reasonable to allow the Bill to be laid.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: Thank you, Sir.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 14th February 1923.